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CURRICULUM-BASED ASSESSMENT & INTERVENTION

- IDEA ensures access to general curriculum for children with speech and language needs
- This requires a shift toward the use of assessments and interventions that are curriculum focused.
- There is a need for more contextually based assessment & intervention and the use of collaboration and teaming approaches within school-based settings.

- Contextually based assessment
- Educationally relevant intervention
- Collaboration & consultation

Educationally relevant intervention

- The intervention plan should focus on functional, content based information within the context of meaningful activities.

- Child will demonstrate grade appropriate comprehension skills and apply them in his classroom first grade reading program (LTG).
SLPs maintain a “therapeutic focus” as they are the experts in language who are knowledgeable about curriculum content while teachers are experts in curriculum content and knowledgeable about language.

Ehren, B.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narrative Kindergarten</th>
<th>Grade 1</th>
<th>Grade 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ask &amp; answer questions about key details (with support)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ask &amp; answer questions: wh- &amp; h questions about key details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retell stories w/detail</td>
<td>Retell stories w/detail &amp; understand central message/lesson</td>
<td>Retell stories, fables, folktales w/detail &amp; understand central message/lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify character, setting, major events in story</td>
<td>Describe character, setting, major events in story using key details</td>
<td>Describe character goals in story.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask/answer questions about unknown words</td>
<td>Identify words, phrases that highlight “feelings”</td>
<td>Describe how regular beats, alliteration, rhymes, repeated lines give “rhythm” and meaning to stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize common text types</td>
<td>Explain differences between texts</td>
<td>Describe text structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify &amp; define author &amp; illustrator (with support)</td>
<td>Identify narrator</td>
<td>Identify character perspective &amp; highlight it (using different voices if necessary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe relationship between illustrations and story line</td>
<td>Use illustrations to describe character, setting, events</td>
<td>Use information from print &amp; illustrations to demonstrate understanding of character, setting, events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compare &amp; contrast stories (with support)</td>
<td>Compare &amp; contrast stories</td>
<td>Compare various versions of h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td>Grade 4</td>
<td>Grade 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask &amp; answer questions referring explicitly to textbase</td>
<td>Use details, examples from text in explaining explicit and inferential information in text</td>
<td>Quote from text and explain explicit and inferential information in text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retell stories (including fables, folktales), identify central message, moral, explain using detail</td>
<td>Determine theme from details; summarize</td>
<td>Determine theme from details, summarize, talk about character goals &amp; motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe characters &amp; explain how their actions contribute to story sequence</td>
<td>Describe characters, setting, events in depth</td>
<td>Compare/contrast characters, settings, events in depth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine word meaning using context in text; literal &amp; nonliteral language</td>
<td>Determine word meaning using context in text; mythology</td>
<td>Determine word meaning using context in text; figurative language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk &amp; write about parts of stories, dramas, poems</td>
<td>Talk &amp; write about differences between poems et al., using story structure</td>
<td>Talk &amp; write about how chapters, scenes, stanzas fit together using “structure” to explain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinguish your point of view from narrator &amp; character</td>
<td>Compare/contrast points of view from different stories</td>
<td>Describe how narrators point of view affects how events are described</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe how illustrations influence the story</td>
<td>Connect text and visual representation of text</td>
<td>Analyze how visual &amp; multimedia impact meaning, tone, beauty of text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expository/informational Kindergarten</td>
<td>Grade 1</td>
<td>Grade 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>With support</strong>, ask &amp; answer questions about details, identify main idea, retell key details, describe relationships between 2 characters, events, ideas, concepts in text</td>
<td><strong>With NO support</strong>, ask &amp; answer questions about details, identify main idea, retell key details, describe relationships between 2 characters, events, ideas, concepts in text</td>
<td>Ask, answer <em>wh &amp; h questions</em> about key details, identify main topic in multi-paragraph text, identify main topic of specific paragraphs, <em>describe relationship between historical events, ideas, concepts, technical procedures in text</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grade 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Grade 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Grade 5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask &amp; answer questions relying explicitly on textbase for answers, main idea, recount key details, explain how they support main idea, describe relationship between historical events, scientific ideas, steps in procedures, using language pertaining to <em>time, sequence, cause/effect</em></td>
<td>Ask &amp; answer questions relying explicitly on textbase for answers, main idea, recount key details, explain how they support main idea, describe relationship between events, procedures, ideas, concepts in historical, scientific texts, <em>include what happened &amp; why based explicitly on text</em></td>
<td>Ask &amp; answer questions relying explicitly on textbase for answers, <em>2 or more main ideas</em>, recount key details, explain how they support main idea, describe relationship between events, procedures, ideas, concepts in historical, scientific texts, include what happened &amp; <em>why based explicitly on text</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHAT DO WE KNOW?

