12-2017

Effects of Dialogic Reading in a Special Day Class

Donna Senn
Dominican University of California

<https://doi.org/10.33015/dominican.edu/2017.edu.15>

Survey: Let us know how this paper benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Senn, Donna, "Effects of Dialogic Reading in a Special Day Class" (2017). *Graduate Master's Theses, Capstones, and Culminating Projects*. 342.
<https://doi.org/10.33015/dominican.edu/2017.edu.15>

This Master's Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Scholarship at Dominican Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Master's Theses, Capstones, and Culminating Projects by an authorized administrator of Dominican Scholar. For more information, please contact michael.pujals@dominican.edu.

Effects of Dialogic Reading in a Special Day Class

Donna Senn

A Culminating thesis submitted to the faculty of Dominican University of California in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science in Education

San Rafael CA

December 2017

EFFECTS OF DIALOGIC READING SPECIAL DAY CLASS

Signature Sheet

This thesis, written under the direction of the candidate's thesis advisor and approved by the department chair, has been presented to and accepted by the Department of Education in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science in Education. The content and research methodologies presented in this work represent the work of the candidate alone.

Donna Senn
Candidate

December 15, 2017

Jennifer Lucko, Ph.D.
Program Chair

December 15, 2017

Suresh Appavoo, Ed.D.
Thesis Advisor

December 15, 2017

EFFECTS OF DIALOGIC READING SPECIAL DAY CLASS

Copyright 2017 – by Donna Senn
All rights reserved.

Table of Contents

Abstract	vi
Acknowledgement	vii
Chapter 1 Introduction.....	1
Background and Need	1
Statement of the Problem	3
Statement of Purpose	4
Research Question	5
Theoretical Rationale	5
Assumptions	7
Summary	8
Chapter 2 Review of the Literature.....	9
Introduction	9
Academic Research	9
Summary	15
Chapter 3 Method.....	16
Research Approach	16
Ethical Standards	17
Access and Permissions	17
Sample and Site	19
Data Collection Procedures	20
Data Analysis and Approach	24
Summary	25
Chapter 4 Findings, Analysis, and Discussion.....	26
Findings.....	26
Analysis and Discussion.....	36
Results	38
Comparison of Results to the Literature.....	43
Summary	44
Chapter 5 Conclusions.....	45
Summary of Major Conclusions.....	45
Limitations of the Study.....	47
Significance of the Study.....	48
Implications for Future Research.....	48
About the Author.....	49
References.....	55
Appendices.....	60

EFFECTS OF DIALOGIC READING SPECIAL DAY CLASS

Table of Tables

Table 1	Language Sample A, Participant A	27
Table 2	Language Sample B, Participant A	28
Table 3	Language Sample A, Participant B	29
Table 4	Language Sample B, Participant B	30
Table 5	Language Sample A, Participant C	31
Table 6	Language Sample B, Participant C	32
Table 7	Language Sample A, Participant D	33
Table 8	Language Sample B, Participant D	34
Table 9	Language Sample A, Participant A Apprenticeship Thinking Framework	38
Table 10	Language Sample B, Participant A Apprenticeship Thinking Framework	39
Table 11	Language Sample A, Participant B Apprenticeship Thinking Framework	39
Table 12	Language Sample B, Participant B Apprenticeship Thinking Framework	40
Table 13	Language Sample A, Participant C Apprenticeship Thinking Framework	41
Table 14	Language Sample B, Participant C Apprenticeship Thinking Framework	41
Table 15	Language Sample A, Participant D Apprenticeship Thinking Framework	42
Table 16	Language Sample B, Participant D Apprenticeship Thinking Framework	42

Abstract

Early Childhood Special Education provides services to children aged three to five years. A predominant identifier is very low communication skills (Shevell, et al, 2003; Kaiser & Roberts, 2011; Robertson & Ohi, 2016). Dialogic Reading techniques have demonstrated successes in various settings (Hargrave & Senechal, 2000; Whitehurst et al., 1988; Trivette & Dunst, 2009). The rationale for this study was grounded in Rogoff's, "apprenticeship in thinking" (1990, p. 7) theory. The research literature reviewed centered on three primary lines of inquiry namely, 1) The social aspect of language learning; 2) Speech and language interventions; and 3) Dialogic reading strategies. This study utilized the qualitative case method approach. Data for the study was collected during a four week period of in-class intervention. Data analysis from the study revealed that the intervention using a dialogic reading strategy enabled the participants to increase their learning, use of expressive vocabulary, and the complexity, use of multiword phrases.

Acknowledgments

This project developed from my experience as an Early Childhood Special Education teacher. Many of my students struggled to develop conversational language although they could repeat rote phrases or create 2-3 word utterances. Due to student need I was motivated to find an alternative, research based method of teaching language to young children with speech and language disabilities.

I want to acknowledge the guidance and assistance of the faculty of the School of Education at Dominican University of California. I owe much gratitude to Dr. Suresh Appavoo for his many hours of review and editing my project. I also thank my classmate and colleague, Tyler West Higgins for her input, suggestions and support. Finally, I express my gratitude to my son, Noah and my husband, Glenn for their encouragement, patience and love during this process.

Chapter 1 Introduction

I am currently completing my fifth year of teaching. I have worked with students who have had a variety of disabilities, including speech or language impairment. The primary focus of my program is to support student language improvement, prepare students for kindergarten, and determine future placement. Students who can develop language skills, may exit or reduce services by the time they enter elementary school. My personal goal has been to improve my practice and teaching strategies so that I have a repertoire of methods to teach language and communication skills.

Background and Need

Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) provides services to children aged three to five years. Provisions for their education are found in the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA) part B, section 619, (Bruder, 2010). These students were either identified with developmental disabilities requiring early intervention between birth and “younger than 3 years” as described in IDEA part C, Section 1431, and California Code of Regulations 5CCR 3031, or were identified through the IDEA Child Find mandate (1412(a)(3)(A-B) at or after age 3 years. Children who have been assessed and meet eligibility requirements (California Education Code (EC) Title 5, section 3030 (a-j)) for special education, may be placed in ECSE special day classes to support their needs.

While these children, aged three to five years may be identified with any of the 13 IDEA eligibility categories, one of the predominant characteristics that identifies them is very low communication skills (Shevell, et al., 2003; Kaiser & Roberts, 2011; Robertson & Ohi, 2016). Due to the frequency of speech or language impairment (SLI) assigned as either the primary or

secondary IEP eligibility reason amidst preschool aged students with disabilities, an important component of the ECSE special day class program is to use strategies designed to build communication skills. Furthermore, preschool aged children who don't understand the meaning of words and word relationships, in the structures of spoken language, lack the foundations needed for a future ability to read (Hoover & Gough, 1990). Therefore ECSE teachers need to use strategies that have been evaluated for their ability to produce desired outcomes (Bruder, 2010; Trivette & Dunst 2009).

In a Northern California County school district, prior to entry into the ECSE, three to five year old students whose language skills are below age expected norms, are assessed by a speech and language pathologist (SLP) with the Preschool Language Scale-5 (PLS-5) assessment tool to determine eligibility for services. Students who score at or below the seventh percentile in overall language skill (receptive/expressive abilities combined) qualify for entry into the ECSE special day class. Additional assessments by other specialists may be administered, depending upon reasons for referral.

Early identification and treatment of children with disabilities is needed in order to address potential developmental delays and prepare students for entrance into elementary school. The development of language/communication skill is critical to future academic attainment. (Fey, Catts & Larrivee, 1995). Therefore, a major component of the ECSE special day class environment and curriculum design is to increase vocabulary (receptive and expressive) and to simultaneously develop spoken language (Frome, Loeb & Armstrong, 2001).

The Read it Once Again (RIOA) curriculum has been used by teachers in a California County school district ECSE special day class. It is a literacy based curriculum that combines the frequent reading of popular children's storybooks with themes and characters found in the

storybook, incorporated into the various domains (cognitive, language, social/emotional, adaptive and motor skills) addressed in class. Many students have demonstrated learning targeted vocabulary by expressively labeling objects, actions, and adjectives. However, the students continue to struggle to combine these parts of speech into age appropriate, grammatically correct utterances. This hinders their ability to generalize the use of multiword phrases (as identified with teacher made vocabulary tests and language samples).

Since ECSE approaches services as developmental, the strategies used are designed to help three to five year old students with language impairment, increase skills and potentially exit special education. The need for this study is that responsible teachers, striving to help students build their communication skills, must continuously find and use methods that have a proven track record of increasing oral language when current strategies used, appear to fall short. Dialogic Reading (DR) techniques have demonstrated successes with students in various settings (Hargrave & Senechal, 2000; Whitehurst et al., 1988; Trivette & Dunst, 2009). If dialogic reading strategies produce any enhancement in the language samples of the ECSE special day class students then they will have the opportunity to exit or reduce special education services and enter kindergarten in a less restrictive environment. In addition to supporting student language acquisition, the successful use of dialogic reading strategies could result in reduced student costs to the school district if fewer children are found eligible for special education.

Statement of the Problem

The ECSE program in a Northern California County district, runs four special day classes, with six to eight students in each class. These students learn expressive vocabulary and repeat rote phrases in predictable routine settings. However, they struggle to incorporate vocabulary into utterances or generalize the use of multiword sentences in peer to peer

conversations and in response to teacher questions during storybook time. The problem is that if these ECSE special day class students do not develop these communication skills they will be at risk of not becoming academically proficient in future education settings (Kaiser & Roberts, 2011), and could be placed in more restrictive environments. Since the current strategies do not seem to be leading the students to proficiency, it is incumbent that different strategies be evaluated for their effectiveness with ECSE students.

Additionally, this Northern California district conducts transitions from the ECSE special day class to kindergarten in spring during the pre-kindergarten year. The continuum of services are considered for each student during this transition. The district places students in the least restrictive environment (LRE) in accordance with IDEA (1412(a) (5)(A) and California Education Codes (EC 56031), (EC 56201), (EC 56206), (EC 56303). If language skills can be improved while in the ECSE special day class, these students may be placed in the general education kindergarten setting without requiring special education services. This would allow them to remain in the classroom with their peers and teacher.

Statement of Purpose

The primary purpose of this study is to evaluate how using dialogic reading techniques, and the Read It Once Again (RIOA) recommended storybooks affects the use of spoken word combinations amongst the students in one ECSE special day class in a Northern California County school district. If the study reflects gain in language usage, then dialogic reading techniques could be integrated into the support for these ECSE students. The secondary purpose of this study is to evaluate how using dialogic reading techniques with the RIOA recommended storybooks can prevent or minimize restrictive environment placements when the students transition to kindergarten.

Research Question

This study was focused on one research question as follows. Does the use of dialogic reading techniques and ‘Read it Once Again’ (RIOA) recommended storybooks during story time, for students identified with a speech or language impairment increase their usage of multiword sentences?

Theoretical Rationale

The theoretical rationale for this study was drawn from Rogoff’s theory of the processes involved in cognitive development, called “apprenticeship in thinking” (1990, p. 7). Rogoff asserted that adults lead a child’s learning of the use of social tools (in this case, language), through a process of focusing attention, providing response or feedback, demonstrating tasks and overseeing the learning activities. This theory suggests that the master of a skill teaches it to a novice (apprenticeship) who learns through a process of interactive guidance (guided participation) that includes a provision of specific tasks that enhance learning through engagement (participatory appropriation) (Rogoff, 1990; 1995, pp. 139, 141). Rogoff proposed that the three components of her theory are interrelated and should not be considered independently. She suggested that apprenticeship is about learning the use of culturally relevant tools from those who are more knowledgeable in a small group. Guided participation is a way to look at interpersonal interactions that involve both activity or observation and the direction provided by social partners. Participatory appropriation suggests that children learn from the process of actively engaging in an activity.

Rogoff’s theory also suggests that children learn within the social contexts of their community or institutional settings through interactions with peers and adults (1995). In other

words, learning is not an independent activity. Rather it is social and set within the context of a child's interactions with others, including daily activities and the physical setting. The classroom is an institutional setting. It provides a physical space where students and teachers interact and engage in personal and interpersonal activities on a routine basis.

Since dialogic reading is a teaching and learning strategy used to increase language capability based on interactive engagement with storybooks and adults, it provides an apprenticeship in the use of words to construct language. The strategy also provides opportunities for learning through guided participation and participatory appropriation by way of the interactive process of building language acquisition through the action of answering questions and retelling the story. These activities allow the child to engage and interact with the teacher and peers while learning through the manner of active involvement in discussing the story.

When using dialogic reading strategies, the teacher begins the interaction as the expert by reading the story. Then the teacher targets specific vocabulary that is related to the storybook by pointing to pictures in the book and asking labeling questions (i.e., "What is it?"). These questions derive one word answers and allow the learner/apprentice to demonstrate vocabulary acquisition. Once the learner has demonstrated mastery of the vocabulary, the teacher moves to the next level of asking questions that require the learner to use the new vocabulary within the context of a longer response. It is here that the teacher uses expansions as a model and teaching tool, by adding only one or two words to the original response and restating the response so that the child can restate the utterance. When the students have demonstrated mastery of creating longer utterances, the teacher uses the storybook to ask questions that facilitate conversation and have the child relate the book to personal experience. This allows practice using newly learned

vocabulary and generalizing the vocabulary to other contexts. Finally, the teacher relinquishes authority as the student or apprentice gains experience in using language to retell the story (Flynn, 2011).

This study used Rogoff's 'theory of apprenticeship' as the theoretical lens for analyzing language samples collected at each stage of the dialogic reading strategy including a set of baseline data and after the intervention to demonstrate the learning and the quality of learning if any. Rogoff theorized that the apprentice's learning stems from interaction with the expert (1990, 1995), and therefore provides the rationale that language samples collected during and after an intervention strategy can not only demonstrate acquisition of new vocabulary, but can also demonstrate the quality of such learning. Rogoff also theorized that the apprentice is able to build upon the learning through the guidance of an expert. Thus, theoretically, language samples collected after using prompts and questions to elicit longer utterances through the support of expert guidance can determine whether any learning occurred, and if so, what the quality of the learning was. Furthermore, as the third element of Rogoff's theory suggests, language samples that reveal the use of vocabulary to other generalized contexts, such as between peers or to retell stories, can demonstrate learning through "participatory appropriation" (Rogoff, 1995, pp. 141-142).

Assumptions

The researcher assumed that study participants were composed of a representative sample of students as typified in an ECSE special day class in the school district of service. The researcher also assumed that the dialogic reading (DR) intervention would produce relevant, observable data that would lend itself to further analysis.

Summary

Prior research studies have identified language attainment as an indicator of potential student success in future grades. Students with the IEP eligibility of speech or language impairment are at risk of not developing reading skills and potential placement in special education programs. Rogoff's theory of cognitive development, provides a basis for how ECSE special day class teachers could help students with speech or language impairments learn to speak in multiword sentences and expand such use of language to other settings or situations. This study attempted to evaluate the effectiveness of dialogic reading with ECSE special day class students. The purpose of this study was to determine whether this method could support the increased usage of multiword utterances for students in an ECSE special day class.

Chapter 2 Review of the Literature

The literature reviewed primarily focused on the social aspect of language learning and how the use of dialogic reading strategies could affect the language acquisition of three to five year old students with the IEP designation of speech or language impairment. Information was gathered from multiple electronic sources of scholarly articles and books spanning the relevant research literature beginning from 1920 up to the year 2017.

The majority of the research scholarship that was reviewed can be clustered into three distinct categories namely, 1) The social aspect of language learning; 2) Speech and language interventions; and 3) Dialogic reading strategies. The reviewed literature is synthesized chronologically in each cluster so as to situate the scholarship within a historical context and presented below.

Social Aspect of Language Learning

Vygotsky's work entered the field of psychology in the U.S. during the early 1960's when "Thought and Language" was published (1962). A social basis for learning and language development began as result of his research findings. Vygotsky linked social context to language acquisition in young children. He described the learning process of young children as social and interactive. While observing children in experimental contexts, he learned that children use language to navigate their environment. Further, he viewed language as a cultural tool (1978, pp. 19-26), used to support a child's communication skills and cognitive growth.

The research of John-Steiner and Tatter (1983), supported the theory of the social aspect of language acquisition by suggesting that children develop language for functional purposes, in relationship with their caregivers, to communicate needs and wants. They proposed that in this

context, the adult adjusts spoken language to fit the child's ability to speak and understand. In turn, this promotes the child's language development as the child interacts and responds. Additional research between parents and children indicated a relationship between adult labeling objects in the environment to child language acquisition (Snow 1984; Moerk 1985) and vocabulary increase (Masur 1982). "Semantic Contingency" (Snow 1982, p. 3) is a term used to describe adult language use that focuses on the child's utterance. The observable elements of this language approach are the adult's capacity to incorporate, expand upon and or correct child utterances. It is an important social aspect of language acquisition. This process integrates the child's responses, interests and abilities into the adult-child interactions (Moerk, 1985; Penner, 1987). According to Rogoff (1990), this method scaffolds a child's developing language and communication skills.

Based upon the social aspect of learning, Rogoff suggested a model that describes a continuous interaction of learning between individuals and their "cultural environments" (1995, p. 140). Rogoff proposed that children develop use of the "tools of culture" (1990, p.16) through interaction with adults and those with more experience who can support their understanding and ability. Rogoff's concepts of learning include three levels that describe areas of focus: "community, interpersonal and personal" (1995, p. 141). Rogoff named these areas of learning apprenticeship, guided participation and participatory appropriation (Rogoff 1990).

Speech and Language Intervention

Speech and language pathology is a broad field, working with a number of speech disorders, including language delays. This literature review is only focused on strategies used to support language impairment and will not attempt to address all areas of speech pathology. There are four broad periods covered in the following review 1) the 1920's through the early 1940's,

2) from 1945 through the late 1950's, 3) the 1960's through the early 1970's, and 4) the 1970's up to 2003.

During the 1920's through the early 1940's, speech correction was concerned with disorders that included stuttering, articulation and lack of speech. Educational approaches to language therapy focused on the teaching of speech sounds and increased to teaching word sequences. Therapy was based on isolated daily drills that were intended to work on areas of need. Practice did not incorporate language corrections into the context of the school day. (Blanton & Blanton, 1920; Orton, 1937; Nemoy & Davies, 1937; Robins & Robins, 1937; Berry & Eisenson, 1942).

From 1945 to the late 1950's, practitioners continued to develop theories of childhood language acquisition and therapeutic methods to treat the disorders. These theories were holistic and evolved to understanding how language was organized and used in context. Language intervention concentrated on the words of language rather than isolating the sounds. Myklebust (1956), elaborated on Goldstein's (1948) models of language processing and developed a guide to therapy that included sound awareness, connecting sounds to the things that made them (i.e., a toy, an instrument), sentence completion tasks, and pairing words that had commonality.

Following Noam Chomsky's theory of language development in 1957, the rules associated with children's language attainment and growth were viewed through a differing lens than that of adult language. In 1963, Fraser, Bellugi, and Brown published research on children's language learning. Their theory proposed that children learn language through imitation, understanding and repetition of certain linguistic rules. Their research findings led to approaches that were highly structured and required children to repeat targeted word choices through prompting and coaching. This method was called elicited imitation and its practitioners believed

correct imitation signified learning of the underlying rules of language (Meltzoff, A. N. & Moore, M. K., 1977; Tyack & Gottsleben, 1977).

Practice approaches began to shift in the mid 1970's as language intervention began trending towards naturalistic methods. A leading method was called incidental language teaching (Hart & Risley 1975, p. 411). This approach followed the theory that if adults worked with children in an unstructured setting and changed the way they talked with children by expanding what the child said to longer utterances, the child's learning would be increased. This situational method was often begun by the child and followed the child's interests. (Snow, 1972; MacDonald, Blott, Gordon, Spiegel & Hartmann, 1974; Hart & Risely, 1982; Warren & Kaiser, 1986).

The naturalistic approach to language learning led to changes in practice that were concerned with how language was used and how language supported the various social settings of daily life (Van Kleeck & Frankel, 1981). Therapy also shifted to view the interaction of communication between people, rather than just the output of an individual (Goldstein & Gallagher, 1992; MacDonald & Carroll, 1991; Simmons-Mackie & Damico, 1995). Rather than pulling students out of their typical routines and situations where speaking and communicating occurred, services were provided in classrooms and other cultural settings. In order to support this new focus on language interaction, services provided direct instruction, language models and prompts (Constable, 1986; Law, Garrett & Nye 2003).

Dialogic Reading Strategies

Dialogic reading strategy studies were originally conducted by Whitehurst, et al. in 1988. The initial study was an inquiry about whether a specific process of questioning, cueing, providing feedback and opportunity to practice between a mother and child during storybook

reading could be used as an intervention strategy. This study contributed via experimentation, to the knowledge base (Ninio & Bruner, 1978; Ninio, 1980; Wells, G., 1985) that the “child-directed speech from parents” could encourage language acquisition from children with typically developing skills (p. 558).

The initial experiments and success of dialogic reading in parent-child groupings lead to further experimentation. In 1992, Valdez-Menchaca and Whitehurst, et al. expanded the study to demonstrate dialogic readings usefulness as an intervention program with students of low social economic status and deemed at risk, in a childcare program in Mexico. Although this study was in a day care, the intervention was conducted with a one to one, child to adult ratio. Additional research studies have continued to contribute to the information regarding the scope and range of dialogic reading interventions (Opel, Ameer & Aboud, 2009; Lever & Senechal, 2011; Simsek & Erdogan, 2015).

In 2000, a research study compared dialogic reading strategy results to the results of regular book reading strategies in a preschool setting with student to teacher ratios of eight to one. This study was conducted within the day cares’ existing circle time and classrooms rather than pulling children out of the classroom. The findings demonstrated that students who were taught using the dialogic reading techniques made greater gains learning new vocabulary than the students who were received the “regular” (Hargrave & Senechal, p.86) reading technique. Continued research shared these conclusions (Ard & Beverly, 2004; Blewitt, Rump, Shealy & Cook, 2009; Trivette & Dunst, 2007; Pillinger & Wood, 2014), including a review by the What Works Clearinghouse database (2007), that dialogic reading was an effective practice for increasing oral language skills.

Initial research into the use of dialogic reading was conducted with typically developing students in need of language intervention. However, in the 1990's, researchers investigations into the use of dialogic reading with children who had language delays, demonstrated positive results in language gain (Yoder & Davies, 1990; Whitehurst, et al., 1991; Yoder, Davies, Bishop & Munson, 1994; Crain-Thoreson & Dale, 1999). These studies were conducted in home or in one to one, child to adult ratios. The results added valuable information to the growing data regarding the use of dialogic reading.

More recent studies have included children with developmental delays (Rahn, Grygas, Coogle & Storie, 2016), including cognitive disabilities (Jordan, Miller & Riley, 2011), and autism (Whalon, Delano & Hanline, 2013; Fleury & Schwartz, 2016). These studies included adaptations to the dialogic reading strategies that were necessary to support student needs related to their developmental disabilities. These studies were also conducted in one to one ratios. In 2014, Maul and Ambler conducted an investigation into the use of dialogic reading as a method for speech-language pathologists to use in therapy sessions. They specifically examined whether students with language disorders could expand their ability by learning to use prefixes and suffixes.

In 2016, a study was conducted with language impaired, three to five year old students to determine whether using the dialogic reading strategy could increase receptive and expressive language skills as well as impact preliterate skills. During this study, the students were placed in small groups of three to five and pulled from regular classroom activities during dialogic reading activities and then returned afterwards. The study demonstrated positive results (Towson, Gallagher & Bingham, 2016).

Summary

The information in this literature review demonstrates that given the social nature of language development, dialogic reading is an effective way to help students increase the use of spoken language. ECSE programs need to employ methods that will actively engage, encourage and teach students how to make multiword utterances. Dialogic reading is designed to support students at various levels of language use and skill through the use of a series of questions, cues and corrective feedback.

The research scholarship covered in this literature review provides support for using dialogic reading strategies in the ECSE classroom. However, continued research is still needed with group sizes of four ECSE students, within the context of the special day class setting and with students whose language skills have been assessed at or below the seventh percentile with the PLS-5 assessment tool.

Chapter 3 Method

This study inquired into whether participants would increase their use of multiword utterances through an in-class intervention program using dialogic reading strategies. This chapter describes the research design and methods of data collection used in this study.

Research Approach

The underlying theoretical basis for this study was social constructivism, and in particular, Rogoff's apprenticeship theory of cognitive development (1990, 1995). This study involved the use of dialogic reading strategy and the observation of how learners developed the use of multiword utterances through a combination of direct instruction, guidance and engaged interactions. This study utilized the qualitative case method approach. Qualitative case methodology is defined by the in-depth study of a "bounded system" (Merriam, 1998, p. 37), which could refer to a person, group or a program. The qualitative case study research design provides for a detailed description of the case process, and has the potential to increase knowledge regarding the case under study through an interactive awareness. According to Merriam, qualitative research focuses on the processes involved, developing awareness of how people learn and interpret their interactions and encounters with others (1998, p. 15).

A qualitative case design was appropriate to this study because the researcher gathered information on participants through observation, and the collection of language samples as a "participant observer" (Gold, 1958). The researcher documented student utterances/responses to questions through the collection of language samples during and after dialogic reading activities over a period of twelve dialogic reading sessions of the same story utilizing prepared questions and cues. These questions and cues were developed based on the dialogic reading

implementation guidelines outlined by Flynn, (2011). Flynn reconstructed the dialogic reading levels devised by Lonigan in 2006 (as cited in Flynn p. 9-12), which were used with the storybook and provided information regarding the type of question and samples, for each level of learning. These questions and cues were designed to encourage student engagement in reading activities. The process oriented methodological approach referred to above is consistent with the description that, “as a participant observer,” the researcher will be a part of the observation and recording the activities of the participants (Schensul & LeCompte, 2013, pp. 83-84)

Ethical Standards

This study adhered to the ethical standards for protection of human subjects of the American Psychological Association (2010). Additionally a research proposal was submitted and reviewed by the Dominican University of California Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (IRBPHS), approved and assigned number 10603 (Appendix A).