- Children with language impairment are often “poor comprehenders”
  - Answer fewer comprehension questions (explicit, implicit),
  - Recall fewer story details
  - Have more difficulty identifying and resolving anomalies in text, particularly at the sentence level (Garner & Kraus, 1982; Paris & Myers, 1981; Oakhill, Hartt & Samois, 2005)
  - Less sensitive to text structure (less experience in reading?)

- These problems exist in narrative & expository discourse

- Will affect their ability to meet the CCSs
### In the States

![Map of the United States highlighting states that have adopted the Common Core State Standards](map_image)

**States that have formally adopted the Common Core State Standards**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alabama</th>
<th>Kentucky</th>
<th>Nevada</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WHAT MAKES A POOR COMPREHENDER?
Comprehension

Memory

Monitoring skill

Vocabulary & World knowledge

Text structure

Inferencing ability

Text structure
Memory

- Recall explicit detail
- Recall information in order to make inferences
- Recall information in a form that is amenable to reporting/relating
  - And answering explicit and inferential question
Vocabulary

- Knowledge of meanings of words in the text
- Ability to decipher the meaning of unknown words using context or questioning techniques
- Experiences/world knowledge to bring to text
- Adds to ability to monitor whether what you are reading “makes sense”
- Interventions to improve vocabulary include Tier 2 (Beck & McKeown) and “rich” instruction (Beimiller)
Text structure

- Narrative text = causal structure
- Character motivated by a goal, caused by an initiating event. Series of actions.
  - Predictable
  - Familiar
  - Schema promotes inferencing, recall (reduces cognitive load)
  - allows for “reflexive associations” between the reader and the text that may improve understanding and the ability to identify and resolve anomalous information (McCrudden, Schraw, Lehman & Poliquin, 2006; Singer & O-Connell, 2003).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cue Words (signal words)</th>
<th>Graphic Organizer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Description | The author describes a topic by listing characteristics, features, attributes, and examples | • for example  
• characteristics  
• for instance  
• such as  
• is like  
• including  
• to illustrate | ![Diagram](image) |
| Sequence  | The author lists items or events in numerical or chronological sequence, either explicit or implied | • first  
• second  
• third  
• later  
• next  
• before  
• then  
• finally  
• after  
• when  
• later  
• since  
• now  
• previously  
• actual use of dates | 1.  
2.  
3.  
4.  |
| Comparison | Information is presented by detailing how two or more events, concepts, theories, or things are alike and/or different | • however  
• nevertheless  
• on the other hand  
• but  
• similarly  
• although  
• also  
• in contrast  
• different  
• alike  
• same as  
• either/or  
• in the same way  
• just like  
• just as  
• likewise  
• in comparison  
• where as  
• yet | ![Diagram](image) |

- Less familiar structure
- Less familiar vocabulary
- Presents both content and structure problems for the comprehender.
- Contains conceptually new information couched in a less-familiar format
Text structure (ES = 2.2-2.4)

- Teaching students to identify text structure
  - Lack of sensitivity to text structure impacts one’s ability to identify the main idea, to self-monitor and to summarize text (Englert & Thomas, 1987)
  - Unable to construct an internal topic structure representation of the information
    - Results in the use of “sentence by sentence” decisions about what is or is not important (Seidenberg, 1989)
2nd graders taught expository text structures scored higher in expository text comprehension than students who received instruction on “content.”