Due to the ages of the participants, all of whom were legal minors, the researcher secured permission from parents/legal guardians prior to their participation. The researcher provided parents/legal guardians a written description of participant rights before receiving permission for their children to become voluntary participants in this study. The researcher additionally provided an overview of the study, data collection methods, and assured parents/legal guardians that the participants would be treated with dignity and their needs would be promptly attended to. The privacy and confidentiality of the participants were protected by the use of a single lettered code for each participant throughout the study.

Access and Permissions

The researcher received district approval to enroll in the Master of Science in Education Program at Dominican University of California, which required the completion of a research study for the Master's thesis.

Specific to this study, the researcher met with the Northern California school district's Program Manager in-person, described the thesis research project by explaining the dialogic reading strategy process and goals; the use of storybooks that were currently in use in the classroom and data collection through student language samples. The researcher explained how student confidentiality would be maintained and their privacy protected. The researcher sought and obtained informed written permission and approval to conduct the research study from the Program Manager (Appendix B).

After having secured the program manager's approval to conduct the research, the researcher met with parent/guardians of the potential participants, explained the purpose of the research and the methods through which the study would be conducted. The researcher discussed the possible risks and/or discomforts that their child may experience from participating in this study. The researcher explained how confidentiality would be maintained and the privacy of the participants protected throughout this study. The researcher explained that participation was voluntary and reviewed the Dominican University of California's Research Participant Bill of Rights that was also provided to them in English and Spanish translations respectively. The researcher solicited and received written informed consent from each parent/guardian, and provided them with a signed copy of the consent letter and the Participant Bill of Rights (English version in Appendix C, and Spanish version in Appendix D).

Sample and Site

This study took place in one school district in a Northern California County that serves a large population of students (2015-16 enrollment was 7173 students TK-12th grade). It has seven elementary schools, serving kindergarten through fifth grade, one school that serves kindergarten through eighth grade, one middle school and three high schools. Given the large number of students served by this district, it also offers special day classes that support early childhood through high school students. This allows the district to provide most special education services within neighborhood boundaries and helps to control educational practices.

The sampling selection criteria for participants in this study was based on requirements for the entry into the Northern California school district's ECSE special day program. The program's primary focus is on language/communication development. Students enrolled in this program were aged three to five years because this is the usual range of the classroom population. Also, as a requirement of receiving services, students enrolled in the ECSE program have IEPs with speech or language impairment (SLI) listed as either their primary or secondary disability. The SLI designation is determined when a pupil receives a score at or below the seventh percentile on the Preschool Language Scale-5 (PLS-5) assessment tool.

Participant A is a three year, nine month old girl. The primary language spoken at home is Spanish. There is a family history of speech and language impairment. Participant A has two siblings who also receive speech and language intervention. She had received feeding therapy, behavioral intervention, and physical therapy prior to entry into the ECSE special day class. Evaluation results from the PLS-5 Spanish Edition administered prior to entry in the ECSE special day class, scored her total language skill as being in the first percentile.

Participant B is a three year, eight month old girl. The primary language spoken at home is Spanish. She had received feeding therapy and behavioral intervention prior to entry into the ECSE special day class. Evaluation results from the PLS-5 Spanish Edition administered prior to entry in the ECSE special day class, scored her total language skill as being in the seventh percentile.

Participant C is a three year, one month old girl. The primary language spoken at home is Spanish. There is a family history of speech and language impairment. Her sibling also receives speech and language intervention. She had received speech and language therapy and behavioral intervention prior to entry into the ECSE special day class. Evaluation results from the PLS-5 Spanish Edition administered prior to entry into the ECSE special day class, scored her total language skill as being in the fourth percentile.

Participant D is a three year, two month old boy. The primary language spoken at home is Spanish. There is no family history of speech and language intervention. He had received speech and language therapy and behavioral intervention prior to entry into the ECSE special day class. Evaluation results from the PLS-5 Spanish Edition administered prior to entry into the ECSE special day class scored his total language skill as being in the second percentile.

Data Collection Procedures

The researcher collected all the data for the study during a four week period. The researcher conducted the dialogic reading sessions three times a week. Each session was 20 minutes in length. During the four week timeframe, the researcher used one storybook. The researcher used the dialogic reading strategies that included the three targeted levels of student

learning and sequencing of teacher questioning and cueing, developed by Lonigan as described by Flynn (2011).

Prior to beginning the first session, the researcher determined vocabulary to target, prepared illustrations, collected objects that depicted vocabulary and developed the questions that were asked of the participants for Levels one, two and three. However, since the process of expanding participant responses, was dependent upon participant utterances, the researcher could not prepare all interactive materials in advance of the sessions. To minimize researcher bias, field notes and language samples were also recorded by a teacher-aide who followed an identical process (teacher-aide was bound by a confidentiality agreement, attached in Appendix E) as a part of the regular procedure for the participants present in the classroom. Additionally, the researcher and teacher-aide alternated their roles as continued effort to minimize researcher bias. The researcher and the teacher-aide independently notated individual participant responses on the Delmar Cengage Learning form (attached in Appendix F).

Since all students had attended the ECSE special day class prior to the four week intervention, the researcher and teacher-aide took language samples of each participant's utterances, during storybook time, to establish a current baseline use of multiword phrases. The pre-intervention language sample was the assessment taken after the participants had listened to the story, "Brown Bear, Brown Bear, What do you see?" by Bill Martin Jr. This book was not presented using dialogic reading strategies. However, it was read three times a week in a four week period during the same storybook reading time of day as the intervention. The targeted vocabulary words were: bear, bird, duck, horse, frog, cat, fish, dog, sheep, teacher and children. Observational field notes of student interactions and behaviors were also kept by the researcher and teacher-aide.

The first session involved introducing the storybook, “From Head to Toe,” by Eric Carle, to the participants via a preview of the book’s illustrations. The researcher also provided and reviewed 12 additional illustrations and provided objects that represented the targeted vocabulary: penguin, giraffe, buffalo, monkey, seal, gorilla, cat, crocodile, camel, donkey, elephant and parrot. During this same session, the researcher read the book to the participants identified targeted vocabulary by pointing to pictures and either labeling the vocabulary or offering opportunities for participants to label or point at specific pictures.

Level one began with the next session which involved presenting vocabulary using the book and pointing to the pictures. The researcher accomplished this by first asking these labeling questions “What is this?” or “What is it?” and then asking another question that required the participant to offer a purpose “What can it do?” (i.e., stomp). The researcher first allowed the participants opportunity to answer the questions and then provided the answers when participants were unable. After the researcher provided the answer, the participants were prompted to repeat the answers. Participant answers were then extended by one to two words by the researcher (i.e., Elephant stomps or Elephant can stomp.). The extension used was the verb associated with each animal in the book, turns, bends, raises, waves, claps, thumps, arches, wiggles, kneels, kicks, stomps and wiggles, respectively. The participants were again prompted to repeat the extended answer. This process was repeated until participants could independently label most of the vocabulary.

During level two sessions, the researcher asked the open-ended questions “What do you see?” or “What can it do?” These questions were followed by, “Tell me more” when participants used one word responses. If participants were unable to reply to the question, the researcher used a sentence starter, either “I see ____” or “____ can ____ (i.e., “Elephant can stomp.”)”, allowing

participants to say the final word in the sentence. Afterwards the participants were prompted to repeat the entire sentence. This provided the participants with the opportunity to practice new vocabulary and build longer responses. The researcher and teacher-aide recorded these prepared questions and prompts in the field notes along with participant codes, where they added student responses, corrections and repetitions. They also used expansions of one or two words (e.g., “I see a green crocodile,” or “Elephant can stomp feet.”) to build participant response. The participants then repeated the expansions.

The level three sessions involved continued use of the same book as in level one and two. At this time the researcher encouraged the participants to engage in conversation about how the book might relate to their own experiences. The researcher continued using the children’s book, “From Head to Toe” by Eric Carle. She asked the question: “What can you do?” Participants were given opportunities to respond to the question. If participants were unable to reply to the question, the researcher used a sentence starter, “I can ____ (i.e., stomp).” Allowing participants to say the final word in the sentence. Their responses would have been expanded upon using one to two additional words (i.e., “I can stomp feet.”). The goal in this level was for the participants to generalize the use of new vocabulary to personal experience.

Evidence of language acquisition targets were determined by documented observation of participant responses. The researcher entered each session with the questions and prompts that were appropriate to each level. All field notes were notated using an alphabetic code assigned to each participant during the sessions. The researcher and teacher-aide wrote participant utterances verbatim on the Delmar, Cengage Learning form (Appendix F). This form is used for obtaining language samples. The teacher-aide followed the same procedures as the researcher during each level to corroborate data and minimize researcher bias and confirm participant learning.

After the four week intervention was complete, the researcher and teacher-aide collected a final language sample. The post-intervention language sample from the participants was collected during the scheduled storybook reading time. While viewing the book, the participants were asked the question, “What can you do?” in order to stimulate participant use of multiword utterances. Participants were not offered the sentence starters to prompt or extend responses.

Data Analysis and Approach

First the researcher reviewed the intervention lesson questions and then the reflective notes after each lesson, in order to determine whether she adhered to the initial questions, prompts and cues. The researcher listed the questions, prompts and cues on a chart, and included the date of instruction. The next step involved analyzing the language samples collected during the sessions for accuracy, complexity, and length of utterance. The student language samples were written phonetically when language was unintelligible or articulation was inaccurate. Researcher interpretation of participant word approximation was noted in parenthesis. The researcher reviewed both her own, and the field notes from the teacher-aide to compare and identify the prompts, cues, and feedback used for each participant during the sessions. The researcher created a coding sheet for each child. Then the researcher listed the prompt, cue or feedback used on the left side of the sheet. The researcher recorded the participants’ responses on the right.

The researcher then identified and coded responses as learned using Rogoff’s apprenticeship thinking rationale. When participants learned via direct instruction, the response was coded as apprenticeship. Participant responses that occurred after prompting and cueing were identified, in accordance with Rogoff’s description of guided participation. Utterances

related to the story that were made without direct instruction, prompting, cueing or repetition were coded as language acquisition through participatory appropriation.

The researcher then compared the language samples taken prior to the intervention, during the intervention and after the intervention to glean any information that would indicate how each participant acquired language using Rogoff's theoretical constructs to compare gains and learning to the baseline.

Summary

Since this study is about determining whether dialogic reading strategies fostered language acquisition in ECSE special day class students, the researcher used qualitative case study design. The researcher adopted the role of a participant observer and utilized a teacher-aide to independently record observations to minimize bias. Given the vulnerability of the participants, the researcher made sure to protect their privacy and minimize risks by assigning an alphabetic code to each of the participants.

This study took place at a school district location and the participants were students who lived within the district boundaries. They attended an ECSE special day class, were aged, three to five years and had an IEP with a SLI designation. All participants' baseline language acquisition was established via PLS-5 assessment prior to entry in the ECSE special day class. Since students had attended the classroom and had received instruction prior to the start of the study, the researcher took language samples to establish a baseline prior to beginning the intervention for this study. Data was collected over a four week period using dialogic reading strategies to teach vocabulary and elicit multiword utterances from the participants.

Chapter 4 Findings, Analysis and Discussion

This study evaluated the use of dialogic reading techniques with the current ECSE classroom 'Read it Once Again' curriculum in order to ascertain student learning to create multiword utterances. The four participants in this study were enrolled in one ECSE special day class. The participants were identified with speech or language impairments. This designation was determined by the administration of assessments, by a speech and language pathologist, prior to entry into the special day class. During this intervention, three 20 minute dialogic reading sessions were conducted three times each week, for four weeks. All participants were included in the sessions. Data collected for the study included demographic information and language samples. Each participant was provided with an alphabetic code to mask their identity.

Findings

Initial findings from the study are organized into two tables for each participant labeled Language Sample A and Language Sample B for the data collected before, during and after the intervention. Language Sample A denotes samples collected by the researcher. Language Sample B denotes samples collected by the teacher-aide. The tables include utterances, errors, and multiword counts. The language sample counts for data collected during the intervention is separated by sessions. Language Complexity measurements used were based upon the 2007 assemblage of the National Institute of Deafness and Other Communication Disorders (NIDCD) recommendations as summarized by Tager-Flusberg et al., (2009). The phases and brief descriptions of what each phase represents in children ages (ages one to four years) are as follows:

Phase 1: Preverbal Communication: children use non word vocalizations and gestures to communicate, Phase 2: First Words: children use one word to communicate about objects

and events, Phase 3: Word Combinations: children usually use two to three words, including verbs, nouns and descriptors, Phase 4 Sentences: children create word combinations (sentences) and may include plurals, prepositions and verb endings, Phase 5: Complex Language: children use relative clauses, verb clauses, word repetition to tell a story or converse (pp. 646-647).

The tables below tabulate participant utterances. They do not include any gestural (nonverbal) responses, or repetitions made after researcher corrections or expansions. Since the participants are under four years of age, word approximations are not considered errors. A multiword phrase is any utterance that contains more than one word. Repetitions of the same word in a single utterance were considered multiword.