Reutzel et al., incorporated the use of **graphic organizers** to teach expository text structure

Williams (2005); Hall, Sabey & McClellan (2005); Reutzel, Smith & Fawson (2005)
COMPREHENSION MONITORING IS ANOTHER “BEAST” ENTIRELY

Poor comprehenders do not “monitor” their understanding very well

- Types of comprehension problems readers may encounter:
  - **External consistency** = When what we hear or read does not match what we know (background knowledge/vocabulary)
**TYPES OF COMPREHENSION MONITORING PROBLEMS**

- **Internal consistency** = When what we hear or read does not match what we have already heard or read (memory, integration)
  - requires that readers integrate propositions across sentences within paragraphs (& across paragraphs [Rubman and Waters, 2000])
- The detection of internal inconsistencies can be achieved through the comparison of literal (explicit) statements in the text, which may not require "inferencing"
MEASURING COMPREHENSION MONITORING

- Insert anomalous information into discourse,
  - **Internal:** The Robbins family were on their way to Disney World. They all got hungry so they stopped at a restaurant. The restaurant was closed. After they got back on the highway they couldn’t believe how full they were. They got to Disney World and had a wonderful vacation.
  - **External:** The astronaut walked on the moon for hours before he went back to his space ship. He enjoyed sorting his moon rocks on the rocket ship while drinking his freshly made milk shake that he’d bought from the corner store just moments before.
Most studies on CM have been done in reading:

- Paris & Meyers (1981) 9-10 year old good & poor readers
- Garner & Kraus (1982) 12-13 year old good & poor comprehenders
- Oakhill, Hartt & Samois (2005) 9 & 10 year old good and poor comprehenders (excluded poor decoders)
- Kelso, Fletcher & Lee (2007) Included good & poor decoders
Eliminate decoding by presenting tasks orally

- Reading presents a “confound” for measuring comprehension monitoring
  - Poor decoding contributes to poor comprehension
  - Many children with language impairment are also poor decoders
  - To measure “comprehension” you must eliminate decoding

Equivalent findings for reading/listening

- Laing & Kamhi (2002) Narrative
- Gillam, S., Fargo, J., & Robertson, K. (2011)
One aim of current study

- Examine CM in poor comprehenders without the confound of decoding
Smith (2006)

- The use of think-alouds to improve comprehension and comprehension monitoring “effective” in narrative and expository text
- Use it! (Reading Teachers)
Does a TA strategy really work for all kinds of poor comprehenders
The SLP in me thinks...no.
Children read expository passages under 2 conditions

+ **TA:** They were also instructed to tell the examiner about any information they were having difficulty with (comprehension monitoring).

+ **Silent Reading**
  + In both conditions, children were asked to recall what they had read

**Findings**

- Recall was better in the **TA** condition for 6th graders and in the **silent reading** condition for 4th graders.
  + Data suggested that students processed text differently in the TA and silent reading conditions.
By asking 4th graders to produce a verbal protocol, we may be impairing their ability to benefit from their own strategic processing (Garner, 1987).

This is particularly important to consider if the student has difficulty with comprehension (poor comprehender).
TA AS AN INTERVENTION APPROACH FOR POOR COMPREHENDERS

- Most research on TA focuses on the approach as a “method of inquiry” or a “context” within which to teach specific strategies (questioning, visualizing, monitoring)
- Laing & Kamhi (2002) – use of TA to examine comprehension processes in narrative text
- Gillam, Fargo & Robertson (2010) – use of TA to examine comprehension processes in expository text
Laing & Kamhi (2002)
- Comprehension is “explanatory based” in narrative
- Poor readers used fewer explanatory inferences

Gillam, Fargo & Robertson (2010)
- Comprehension is “summary based” in expository
- Poor readers used fewer paraphrases

TA video clip
Limited research as to whether or not the "act" of thinking aloud improves comprehension and comprehension monitoring in narrative & expository discourse

- Think Aloud (Bereiter & Bird, 1985; Kucan & Beck, 1997; Smith, 2006)
TA AS A COMPREHENSION STRATEGY?

- Theory 1: TA encourages deep processing, & slows the act of comprehension so anomalies can be identified and resolved
- Theory 2: TA interferes with comprehension for young readers in expository text (Cote, Goldman & Saul, 1998)
SECOND AIM OF CURRENT STUDY

- To examine potential differential effects of TA process on improving comprehension and comprehension monitoring in poor comprehenders (most with language impairment)
- Because Cote et al., found that the act of TA interfered with comprehension for 4th graders, we developed a “non-think aloud” version of the task
- Theoretically, the processing would still occur – we just aren’t asking them to report on it – thereby interfering with whatever benefit they may be receiving by stopping and “thinking”
The purpose of the current study was:

To examine whether the use of a No-protocol “Think Aloud” or,

Stop, Think, and Monitor Procedure (STAMP) was associated with better comprehension and comprehension monitoring for 4th grade good and poor comprehenders than a Listen Through (LT) condition in expository & narrative discourse.