Table 1

Language Sample A, Participant A

	Pre Intervention			During Intervention			Post Intervention		
Language Sample A	Utterances	Errors	Multi word phrases	Utterances	Errors	Multi word phrases	Utterances	Errors	Multi word phrases
	9	5	0				3	0	3
Level 1:									
Day 1				9	4	0			
Day 2				6	2	0			
Day 3				7	3	0			
Day 4				5	0	0			
Level 2:									
Day 5				3	0	0			
Day 6				7	0	0			
Day 7				3	0	1			
Day 8				3	0	0			
Day 9				5	0	3			
Level 3:									
Day 10				6	0	2			
Day 11				12	0	7			
Day 12				4	0	4			
Complexity	Phase 2: First Words			Days 1 – 5: Phase 2: First Words Days 6-12: Phase 2: First Words and Phase 3: Word Combinations			Phase 3: Word Combinations		

As shown in Table 1, Participant A demonstrated a reduction in labeling errors by day four, an overall increase in labeling, a slight increase in multiword utterances and moved to phase 3 phrase complexity by the end of the four week intervention.

Table 2

Language Sample B, Participant A

	Pre Intervention			During Intervention			Post Intervention		
Language Sample B	Utterances	Errors	Multi word phrase	Utterance	Errors	Multi word phrases	Utterances	Errors	Multi word phrases
	9	5	0				3	0	3
Level 1:									
Day 1				6	1	0			
Day 2				6	2	0			
Day 3				7	3	0			
Day 4				6	0	0			
Level 2:									
Day 5				3	0	0			
Day 6				6	0	0			
Day 7				5	0	2			
Day 8				3	0	0			
Day 9				4	0	2			
Level 3:									
Day 10				5	0	2			
Day 11				8	0	4			
Day 12				3	0	3			
Complexity	Phase 2: First Words			Days 1 – 5: Phase 2: First Words Days 6-12: Phase 2: First Words and Phase 3: Word Combinations			Phase 3: Word Combinations		

As shown in Table 2, the teacher- aide registered slightly different totals in utterance, error and multiword phrases for Participant B compared to the researcher. However, the participant's progress to phase 3, phrase complexity is consistent.

Table 3

Language Sample A, Participant B

Language Sample A	Pre Intervention			During Intervention			Post Intervention		
	Utterances	Errors	Multi word phrases	Utterances	Errors	Multi word phrases	Utterances	Errors	Multi word phrases
	13	0	4				4	0	4
Level 1: Day 1				7	1	1			
Day 2				7	3	1			
Day 3				6	1	1			
Day 4				9	0	5			
Level 2: Day 5				8	0	5			
Day 6				0	0	0			
Day 7				10	0	8			
Day 8				1	0	1			
Day 9				4	0	3			
Level 3: Day 10				8	0	6			
Day 11				9	0	7			
Day 12				4	0	4			
Complexity	Phase 2: First Words and Phase 3: Word Combinations			Day 1: Phase 2: First Words and Phase 3: Word Combinations Days 2 – 5: Phase 2: First Words and Phase 3: Word Combinations Day 6: (Absent) Days 7-12: Phase 2: First Words, Phase 3: Word Combinations and Phase 4: Sentences			Phase 3: Word Combinations and Phase 4: Sentences		

As shown in Table 3, Participant B demonstrated a reduction in labeling errors by day four, an overall increase in multiword utterances and moved to phase 4 phrase complexity by the end of the four week intervention.

Table 4

Language Sample B, Participant B

Language Sample B	Pre Intervention			During Intervention			Post Intervention		
	Utterances	Errors	Multi word phrase	Utterance	Errors	Multi word phrases	Utterances	Errors	Multi word phrases
	12	0	4				5	0	5
Level 1: Day 1				8	1	1			
Day 2				7	3	2			
Day 3				6	0	4			
Day 4				6	0	3			
Level 2: Day 5				5	0	4			
Day 6				0	0	0			
Day 7				7	0	4			
Day 8				1	0	1			
Day 9				5	0	2			
Level 3: Day 10				9	0	5			
Day 11				7	0	5			
Day 12				3	0	3			
Complexity	Phase 2: First Words and Phase 3: Word Combinations			Day 1: Phase 2: First Words and Phase 3: Word Combinations Days 2 – 5: Phase 2: First Words and Phase 3: Word Combinations Day 6: (Absent) Days 7-12: Phase 2: First Words, Phase 3: Word Combinations and Phase 4: Sentences			Phase 3: Word Combinations and Phase 4: Sentences		

As shown in Table 4, the teacher- aide registered slightly different totals in utterance, error and multiword phrases for Participant B compared to the researcher. However, the participant's progress to phase 3, phrase complexity is consistent.

Table 5

Language Sample A, Participant C

Language Sample A	Pre Intervention			During Intervention			Post Intervention		
	Utterances	Errors	Multi word phrases	Utterances	Errors	Multi word phrases	Utterances	Errors	Multi word phrases
	8	5	0				6	0	4
Level 1: Day 1				3	2	0			
Day 2				0	0	0			
Day 3				8	2	0			
Day 4				4	0	0			
Level 2: Day 5				4	0	0			
Day 6				3	0	1			
Day 7				4	0	0			
Day 8				1	0	1			
Day 9				6	0	1			
Level 3: Day 10				7	1	0			
Day 11				3	0	3			
Day 12				2	0	1			
Complexity	Phase 2: First Words			Days 1: Phase 2: First Words Day 2: (Absent) Days 3 – 5: Phase 2: First Words Day 6: Phase 2: First Words and Phase 3: Word Combinations Day 7: Phase 2: First Words Day 8: Phase 3: Word Combinations Day 9: Phase 2: First Words and Phase 3: Word Combinations Day 10: Phase 2: First Words Days 11-12: Phase 2: First Words and Phase 3: Word Combinations			Phase 2: First Words Phase 3: Word Combinations		

As shown in Table 5, Participant C demonstrated a reduction in labeling errors, an increase in multiword utterances and moved to phase 3 phrase complexity by the end of the four week intervention.

Table 6

Language Sample B, Participant C

Language Sample B	Pre Intervention			During Intervention			Post Intervention		
	Utterances	Errors	Multi word phrase	Utterance	Errors	Multi word phrases	Utterances	Errors	Multi word phrases
	9	5	0				5	0	2
Level 1:									
Day 1				3	2	0			
Day 2				0	0	0			
Day 3				6	2	0			
Day 4				4	0	0			
Level 2:									
Day 5				4	0	0			
Day 6				3	0	1			
Day 7				2	0	0			
Day 8				1	0	1			
Day 9				4	0	1			
Level 3:									
Day 10				4	0	1			
Day 11				4	0	2			
Day 12				2	0	0			
Complexity	Phase 2: First Words			Days 1: Phase 2: First Words Day 2: Absent Days 3 – 5: Phase 2: First Words Day 6: Phase 2: First Words and Phase 3: Word Combinations Day 7: Phase 2: First Words Day 8: Phase 3: Word Combinations Days 9-11: Phase 2: First Words and Phase 3: Word Combinations Day 12: Phase 2: First Words			Phase 2: First Words Phase 3: Word Combinations		

As shown in Table 6, the teacher- aide registered slightly different totals in utterance, error and multiword phrases for Participant B compared to the researcher. However, the participant's progress to phase 3, phrase complexity is consistent.

Table 7

Language Sample A, Participant D

	Pre Intervention			During Intervention			Post Intervention		
Language Sample A	Utterances	Errors	Multi word phrases	Utterances	Errors	Multi word phrases	Utterances	Errors	Multi word phrases
	12	0	5				9	0	9
Level 1: Day 1				10	5	0			
Day 2				8	1	2			
Day 3				10	0	2			
Day 4				10	0	1			
Level 2: Day 5				4	0	0			
Day 6				4	0	1			
Day 7				6	1	1			
Day 8				4	1	1			
Day 9				4	0	1			
Level 3: Day 10				10	1	8			
Day 11				8	0	5			
Day 12				3	0	3			
Complexity	Phase 2: First Words and Phase 3: Word Combinations			Day 1: Phase 2: First Words Days 2-4: Phase 2: First Words and Phase 3: Word Combinations Day 5: Phase 2: First Words Day 6: Phase 2: First Words, Phase 3: Word Combinations and Phase 4: Sentences Days 7-8: Phase 2: First Words and Phase 3: Word Combinations Days 9-12: Phase 2: First Words, Phase 3: Word Combinations and Phase 4: Sentences			Phase 3: Word Combinations and Phase 4: Sentences		

As shown in Table 7, Participant D demonstrated a reduction in labeling errors by day four, an overall increase in multiword utterances and move to phase 4 phrase complexity by the end of the four week intervention.

Table 8

Language Sample B, Participant D

Language Sample B	Pre Intervention			During Intervention			Post Intervention		
	Utterances	Errors	Multi word phrase	Utterance	Errors	Multi word phrases	Utterances	Errors	Multi word phrases
	8	0	6				6	0	6
Level 1: Day 1				10	4	0			
Day 2				7	1	2			
Day 3				11	1	2			
Day 4				10	0	1			
Level 2: Day 5				4	0	0			
Day 6				4	0	1			
Day 7				6	1	1			
Day 8				4	1	1			
Day 9				8	0	1			
Level 3: Day 10				10	0	6			
Day 11				14	0	4			
Day 12				4	0	4			
Complexity	Phase 2: First Words and Phase 3: Word Combinations			Day 1: Phase 2: First Words Days 2-4: Phase 2: First Words and Phase 3: Word Combinations Day 5: Phase 2: First Words Day 6: Phase 2: First Words, Phase 3: Word Combinations and Phase 4: Sentences Day 7: Phase 2: First Words Day 8: Phase 2: First Words and Phase 3: Word Combinations Days 9-12: Phase 2: First Words, Phase 3: Word Combinations and Phase 4: Sentences			Phase 3: Word Combinations and Phase 4: Sentences		

As shown in Table 8, the teacher- aide registered slightly different totals in utterance, error and multiword phrases for Participant B compared to the researcher. However, the participant's progress to phase 3, phrase complexity is consistent.

Observations.

During the 'Dialogic Reading' sessions, observations of the interactions that occurred between peers, the setting and the teachers (researcher and teacher-aide) were noted. The sessions were conducted in the ECSE classroom circle time area. This is the area where the students regularly convene for story time. The researcher and the teacher-aide were seated in the circle area with the participants and other classroom students. During these sessions, the

participants were observed sitting and moving around the area, depending on the activity that was presented. They often stood up and touched the book, pictures and objects. The sessions were observed to be cooperative in nature. The participants and other students worked together to label the vocabulary. They took turns handling and passing vocabulary related objects around the circle as they labeled them. During Levels two and three, the participants took turns standing before their peers, demonstrating actions while they attempted to make or made two word utterances. In some cases it appeared that the participants learned labels from their peers. During the first two days, Participant A used some labels that were similar in word approximation to Participant B (i.e., 'pecket' and 'eminent'). Participant A and C often labeled vocabulary and extensions after participant B and D because participant B and D quickly learned the vocabulary and extensions and volunteered to demonstrate.

Five modes of social behavior were demonstrated and observed between the adults and the children. They were 1) the use of social tools; 2) focusing attention; 3) providing feedback; 4) demonstrating tasks; and 5) overseeing learning tasks. The social tool in these lessons was language. The researcher and teacher-aide observed the participants labeling vocabulary, understanding and answering questions (i.e., "What is it?" "What can you do?") at various levels of complexity. During the circle time activities, by using items (i.e., stuffed animals and pictures) that were of interest to the participants, the researcher and teacher-aide were able to observe what appeared to be participants focusing their attention on learning new vocabulary, by using correct labels and then attempting to use the vocabulary in teacher prompted extensions. The extensions and corrections, used by the researcher and teacher-aide to provide immediate feedback were observed to be helpful to the participants. By labeling, providing extensions, modeling physical demonstrations (i.e., stomping, clapping) and using sentence starters, the researcher and teacher-

aide were able to observe the participants first attempting and then performing such tasks. Throughout the dialogic reading process the researcher and teacher-aide were able to oversee and observe the improvement of participant utterances through using corrections, extensions, prompts and requesting repetitions. The researcher and teacher-aide also observed Participant B and Participant D attempt to oversee Participant A's and Participant C's improvement by labeling objects and demonstrating physical movements for them.

Analysis and Discussion of Primary Themes

After collecting and arranging the participant language samples, three primary themes emerged from the analysis of the data. The three primary themes were 1) Vocabulary Attainment, 2) Language Complexity and 3) Generalization of Vocabulary.

Vocabulary attainment.

On days one through three, the participants made a combination of correct and erroneous responses to the question, "What is it?" This was demonstrated by not answering the question or mislabeling the targeted vocabulary. By day four, all participants were able to accurately label the targeted vocabulary by either saying correct words or using word approximations. The participant use of correct word versus approximation varied. Participant B reduced use of word approximation for targeted vocabulary by day four. Participant A, C and D's varied responses for individual vocabulary throughout the intervention demonstrated a progression from word approximation to use of words in the following examples. Participant A used "jaja" for giraffe on day four, "gira" on day five, "girag" and giraffe on day six, and then used giraffe again on day ten. Participant D used variations on buffalo: "lolo" on day seven, "bualo" on day nine and "bupalo" or buffalo on day ten. For crocodile, he used "ocodile/kikidile", "kakdile/cocodilo" on day eleven and crocodile on day twelve. Participant C used word approximations for most of the

vocabulary throughout the intervention. Her actual pronunciation was difficult to capture.

However patterns of change emerged with giraffe. On day one it was “ruh”, day three “rara”, day four, “jara”, on day six and nine, it became “girah.”

Language complexity.

All participants increased the complexity of their utterances as depicted on the tables. Complexity of utterance was examined on the language samples collected prior to the intervention, during the intervention and after the intervention. Participant A and C progressed from Phase 2 First Words (FW) to also using Phase 3 Word Combinations (WC). Participant A began this trend at day six by labeling what she saw in a picture (monkey, mano). On day seven she used Phase 3 WC when she said, “I penmen” (“I see a penguin”), using a pronoun. Participant C attempted a Phase two WC on day eight when she uttered, “Ephant top,” (“Elephants stomp.”). Participant B and D progressed from using a combination of Phase 2 FW and Phase 3 WC to including Phase 4 Sentences (S). On day seven, Participant B began using sentences when she said, “A boy wiggle” to describe what she saw in the book. Participant D began using Phase 4 S during day six when he said, “Crocodile snap me”. He was relating the picture of the crocodile from the book to a poem learned at school.

Generalization of vocabulary.

Generalization occurred when the participants used the vocabulary to describe something that they could do or used the vocabulary beyond the context of the book. In order to help participants develop this ability, during level three interventions, the researcher used the “I can _____”, sentence starter as an extension. All participants learned the storybook repeated line, “I can do it!” and uttered variations of the phrase from day two through day twelve. Although this statement would appear to be a generalization, it is a repetition. However, by the post

assessment, all participants were able to generalize the vocabulary using the associated verbs, after having demonstrated the action, with varying degrees of ability. Here are some examples from the table: On day ten, Participant A said, “Emilent, I top” (“Elephant, I stomp). Participant B began generalizing on day eight when she held the stuffed cat and said, “My kitty cat. I want kitty.” On day twelve she said, “Arch my back,” using words associated with the vocabulary and learned from the book. During the post assessment, Participant C was able to utter, “I bah” (I bend) when demonstrating what she could do with her knees. On day twelve, Participant D said, “I turn, pecket (penguin) turn,” while demonstrating his ability to turn his neck.

Results

The participant language samples were placed in the tables below which illustrate Rogoff’s framework of how children learn within the context of a social setting, using her terms: Apprenticeship, Guided Participation and Participatory Appropriation (1990).

Table 9

Language Sample A, Participant A Apprenticeship Thinking Framework:

	Apprenticeship	Guided Participation	Participatory Appropriation
Language sample A	<u>During Intervention Sample</u> Days 1-12 penmen, monkey, cat, doney, eminent, giraffe, camel, gorlla, wiggle, peppit, seal, buffalo, crocodioe	<u>During Intervention Sample</u> Day 6: Monkey mono Day 9: Cat dune it, Monkey wave. Day 10: Bend, giraffe bend. Day 11: The monkey, Look, cat meow., Look, monkey Day 12: Bend neck	<u>During Intervention Sample</u> Day 7: I penmen Day 10: Elepet, eminent, I top. Day 12: Wiggle, I wiggle. <u>Post Intervention Sample</u> I clap. I wiggle, wiggle. Kick it

As shown in Table 9, Participant A’s utterances demonstrate how her increasing use of multiword phrases moved through Rogoff’s differing planes of focus. It reveals growth in her use of language from single words to emerging use of multiword utterances through her participation in the dialogic reading activities.

Table 10

Language Sample B, Participant A Apprenticeship Thinking Framework:

	Apprenticeship	Guided Participation	Participatory Appropriation
Language Sample B	<u>During Intervention Sample</u> Days 1-12 penmen, monkey, cat, donkey, emenent, giraffe, camel, grlla, wiggle, peppit, seal, buppalo, crocodile	<u>During Intervention Sample</u> Day 6: Monkey mono Day 9: Monkey wave. Day 10: Giraffe bend Day 11: The monkey, And a monkey. Day 12: Ben neh	<u>During Intervention Sample</u> Day 7: I penmen. Day 10: Emilent, I top. <u>Post Intervention Sample</u> I cwap ! Wiggle, I can wiggle. I can kic

As shown in Table 10, data between the researcher and teacher- aide regarding participant utterances, have recorded differences. Some of these differences were insignificant nuances attributed to interpretation of word approximations (i.e., eminent vs. emenent) or as in day twelve, interpreting and recording an utterance differently (i.e., Wiggle, I wiggle v. wiggle, wiggle). Differences occurred due to our roles during the intervention sessions as well as to our proximity to Participant A and other participants during the interventions Overall progression is consistent between the teacher and teacher-aide recorded utterances.

Table 11

Language Sample A, Participant B Apprenticeship Thinking Framework:

	Apprenticeship	Guided Participation	Participatory Appropriation
Language sample A	<u>During Intervention Sample</u> Days 1-4, Day 9 parrott, monkey, grilla, elephant,, cat, crocodile, seal, penguin, donkey, camo, giraffe, wiggle	<u>During Intervention Sample</u> Day 4: Donkey kick it Day 5: Donkey, he kick, My turn, elephant stomp. Day 7: Monkey wave. Day 9: Monkey wave, Kitty cat arching., Crocodile wiggle, wiggle, wiggles. Days 10-11: Donkey kick Penguin turns. I do it. He can dude it Monkey clap he hands. I do it. Look it stompt I can do that. Crocodile, two cats Penguin. I turn. I can do it. It a monkey Look, it cold. Kitty cat, me.	<u>During Intervention Sample</u> Day 4: Gorilla itchy Day 7: Cat scratching., Crocodile eating., I got a elephant., I see you, Donna Day 8: My kitty cat. I like kitty. I want kitty. Bye kitty. Day 11: I can bend it. Day 12: Giraffe bend. I bending it. I clap it. Arch my back. Kitty cat arch. <u>Post Intervention Sample</u> I can wave. I can clap, happy! I can arch. I bendin' knees.

As shown in Table 11, Participant B's utterances demonstrate how her increasing use of multiword phrases moved through Rogoff's differing planes of focus. It reveals growth in her use of language from single words to emerging use of multiword utterances to expanding

language use to her personal experience or observation, through her participation in dialogic reading activities.

Table 12

Language Sample B, Participant B Apprenticeship Thinking Framework:

	Apprenticeship	Guided Participation	Participatory Appropriation
Language Sample B	<u>During Intervention Sample</u> Days 1-4, Day 9 parrott, monkey, grilla, elephant,, cat, crocodile, seal, penguin, donkey, camo, giraffe, wiggle	<u>During Intervention Sample</u> Day 3: Seal claps. Day 4: Donkey kick it Day 5: He kick Day 7: A boy wiggle, Monkey wave. Day 9: Kitty cat arching, Crocodile wiggle, wiggles. Days 10 – 12 Donkey kick. Penguin turns. Do it, head. Giraffe bend Monkey clapping hands. I dude it. Penguin turn. A monkey clap hands. I can do it. Donkey kick. Buffalo, he can dude it. That's giraffe. Bend neck. Clap it. Kitty arch.	<u>During Intervention Sample</u> Day 3: I love you gorilla Day 4: Gorilla itchy Day 7: Cat scratching. Day 8: My kitty cat. I want kitty. Day 12: I bending, I clap, Arch my back. <u>Post Intervention Sample</u> I can wave. I happy. I can clap. I can arch. I bend it knees.

As shown in Table 12, data between the researcher and teacher- aide regarding participant utterances, have recorded differences. Some of these differences were insignificant nuances attributed to interpretation of Participant B's utterances (i.e., dude it vs. do it) or the interpreting and recording an utterance differently between the researcher and teacher-aide. (i.e., "seal claps" vs. "seal"). Other differences occurred due to our proximity to Participant B in relation to other participants during the interventions which caused the researcher to record different utterances than the teacher-aide as noted in day seven, day eight, eleven and twelve. However Participant B's overall progression is consistent between the researcher and teacher-aide recorded utterances.

Table 13

Language Sample A, Participant C Apprenticeship Thinking Framework:

	Apprenticeship	Guided Participation	Participatory Appropriation
Language sample A	<u>During Intervention Sample</u> Days 1-7, 9-12 pecket, donti, girah, montey, iggle, cat, camel, buh, ephant, <u>Post Intervention Sample</u> Tup, ah ca, ah ca do uh, cat,	<u>During Intervention Sample</u> Day 6: Boy sh Day 8: Ephant top.	<u>During Intervention Sample</u> Day 12: Ah beh. <u>Post Intervention Sample</u> I ben. I kick.

As shown in Table 13, participant C's utterances demonstrate how her use of words and phrases moved through Rogoff's differing planes of focus. It reveals growth in her use of language from single words and word approximations to a more consistent use of single words and emerging use of multiword utterances through participation in dialogic reading activities.

Table 14

Language Sample B, Participant C Apprenticeship Thinking Framework:

	Apprenticeship	Guided Participation	Participatory Appropriation
Language Sample B	<u>During Intervention Sample</u> Days 1-7, 9 – 12 penkin, giraffe, ephant, camel, donti, caw, monkey, bup <u>Post Intervention Sample</u> Tump ah ca, cat	<u>During Intervention Sample</u> Day 6: Boy sh Day 8: Ephant top.	<u>During Intervention Sample</u> Day 12: Ah beh. <u>Post Intervention Sample</u> I bah. Ah kick.

As shown in Table 14, data between the researcher and teacher- aide regarding participant utterances, have recorded differences. These differences were insignificant nuances attributed to interpretation of Participant C's utterances (i.e., "pecket" vs. "penkin"). Participant C's word approximations were difficult to interpret and record. However Participant C's overall progression is consistent between the researcher and teacher-aide recorded utterances.

Table 15

Language Sample A, Participant D Apprenticeship Thinking Framework:

	Apprenticeship	Guided Participation	Participatory Appropriation
Language sample A	<u>During Intervention Sample</u> Days 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9 peckit, parrott, monkey, cat, yewwow, gorilla, crocodile, giraffe, donkey, elephant, camel, seal, wades, kneos, wiggle,	<u>During Intervention Sample</u> Day 2: Yewwow jraff Day 3: Giraffe ben, Day 4: Peckit turns Day 9: Bualo raiz. Bualo. It's a bualo. Days 10 – 12 Head ta toe. Donkey kick. Bend, giraffe, bend Seal, he clap. I can do it! Elpant can tomp Ocodile ca wiggle	<u>During Intervention Sample</u> Day 6: Crocodile snap me. Day 11: Buffalo. I up down Day 12: I turn, Cocodilo. I wiggle <u>Post Intervention Sample</u> I can turn. I can wave. I clap happy. I can bump I can art bah. I can do it! I can wiggl, Knees, can do. I can kick.

As shown in Table 15, participant D's utterances demonstrate how his increasing use of multiword phrases moved through Rogoff's differing planes of focus. It reveals growth in his use of language from single words to use of multiword utterances and emerging language use to express his personal experience or observation, through his participation in dialogic reading activities.

Table 16

Language Sample B, Participant D Apprenticeship Thinking Framework:

as	Apprenticeship	Guided Participation	Participatory Appropriation
Language Sample B	<u>During Intervention Sample</u> Days 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9 peckit, parrott, monkey, cat, yewwow, gowilla, crocodile, giraffe, donkey, elephant, camel, seal, wades, wiggle, bupilo	<u>During Intervention Sample</u> Day 2: Giraffe yellow giraffe Day 3: Giraffe ben Day 4: Peckit turns Day 9: Bupilo raiz. Bupilo. It's a bupilo Days 10-12 He to Toe Donkey kick. Giraffe can bend Kikidile wiggles. pecket can doo it Monkey wave.	<u>During Intervention Sample</u> Day 6: Crocodile snap me. Day 12: I turn, Crocodile. I can wiggle. <u>Post Intervention Sample</u> I ca (can) tur (turn). I can wabe (wave). I can clap, happy. I can bump (thump) chest. I can wibble (wiggle). I can kick.

As shown in Table 16, data between the researcher and teacher- aide regarding participant utterances, have recorded differences. Some of these differences were insignificant nuances attributed interpretation of Participant D's utterances (i.e., "gorilla" vs. "gowilla"). The teacher and teacher-aide recorded a large number of Participant D's utterances. His word

approximations were difficult to interpret and record, causing the researcher and teacher-aide to focus on different utterances. However Participant D's overall progression is consistent between the researcher and teacher-aide recorded utterances.

All four participants demonstrated language growth and active engagement during the dialogic reading sessions. The tables above exhibit how their repeated attempts to learn the vocabulary and practice the extensions developed into more complex utterances as the intervention progressed over the four weeks. As the tables also reveal, their learning of more complex utterances was non-linear. All participants had sessions where their utterances were placed in more than one frame of learning.

Comparison of the Results to the Literature

The analysis of the data revealed that the participants progressively learned expressive vocabulary and complexity during the four week intervention as the participants practiced using the new vocabulary and extensions. This was consistent with Rogoff's theoretical framework where she suggests that children learn from more experienced adults and peers within the context of a social setting. She also proposed that children are actively engaged in their learning, practicing what they learn in attempts to incorporate the learning into their repertoire of skills (Rogoff, 1990; 1993).

The study took place within the participants' classroom amongst their peer group. This social context allowed the participants to benefit from the guidance provided by the researcher, the teacher-aide and the more experienced peers (Rogoff, 1990, p. 39). Based on the application of Rogoff's theoretical framework which may be referred to as the 'apprenticeship in thinking' model, this study revealed the following (1990):

1. Apprenticeship learning was observed when the participants actively practiced labeling the objects that represented vocabulary.
2. Guided Participation was observed when the participants began attempting the new vocabulary with extensions, repeated researcher corrections and sentence starters and imitated their peers.
3. Participatory Appropriation was observed when the participants practiced generalizing the new vocabulary to personal experience or other contexts beyond the scope of the storybook it was linked to.

Summary

The findings from this study were categorized into three themes. All four participants were actively involved in each dialogic reading session. Language learning was achieved by each participant's repeated use of the new vocabulary through labeling and word extensions. When participants struggled or incorrectly labeled words, the researcher provided corrections and prompted repetitions. During these sessions, the researcher only spoke to prompt utterances from the participants and encourage their efforts. As the participants gained confidence in their ability to use the newly attained language, they attempted longer utterances with varying degrees of complexity and varying ability to generalize.

Chapter 5 Conclusions

This chapter presents the major conclusions from this study that inquired into whether the use of dialogic reading techniques and ‘Read it Once Again’ (RIOA) recommended storybooks during story time, for students identified with a speech or language impairment increase their usage of multiword sentences? This chapter also presents insights from the study regarding the proposition that language learning is a social endeavor.

Summary of Major Conclusions

This study found that the dialogic reading intervention strategy increased the learning and usage of multiword phrases for all four participants. Further, this study also found that all four participants increased their learning of vocabulary over the four weeks of the intervention. Overall, this case study found that all four participants increased their learning about the complexity of utterances, and their learning to generalize utilizing vocabulary. All participants were able to demonstrate attainment of the twelve nouns that were presented as vocabulary by day four of the intervention and 30% of the associated verbs by the end of the intervention. All participants’ phrases increased in complexity by one phase as measured by, the NIDCD recommendations, summarized by Tager-Flusberg et al., (2009). Ability to generalize the vocabulary to personal experience or classroom activities varied by participant in the total number of utterances made. However, Participants A, B, and D demonstrated that they could generalize 100% of their utterances during the post assessment while Participant C was able to generalize one of her utterances.

This study supports the proposition that language learning is a social endeavor that is dependent upon interactions between the children involved and the adults within their social orbit (Vygotsky, 1986; John-Steiner & Tatter, 1983), which in this case included the researcher

in the classroom. According to Rogoff's "apprenticeship in thinking" theory, adults and children work together to develop responsibilities by means of the adult breaking tasks down into achievable steps of a process (1990, p. 86). The process begins when the more learned or master of a skill teaches it to a novice or apprentice. Through interactive guidance, the novice gains skill by means of practicing specific tasks that enhance learning. Rogoff identified the phases of this learning process as apprenticeship, guided participation and participatory appropriation (Rogoff, 1990; 1995, p. 139, 141).

During the dialogic reading sessions, the researcher, was the more learned group member, who attempted to teach vocabulary to the participants during the apprenticeship phase of learning. The researcher provided guidance to the study participants in the way of encouraging, prompting and stretching or extending their utterances (Moerk, 1985; Penner, 1987; Rogoff, 1990). Through this guided participation, the participants were provided opportunities to extend their utterances by attempting the word extensions. The participants' achieved participatory appropriation when they attempted to generalize the vocabulary to personal experience.

Since dialogic reading strategy aligns with the perspective that language develops within the framework of adult-child interaction (Hoff-Ginsberg & Shatz, 1982; Snow, 1984) to the degree that attention is paid to labeling objects (Masur, 1982) and builds upon child ability and utterances (Snow, 1984; Moerk, 1985); the researcher was able to support the participants' increased usage of multiword utterances while using the RIOA storybook. Furthermore if the participants continue to achieve multiword utterance gains with the continued use of dialogic reading strategies in the ECSE special day class, their kindergarten placements could be in less restrictive environments.

Limitations of the Study

This study was based upon a small sample size of four participants. These participants were entered into the ECSE special day class under the same criteria as other students with the SLI designation. However, the sample size makes it difficult to compare the rate of learning vocabulary, developing complexity of utterance and generalizing vocabulary to self or personal experience to other ESCE special day class students with the SLI designation. Therefore, these conclusions cannot be generalized to the whole population of ESCE students.

All four participants come from families whose primary language is Spanish. Since the class is taught in English, the researcher needed to structure the dialogic reading lessons to incorporate methods to help the participants learn a second language (i.e. use of objects that depicted vocabulary) during the apprenticeship phase. In order to move into guided participation and participatory appropriation, the participants needed to understand the prompting phrases and questions that were used to develop multiword utterances and complexity of phrases. It is difficult to know what participant gains would have been if they were taught in their first language or bilingually.

Finally, because the participants did not understand researcher questions without demonstration and repetitions using sentence starters for the questions: “What is it?” “What do you see?” and “What can you do?” the participants learned to answer these questions along with the vocabulary. Therefore, it is unclear how this may have impacted their use of the vocabulary in terms of complexity of phrase and generalized use.

Significance of the Study

Student ability to communicate with teachers and peers is paramount to learning. Communication skill is an indicator of a student's future literacy skill and educational success (Fey et al., 1995). Preschool aged children who do not develop the understanding of word meanings and relationships may lack foundations needed for future ability to read (Hoover & Gough, 1990). Through the use of dialogic reading strategies within the social context of the ECSE special day classroom, teachers can create an environment where the framework of "apprenticeship thinking" (Rogoff, 1990) can support student learning of multiple word phrases through intentional interventions similar to this study. Such types of intervention using dialogic reading could enable ECSE students to be placed in less restrictive environments, allowing them more access to the general education environment, social experience and curriculum which may enhance their language learning potential.

Implications for Future Research

This study suggests that dialogic reading strategies supported English language learning and lengthened utterances for the four participants. However one major implication is that future studies such as this, with participants for whom English is not their first language must include both Spanish and English approaches and interventions using a bilingual approach in order to provide deeper insights.

About the Author

I have worked with young children in a variety of settings for the past 20 years. My first experience was teaching four year old children in a private preschool. The majority of the students in my classes were high achieving with strong communication skills. However, occasionally students with special needs were enrolled. I always offered to work with them and spent a great deal of time differentiating the lessons to accommodate their needs.

Over time I decided that I wanted to learn more about children with special needs. I expanded my experience and volunteered as an aide in a hospital based preschool therapy program. These young children had severe developmental delays. The two hour program was designed to help the children develop functional skills like eating, participating in group activities and playing. I enjoyed the work so much that I decided to seek employment in special education and soon became a one to one instructional aide to a boy with autism for two and a half years. This young boy had limited communication skills and was deemed non-verbal. I was able to help him find his ability to communicate. This experience was inspiring. The aide position led me to pursue my teaching credentials and current position as an Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) teacher. Given my experience and passion for helping young students, it was the right fit for me.

References

- Ard, L.M., & Beverly, B.L. (2004). Preschool word learning during joint book reading: Effect of adult questions and comments. *Communication Disorders Quarterly*, 26, 17-28. doi: 10.1177/15257401040260010101
- Arnold, D.H., Lonigan C.J., Whitehurst, G.J. & Epstein, J.N. (1994). Accelerating Language Development Through Picture Book Reading: Replication and Extension to a Videotape Training Format. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 86(2), 235-243. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.86.2.235
- Berry, M., & Eisenson, J. (1942). *The defective in speech*. New York, NY: Meredith Publishing.
- Blanton, M., & Blanton, S. (1920). *Speech Training for Children; The Hygiene of Speech*. New York, NY: The Century Co.
- Blewitt, P., Rump, K.M., Shealy, S.E., & Cook, S.A. (2009). Shared book reading: When and how questions affect young children's word learning. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 101(2), 294-304. doi: 10.1037/a0013844
- Bruder, M. (2010). Early Childhood Intervention: A Promise to Children and Families for Their Future. *Review of Educational Research*, 76(3), 339-355. doi:10.1177/001440291007600306
- Chomsky, N. (2002). *Syntactic structures* (2nd ed). New York, NY: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Constable, C. (1986). The application of scripts in the organization of language intervention contexts. In K. Nelson (Ed.), *Event knowledge: Structure and function in development*. (pp. 205-230). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates
- Crain-Thoreson, C., & Dale, P.S. (1999). Enhancing Linguistic Performance: Parents and

- Teachers as Book Reading Partners for Children with Language Delays. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education*, 19(1), 28-39. doi:10.1177/027112149901900103
- Dickson, D.K., & Tabors P.O. (2001). *Beginning Literacy with Language: Young Children Learning at Home and School*. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes.
- Dunst, C.J., & Trivette, C.M. (2009). Using Research Evidence to Inform and Evaluate Early Childhood Intervention Practices. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education*, 29(1), 40-52, doi:10.1177/0271121408329227
- Fey, M., Catts, H. & Larrivee, L. (1995). Preparing preschoolers for the academic challenges of school. In M. Fey, J. Windsor & S. Warren (Eds.), *Language intervention: Preschool through the elementary years* (pp. 3-38). Baltimore MD: Paul H. Brookes.
- Fleury, V.P., & Schwartz, I.S. (2016). A Modified Dialogic Reading Intervention for Preschool Children With Autism Spectrum Disorder. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education*, 37(1), 16-28. doi:10.1177/0271121416637597
- Flynn, K.S. (2011). Developing Children's Oral Language Skills Through Dialogic Reading: Guidelines for Implementation. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 44(2), 8-16. doi:10.1177/004005991104400201
- Fraser, C., Bellugi, U., & Brown, R. (1963). Control of grammar in imitation, comprehension, and production. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 2, 121-135.
- Frome Loeb, D. & Armstrong, N. (2001). Case studies on the efficacy of expansions and subject-verb-object models in early language intervention. *Child Language Teaching and Therapy*, 17(1), 35-53. doi:10.1177/026565900101700103
- Gold, R. (1958). Roles in sociological field observations. *Social Forces*, 36(3), 217-223. doi:10.2307/2573808

- Goldstein, H., & Gallagher, T. (1992). Strategies for promoting the social communicative competence of young children with specific language impairment. In S. Odom, S. McConnell, & M. McEvoy (Eds.), *Social competence of young children with disabilities* (pp. 189-213). Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.
- Goldstein, K. (1948). *Language and language disturbances: Aphasic symptom complexes and their significance for medicine and theory of language*. New York, NY: Grune and Stratton
- Hargrave, A.C., & Senechal, M. (2000). A Book Reading Intervention with Preschool Children Who Have Limited Vocabularies: The Benefits of Regular Reading and Dialogic Reading. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 15(1), 75-90. doi:10.1016/S0885-2006(99)00038-1
- Hart, B., & Risley, T. R. (1975). Incidental teaching of language in preschool. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 8(4), 411-420. doi: 10.1901/jaba.1975.8-411
- Hart, B., & Risley, T. R. (1982). *How to use incidental teaching for elaborating language*. Lawrence, KS: H & H Enterprises, Inc.
- Hoff-Ginsberg, E., & Shatz, M. (1982) Linguistic input and the child's acquisition of language. *Psychological Bulletin*, 92(1), 3-26. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.92.1.3
- Hoover, W. & Gough, P. (1990). The simple view of reading. *Reading and Writing*, 2(2), 127-160. doi:10.1007/BF00401799
- Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 1975, Pub. L. No. 94-142
- Jordan, S., Miller, G.L., & Riley, K. (2011). Enhancements of Dialogic Reading for Young Children With Down Syndrome. *Young Exceptional Children*, 14(4), 19-30. doi:10.1177/1096250611425025
- Kaiser, A. P., & Roberts, M.Y. (2011). Advances in Early Communication and Language

- Intervention. *Journal of Early Intervention*, 33(4), 298-309. doi:10.1177/1053815111429968
- Law, J., Garrett, Z., & Nye, C. (2003). Speech and language therapy interventions for children with primary speech and language delay or disorder. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, 3. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD004110.
- Lever, R., & Senechal, M. (2011). Discussing stories: On how a dialogic reading intervention improves kindergartners oral narrative construction. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 108(1), 1-24. doi: 10.1016/j.jecp.2010.07.002
- MacDonald, J., Blott, J., Gordon, K., Spiegel, B., & Hartmann, M. (1974). An experimental parent-assisted treatment program for preschool language delayed children. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders*, 39(3), 395-415.
- MacDonald, J., & Carroll, J. (1992). Communicating with Young Children. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, 1, 39-48. doi: 10.1044/1058-0360.0104.39
- Masur, E. F. (1982). Mothers' responses to infants' object-related gestures: Influences on lexical development. *Journal of Child Language*, 9(1), 23-30. doi: 10.1017/S0305000900003585
- Maul, C.A., & Ambler, K.L. (2014). Embedded Language Therapy in Dialogic Reading to Teach Morphologic Structures to Children with Language Disorders. *Communication Disorders Quarterly*, 35(4), 237-247. doi:10.1177/1525740114525657
- Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E.J. (1990). *Qualitative Research: A Guide to Design and Implementation (Rev. ed.)*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Meltzoff, A.N., & Moore, M. K. (1977). Imitation of facial and manual gestures by human neonates. *Science*, 198(4312), 75-78. Retrieved from https://s3.amazonaws.com/academia.edu.documents/5091501/meltzoff_moore.pdf?

- Moerk, E. L. (1985). A differential interactive analysis of language teaching and learning. *Discourse Processes*, 8, 113-142. doi: 10.1080/01638538509544610
- Moerk, E. L. (1986). *The Guided Acquisition of First Language Skills (Advances in Applied Developmental Psychology)* (Kindle ed. Vol. 20) In I. Sigel (Ed.), Stamford, CT: Alex Publishing Corp.
- Myklebust, H. (1957). Aphasia in children. In L. Travis (Ed.), *Handbook of Speech Pathology* (pp. 503-520). New York, NY: Meredith Publishing Co.
- Nemoy, E., & Davis, S. (1937). *The correction of defective consonant sounds*. Boston, MA: Expression Co.
- Ninio, A. (1980). Picture-Book Reading in Mother-Infant Dyads Belonging to Two Subgroups in Israel. *Society for Research in Child Development*, 51(2), 587-590.
- Ninio, A., & Bruner, J. (1978). The achievement and antecedents of labelling. *Journal of Child Language*, 5, 1-15.
- Pillinger, C., & Wood, C. (2014). Pilot study evaluating the impact of dialogic reading and shared reading at transition to primary school: early literacy skills and parental attitudes. *Literacy*, 48(3), 155-163.
- Opel, A., Ameer, S.S., & Aboud, F.E. (2009). The effect of preschool dialogic reading on vocabulary among rural Bangladeshi children. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 48(1), 12-20. doi: 10.1016/j.ijer.2009.02.008
- Orton, S. T. (1937). *Reading, writing and speech problems in children: A presentation of certain types of disorders in the development of the language faculty*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton.
- Penner, S.G. (1987). Parental responses to grammatical and ungrammatical child utterances. *Child Development*, 58, 376-385. doi: 10.2307/1130514

- Pillinger, C., & Wood, C. (2014) Pilot study evaluating the impact of dialogic reading and shared reading at transition to primary school: early literacy skills and parental attitudes. *Literacy*, 48(3), 155-163. doi: 10.1111/lit.12018
- Rahn, N.L., Grygas Coogle, C., & Storie, S. (2016). Preschool Children's Use of Thematic Vocabulary During Dialogic Reading and Activity-Based Intervention. *The Journal of Special Education*, 50(2), 98-108. doi:10.1177/0022466915622202
- Robbins, S. D., & Robbins, R. (1937). *Corrections of speech defects of early childhood*. Boston, MA: Expression Co.
- Robertson, N., & Ohi, S. (2016). Building a Model of Support for Preschool Children with Speech and Language Disorders. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 5(3), 173-181. doi:10.5539/jel.v5n3p173
- Rogoff, B. (1990). *Apprenticeship in Thinking: Cognitive Development in Social Context*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Rogoff, B. (1995). Chapter 6: Observing sociocultural activity on three planes: participatory appropriation, guided participation, and apprenticeship. In J. V. Wertsch, P. Del Rio, & Alvarez (Eds.), *Sociocultural Studies of Mind* (pp. 139-164). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9781139174299.008
- Rogoff, B., Jayanthi, M. Goncu, A., & Mosier, C. (1993). Guided Participation in Cultural Activity by Toddlers and Caregivers. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 58(8), 1-174. doi:10.2307/1166109
- Schensul, J.J., & LeCompte, M.D. (2013). *Essential ethnographic methods: A mixed methods approach. Ethnographer's toolkit, book 3* (2nd ed.). Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press.
- Shevell, M., Ashwal, S., Donley, D., Flint, J., Gingold, M., Hirtz, D.,...Majnermer, A. (2003).

- Practice parameter: Evaluation of the child with global developmental delay: Report of the Quality Standards Subcommittee of the American Academy of Neurology and The Practice Committee of the Child Neurology Society. *Neurology*, 60, 367-380.
doi:10.1212/01.WNL.0000031431.81555.16/
- Simmons-Mackie, N., & Damico, J.(1995). Communicative competence and aphasia: Evidence from compensatory strategies. *Clinical Aphasiology*, 23, 95-105. Retrieved from <http://eprints-prod-05.library.pitt.edu/193/1/23-09.pdf>
- Simsek, Z.C., & Erdogan N.I. (2015). Effects of the Dialogic and Traditional Reading Techniques on Children's Language Development. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 197, 754-758. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2017.07.172
- Snow, C.E. (1972). Mothers' speech to children learning language. *Child Development*, 43(2), 549-565. doi: 10.2307/1127555
- Snow, C.E. (1982). Are parents language teachers? In K. Borman (Ed) *The Social Life of Children in a Changing Society* (pp. 81-96), Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corp.
- Snow, C.E. (1984). Parent-Child interaction and the development of communicative ability. In R. Schiefelbusch & J. Pickar (Eds.), *The Acquisition of Communicative Competence* (pp. 69-108), Baltimore, MD: University Park Press
- Tager-Flusberg, H., Rogers, S., Cooper, J., Landa, R., Lord, C., Paul, R.,... Yoder, P. (2009). Defining Spoken Language Benchmarks and Selecting Measures of Expressive Language Development for Young Children With Autism Spectrum Disorders. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 52, 643-652. doi: 10.1044/1092-4388(2009/08-0136)
- Towson, J.A., Gallagher, P.A., & Bingham, G.E. (2016). Dialogic Reading: Language and

- Preliteracy Outcomes for Young Children With Disabilities. *Journal of Early Intervention*, 38(4), 230-246. doi:10.1177/1053815116668643
- Trivette, C.M., & Dunst, C.J. (2007). Relative Effectiveness of Dialogic, Interactive and Shared Reading Interventions. *CELLReviews*, 1(2), 1-12. Retrieved from: http://www.earlyliteracylearning.org/cellreviews/cellreviews_v1_n2.pdf
- Tyack, D., & Gottsleben, R. (1977). *Language sampling, analysis, and training: A handbook for teachers and clinicians*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Valdez-Menchaca, M.C., & Whitehurst, G.J. (1992). Accelerating language development through picture-book reading: A systematic extension to a Mexican day-care. *Developmental Psychology*, 28(6), 1106-1114. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.28.6.1106
- Van Kleeck, A., & Frankel, T. (1981) Discourse devices used by language disordered children: A preliminary investigation. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders*, 46(3), 250-257. doi:10.1044/jshd.4603.250
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: the development of higher psychological processes* In M. Cole, V. John-Stein, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman (Eds.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Retrieved from <https://www.amazon.com/Mind-Society-Development-Psychological-Processes-ebook/dp/B00CN509GK>
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1986). *Thought and Language*. In A. Kozulin (Ed.) Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Warren, S., & Kaiser, A. (1986). Incidental language teaching: A critical review. *Jouranl of Speech and Hearing Disorders*, 51, 191-199. Retrieved from <http://isbd.pubs.asha.org>
- Wells, G. (1985). *Language Development in the Pre-School Years (Language at Home and at School)*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Wells, G. (1986). *The Meaning Makers: Children Learning Language and Using Language to*

Learn. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Whalon, K., Delano, M., & Hanline, M.F. (2013). A Rationale and Strategy for Adapting

Dialogic Reading for Children With Autism Spectrum Disorder: RECALL. *Preventing School Failure*, 57(2), 93-101. doi:10.1080/1045988X.2012.672347

What Works Clearinghouse. (2010, April). *Dialogic Reading*. Retrieved from https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/InterventionReports/wwc_dialogic_reading_042710.pdf

Whitehurst, G.J., Arnold, D.S., Epstein, J.N., Angell, A.L., Smith, M., & Fischel, J.E. (1994). A

Picture Book Reading Intervention in Day Care and Home for Children From Low-Income Families. *Developmental Psychology*, 30(5), 679-689. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.30.5.679

Whitehurst, G.J., Arnold, D.S., Fischel, J.E., Lonigan, C.J., & Valdez-Menchaca, M.C. (1991).

Family History in Developmental Expressive Language Delay. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 34, 1150-1157. doi:10.1044/jshr.3405.1150

Whitehurst, G.J., Falco, F.L., Lonigan, C.J., Fischel, J.E., DeBaryshe, B.D., Valdez-Menchaca,

M.C., & Caulfield, M. (1988). Accelerating Language Development Through Picture Book Reading. *Developmental Psychology*, 24(4), 552-559. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.24.4.552

Whitehurst, G.J., Fischel, J.E., Lonigan, C.J., Valdez-Menchaca, M.C., Arnold, D.S., & Smith,

M. (1990). Treatment of early expressive language delay: If, when and how. *Topics in Language Disorders*, 11(4), 55-68.

Yoder, P.J., & Davies, B. (1990). Do Parental Questions and Topic Continuations Elicit Replies

from Developmentally Delayed Children? *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 33, 563-573. doi:10.1044/jshr.3303.563

Yoder, P.J., & Davies, B., Bishop, K., & Munson, L. (1994). Effect of Adult Continuing Wh- Questions on Conversational Participation in Children With Developmental Disabilities. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 37, 193-204.
doi:10.1044/jshr.3701.193

Appendices

Appendix A

October 2, 2017

Donna Senn
50 Acacia Ave.
San Rafael, CA 94901

Dear Donna:

I have reviewed your proposal entitled *Effects of Dialogic Reading in a Special Day Class* submitted to the Dominican University Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Participants (IRBPHP Application, #10603). I am approving it as having met the requirements for minimizing risk and protecting the rights of the participants in your research.

In your final report or paper please indicate that your project was approved by the IRBPHP and indicate the identification number.

I wish you well in your very interesting research effort.

Sincerely,

[Redacted Signature]

Chair, IRBPHP

Cc: Faculty Advisor

Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Participants

Office of Academic Affairs • 50 Acacia Avenue, San Rafael, California 94901-2298 • 415-257-1310 www.dominican.edu

Appendix B **LETTER OF PERMISSION TO AGENCY DIRECTORS**

Ms. _____
Program Manager of Early Intervention,

San Rafael CA _____

Dear Ms. _____:

This letter of permission confirms that you have been provided with all relevant information regarding my thesis research study which is required for the completion of my Master's degree in Education at Dominican University of California. This thesis research project is based upon using 'Read it Once Again' storybooks with dialogic reading techniques during story time to increase student use of multiword sentences. This research study was approved by the Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (IRBPHS) at Dominican University of California and assigned approval number 10603. As we discussed in our meeting, I will ensure that my data collection does not interfere with teaching my class. I believe that it will actually enhance my program. I will also ensure that the privacy of the students is maintained.

Based on your permission and consent, I will contact the parent/guardian(s) of the potential participants for this study, and solicit their consent. Please note that the parent/guardian(s) of the participants in this study will be informed that their child's participation in this study will be voluntary, anonymous, confidential, non-paid and that they reserve the right to withdraw from this study at any time. If you have questions about the research you may contact me at 415-492-5912. If you have further concerns you may contact my thesis advisor, Dr. Appavoo at 415-482-3598 or the Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects at Dominican University of California by calling (415) 482-3547.

If my request to conduct this research in my classroom meets with your approval, please sign and date this letter below and return it to me in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope as soon as possible. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions about this study. Your signature on this letter also confirms that you provide informed consent for me to conduct this research during regular school hours within my classroom. Thank you very much for your time.

Sincerely,

Donna Senn
San Anselmo, CA 94960
donna.senn@students.dominican.edu
(415) 492-5912

Permission and Informed Approval

I have been given a copy of this permission form, signed and dated, for my records. I have been made aware that my permission and approval for this study is voluntary and is not required. I am aware that I am free to decline the participation of my agency including the students, or to withdraw my agency including the students from participating in this study at any point. My signature below indicates that I agree to permit my agency, including the selected students to participate in this research study. I approve and grant permission to the undersigned and named researcher to conduct this research study.

Name and Signature of Program Manager:

_____ Date _____

Name and Signature of Researcher:

_____ Date _____

Appendix C **PROXY CONSENT FOR RESEARCH PARTICIPATION****Purpose and Background:**

Ms. Donna Senn, a graduate student, is doing a study on whether using a strategy of combining Read it Once Again suggested storybooks with Dialogic Reading strategies will increase student use of multiword utterances. This research study was approved by the Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (IRBPHS) at Dominican University of California and assigned approval number 10603. Since most students enrolled in the Early Childhood Special Education program have language delays, the researcher is interested in learning whether these children will develop new vocabulary and use it in peer to peer conversation and to answer teacher questions. This proxy consent outlines the research process and activities and is used because of the age of my child, who is a minor.

Procedures:

If I consent to allow my child to be in this study, the following will happen:

1. My child will listen to a story that is read during story time.
2. The researcher will ask my child questions that target vocabulary and require him/her to label the vocabulary by way of identifying it in book illustrations. The researcher will monitor my child's responses for mastery.
3. The researcher will ask my child open ended and "wh..." questions about the story. These questions require more than a yes or no answer. The researcher will offer prompts and corrections to help my child build the length of his/her responses.
4. The researcher will prompt my child to use vocabulary in utterances.
5. The researcher will observe my child and write down my child's utterances in a language sample.

Risks and/or discomforts:

I understand that all of the activities for this research study will occur as a part of the regular instruction in the classroom. I understand that there is a risk that my child may become slightly uncomfortable during the period that the researcher is asking him/her questions. I understand that the researcher will stop any activities if my child demonstrates any discomfort, and will make every attempt to prevent any risks or discomfort from occurring during my child's participation in the research activities.

Confidentiality

I understand that all hard copy records and documents from this study will be maintained confidentially by the researcher in a secure location under personal lock and key. All electronic and digital information will be maintained on a secure personal device that is password protected. No individual identities will be used in any reports or publications resulting from this study. All personal references and identifying information will be eliminated from this study, and all participants will be identified only by a code/pseudonym. Only the researcher will review any data and or documents. One year after the completion of the research, all written and recorded materials will be completely destroyed.

Benefits:

I understand that there may be no direct benefit to me or to my child from participating in this study. I also understand that my child may or may not benefit from increasing his/her spoken language. The anticipated benefit of this study is a better understanding of whether using a combined method of the Read it Once Again suggested storybooks with dialogic reading techniques can increase a student's use of spoken language with peers and teachers.

Costs/Financial Considerations:

I understand that there are no material costs to me or to my child for taking part in this study.

Payment/Reimbursement:

I understand that participation in this study is voluntary and non-paid. Neither my child nor I will receive any payments and or reimbursements for participation in this study.

Questions:

I have talked to Ms. Senn about this study and have had my questions answered. If I have further questions about the study, I may call her (415) 492-5912. If I have any questions or comments about participation in this study, I should first talk with the researcher. If for some reason I do not wish to do this, I may contact the Dominican University of California Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (IRBPHS), which is concerned with protection of volunteers in research projects. I may reach the IRBPHS Office by calling (415) 482- 3547 and leaving a voicemail message, or FAX at (415) 257-0165, or by writing to IRBPHS, Office of Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dominican University of California, 50 Acacia Avenue, San Rafael, CA 95901.

RESEARCH PARTICIPANT BILL OF RIGHTS

Every person who is asked to be in a research study has the following rights:

1. To be told what the study is trying to find out;
2. To be told what will happen in the study and whether any of the procedures, drugs or devices are different from what would be used in standard practice;
3. To be told about important risks, side effects or discomforts of the things that will happen to her/him;
4. To be told if s/he can expect any benefit from participating and, if so, what the benefits might be;
5. To be told what other choices s/he has and how they may be better or worse than being in the study;
6. To be allowed to ask any questions concerning the study both before agreeing to be involved and during the course of the study;
7. To be told what sort of medical treatment is available if any complications arise;
8. To refuse to participate at all before or after the study is stated without any adverse effects. If such a decision is made, it will not affect h/her rights to receive the care or privileges expected if s/he were not in the study.
9. To receive a copy of the signed and dated consent form;
10. To be free of pressure when considering whether s/he wishes to be in the study.

If you have questions about the research you may contact me Donna Senn at (donna.senn@students.dominican.edu). If you have further questions you may contact my research supervisor, Dr. Suresh Appavoo (415) 482-3598, or the Dominican University of California Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (IRBPHS), which is concerned with protection of volunteers in research projects. You may reach the IRBPHS Office by calling (415) 482-3547 and leaving a voicemail message, or FAX at (415) 257-0165, or by writing to IRBPHS, Office of Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dominican University of California, 50 Acacia Avenue, San Rafael, CA 94901

Consent:

I have read and understood this Consent form and the included Participant Bill of Rights. I understand that I am free to decline permission for my child be in this study, or to withdraw my consent and my child from participating in it at any point. I understand that my decision to permit my child, and or continue participation in this study will have no influence on my child's present or future status as a student in this researcher's classroom. I have received a signed and dated copy of this consent form and document. My signature below indicates that I agree to allow my child named below to participate in this study.

Name of Participant: _____

Signature of Participant Parent/Guardian(s)

Date

Signature of Researcher

Date

Appendix D

CONSENTIMIENTO DE REPRESENTANTE PARA PARTICIPAR EN EL ESTUDIO

Propósito y antecedentes:

La Sra. Donna Senn, estudiante de posgrado, está haciendo un estudio sobre si el uso de una estrategia de combinar libros de cuentos de “*Read it Once Again*” con estrategias de Lectura de *Dialogic* aumentará el uso de los estudiantes de las expresiones de palabras múltiples. Este estudio de investigación fue aprobado por la Junta de Revisión Institucional para la Protección de los Sujetos Humanos (IRBPHS) en la Universidad Dominicana de California y se le asignó el número de aprobación 10603. Como la mayoría de los estudiantes matriculados en el programa de educación especial de la primera infancia tienen retrasos en el lenguaje, la investigadora está interesada en saber si estos niños desarrollarán un nuevo vocabulario y lo usarán en la conversación entre compañeros y para contestar preguntas del maestro. Este consentimiento de representante describe el proceso de investigación y actividades y se utiliza debido a la edad de mi hijo, que es un menor de edad.

Procedimientos:

Si consiento en permitir que mi hijo participe en este estudio, sucederá lo siguiente:

1. Mi hijo escuchará un cuento que se le lea durante la hora de lectura.
2. La investigadora preguntará a mi hijo (a) sobre las preguntas que apuntan al vocabulario y le pedirá que etiquete el vocabulario para identificarlo en ilustraciones de libros. La investigadora monitoreará las respuestas de mi hijo para el dominio.
3. La investigadora le hará a mi hijo preguntas abiertas y de que, como, quien, cuando y donde, (en inglés conocidas como preguntas de “*wh...*”) sobre el cuento. Estas preguntas requieren más que una respuesta afirmativa o negativa. El investigador ofrecerá sugerencias y correcciones para ayudar a mi hijo a construir la longitud de sus respuestas.
4. La investigadora pedirá a mi hijo que use el vocabulario en las expresiones.
5. La investigadora observará a mi hijo y anotará los enunciados de mi hijo en una muestra de lenguaje.

Riesgos y / o molestias:

Entiendo que todas las actividades para este estudio de investigación ocurrirán como parte de la instrucción regular en el aula. Entiendo que existe el riesgo de que mi hijo se sienta un poco incómodo durante el período en que la investigadora le hace sus preguntas. Entiendo que la investigadora detendrá cualquier actividad si mi hijo demuestra cualquier incomodidad y hará todo lo posible para prevenir cualquier riesgo o incomodidad que se produzca durante la participación de mi hijo en las actividades de investigación.

Confidencialidad

Entiendo que todos los registros y documentos impresos de este estudio serán mantenidos confidencialmente por la investigadora en un lugar seguro bajo llave personal. Toda la información electrónica y digital se mantendrá en un dispositivo personal seguro protegido por contraseña. No se utilizarán identidades individuales en los informes o publicaciones resultantes de este estudio. Todas las referencias personales e información de identificación serán eliminadas de este estudio, y todos los participantes serán identificados solamente por un código / seudónimo. Sólo la investigadora revisará cualquier dato o documento. Un año después de la finalización de la investigación, todos los materiales escritos y grabados serán completamente destruidos.

Beneficios:

Entiendo que no puede haber ningún beneficio directo para mí o para mi hijo de participar en este estudio. También entiendo que mi hijo puede o no beneficiarse de aumentar su lenguaje hablado. El beneficio anticipado de este estudio es una mejor comprensión de si el uso de un método combinado de los libros de cuentos *Read it Once Again* sugeridos con técnicas de lectura dialógica puede aumentar el uso de un estudiante del lenguaje hablado con compañeros y maestros.

Costos / consideraciones financieras:

Entiendo que no hay costos materiales para mí o para mi hijo por participar en este estudio.

Pago / Reembolso:

Entiendo que la participación en este estudio es voluntaria y no pagada. Ni mi hijo ni yo recibiremos ningún pago y / o reembolso por participar en este estudio.

Preguntas:

He hablado con la Sra. Senn sobre este estudio y ha respondido a mis preguntas. Si tengo más preguntas sobre el estudio, puedo llamarla al (415) 492-5912. Si tengo alguna pregunta o comentario sobre la participación en este estudio, primero debo hablar con la investigadora. Si por alguna razón no deseo hacerlo, puedo contactar a la Junta de Revisión Institucional de la Universidad Dominicana de California para la Protección de los Sujetos Humanos (IRBPHS), que se ocupa de la protección de los voluntarios en proyectos de investigación. Puedo contactar a la Oficina de IRBPHS llamando al (415) 482-3547 y dejando un mensaje de correo de voz, o FAX al (415) 257-0165, o escribiendo a IRBPHS, Oficina del Vicepresidente Asociado de Asuntos Académicos de la Universidad Dominicana de California, 50 Acacia Avenue, San Rafael, CA 95901.

DECLARACIÓN DE DERECHOS DEL PARTICIPANTE EN INVESTIGACIÓN

Toda persona a la que se le pide participar en un estudio de investigación tiene los siguientes derechos

1. Que se le diga lo que el estudio está tratando de averiguar;
2. Que se le diga qué sucederá en el estudio y si alguno de los procedimientos, fármacos o dispositivos son diferentes de los que se utilizarían en la práctica estándar;
3. Ser informado acerca de riesgos importantes, efectos secundarios o molestias de las cosas que le sucederán;
4. Ser informado si puede esperar algún beneficio de participar y, si es así, cuáles podrían ser los beneficios;
5. Que se le diga qué otras opciones tiene y cómo pueden ser mejores o peores que estar en el estudio;
6. Que se le permita hacer cualquier pregunta sobre el estudio antes de comprometerse a participar y durante el curso del estudio;
7. Que se le diga qué tipo de tratamiento médico está disponible si surgen complicaciones;
8. Rehusarse a participar en todo antes o después de que el estudio se declare sin ningún efecto adverso. Si se toma tal decisión, no afectará sus derechos de recibir el cuidado o privilegios esperados si él / ella no estuviera en el estudio.
9. Recibir una copia del formulario de consentimiento firmado y fechado;
10. Estar libre de presión al considerar si desea participar en el estudio.

Si tiene preguntas sobre la investigación puede ponerse en contacto conmigo Donna Senn, en (donna.senn@students.dominican.edu). Si tiene más preguntas, puede comunicarse con mi supervisor de investigación, Dr. Suresh Appavoo (415) 482-3598, o con la Junta de Revisión Institucional de la Universidad Dominicana de California para la Protección de los Sujetos Humanos (IRBPHS), que se ocupa de la protección de los voluntarios en proyectos de investigación. Puede comunicarse con la Oficina del IRBPHS llamando al (415) 482-3547 y dejando un mensaje de correo de voz, o FAX al (415) 257-0165, o escribiendo a IRBPHS, Oficina del Vicepresidente Asociado de Asuntos Académicos de la Universidad Dominicana de California, 50 Acacia Avenue, San Rafael, CA 94901

Consentimiento:

He leído y entendido este formulario de Consentimiento y la Declaración de Derechos de Participantes incluida. Entiendo que soy libre de denegar el permiso para que mi hijo participe en este estudio, o de retirar mi consentimiento y mi hijo (a) de participar en él en cualquier momento. Entiendo que mi decisión de permitir a mi hijo (a) y seguir participando en este estudio no influirá en el estado actual o futuro de mi hijo (a) como estudiante en el aula de esta investigadora. He recibido una copia firmada y fechada de este formulario y documento de consentimiento. Mi firma a continuación indica que estoy de acuerdo en permitir que mi hijo (a) mencionado abajo participe en este estudio.

Nombre del participante: _____

Firma del padre / tutor (es) del participante

Fecha

Firma del investigador

Fecha

Appendix E **CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENT**

NAME AND ADDRESS OF TEACHER-AIDE

Dear Ms. _____:

This letter confirms that you are voluntarily agreeing to record in-class data for my research study "Effects of Dialogic Reading in a Special Day Class". This research study was approved by the Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (IRBPHS) at Dominican University of California and assigned approval number 10603. You specifically agree to record all instructional assessment data and field notes from the participants present during my class during the regular fall 2017 school semester. You are explicitly agreeing to keep any and all in-class data that you record confidential, and agree to not share information with anyone else, for any reason, excepting the researcher named below. You are agreeing to submit all recorded data in hard copy and or electronic to the researcher immediately after the recording is complete. You also agree that you will not make, and or retain any copies, duplicates in any form of the recorded data from my classroom during the fall 2017 school semester.

If I have questions I understand that I may contact Ms. Donna Senn at donna.senn@students.dominican.edu or her research supervisor, Dr. Suresh Appavoo at (415) 482-3598. If I have further questions or comments about participation in this study, I may contact the Dominican University of California Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (IRBPHS), which is concerned with the protection of volunteers in research projects. I may reach the IRBPHS Office by calling (415) 257-1310 and leaving a voicemail message, by FAX at (415) 257-0165 or by writing to the IRBPHS, Office of the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dominican University of California, 50 Acacia Avenue, San Rafael, CA 94901.

Please sign and date this letter below to indicate your consent and approval to serve as a confidential, voluntary, unpaid, in-class teacher aide for this research project, and return it to me in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope as soon as possible. Thank you very much for your time.

Sincerely,

Donna Senn
San Anselmo, CA 94960

I have read and understand the contents of the document above, and agree to record in-class field notes. I understand that I am not a participant and or a co-researcher for this research study, and only serve as an aide to record in-class field notes. I agree that I will maintain the confidentiality of all information that I record and submit all hard copy or electronic documents and or records only to the researcher named below.

Name and Signature of Teacher-aide:

Date

Name and Signature of Researcher:

Date