STAMP video clip
The LT method was designed to mirror silent reading conditions used in previous studies, but did not require children to read.

Mediating factors for comprehension outcomes were also measured and included general language skill (McKeown & Gentilucci, 2007), listening skill, working memory, nonverbal reasoning, decoding and passage comprehension.
MEASUREMENT OF COMPREHENSION

- Comprehension questions
  - Explicit
  - Implicit
- Recalling details (story recall)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Poor Comprehenders</th>
<th>Good Comprehenders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Age</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (% male)</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal working memory</td>
<td>14.4 (2.3)</td>
<td>18.1 (2.5)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONI</td>
<td>92.5 (7.8)</td>
<td>95.3 (8.4) ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CELF</td>
<td>81.9 (15.0)</td>
<td>100.5 (14.4)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passage Comprehension WRMT</td>
<td>90.75 (4.84)</td>
<td>105.95 (6.5)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-year or more &lt; Grade level</td>
<td></td>
<td>At or above grade level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word identification</td>
<td>63.4 (8.7)</td>
<td>72.3 (3.4)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>13 AA</td>
<td>7 W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 AA</td>
<td>9 W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
You are going to hear a passage, retell it, and answer comprehension questions about it.

Listen carefully because there is an error in the passage.

Stop me if you hear it (detection of anomaly).

Tell me what is wrong (resolution of anomaly).

You can ask me to repeat anything you want, as many times as you want (listen-again, look-back)

You will only hear one sentence at a time… ready?
You are going to hear a passage, retell it, and answer comprehension questions about it.

Listen carefully because there is an error in the passage.

Stop me if you hear it. (detection of anomaly).

Tell me what is wrong (resolution of anomaly).

You can ask me to repeat anything you want, as many times as you want (listen-again, look-back).

I will keep reading unless you stop me to ask me to repeat something or to tell me something that does not make sense.... ready?
RESULTS

- Comparisons BETWEEN good & poor readers
  - Must be able to explain why a strategy might work for one child (good comprehender) and not another (poor comprehender)
- Good comprehenders answered more questions, recalled more story details than poor comprehenders in the LT condition for narrative and expository discourse.
Good vs. Poor comprehenders

**Listen-Through Condition**

- **Narrative**
  - Explicit
  - Inferential
  - Story detail
- **Expository**
  - Explicit
  - Inferential
  - Story detail
Differences between the groups for narrative discourse disappear in the STAMP condition.
FACILITATIVE EFFECT IN NARRATIVE FOR POOR COMPREHENDERS

Mediated vwm? Extra processing time?

**STAMP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Explicit</th>
<th>Inferential</th>
<th>Story detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Explicit</th>
<th>Inferential</th>
<th>Story detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NO FACILITATIVE EFFECT FOR STAMP IN EXPOSITORY TEXT

**STAMP**

**LT**

Good vs. Poor comprehenders

Differences between groups remain
COMPREHENSION MONITORING OUTCOMES

- No differences between groups in identification and resolution of anomalies in LT for narrative or expository text.
Identification & resolution of anomalies in narrative and expository in *Listen Through* condition.

No differences between groups

Narrative

- Poor Comprehenders
- Good Comprehenders

Expository

Good vs. Poor comprehenders
Facilitative effect of STAMP for good comprehenders in comprehension monitoring

- Only in **narrative** text.
Identification & resolution of anomalies in narrative and expository in STAMP condition

Can’t mediate language deficit by STAMP?

Good vs. Poor comprehenders
FACILITATIVE EFFECT OF STAMP IN NARRATIVE FOR GOOD COMPREHENDERS
WHAT MEDIATED COMPREHENSION PERFORMANCE?

- Memory
  - Questions Expository: $r = 0.48^{**}$
  - Recall Narrative: $r = 0.33^{*}$
  - Recall Expository: $r = 0.50^{**}$

- Language skill
  - Questions Expository: $r = 0.51^{**}$
  - Recall Narrative: $r = 0.48^{**}$
  - Recall Expository: $r = 0.65^{**}$

> vwm, > language, > performance
WHAT MEDIATED COMPREHENSION MONITORING?

- **Memory**
  - Narrative & CM: $r = .23$ (ns)
  - Expository & CM: $r = .09$ (ns)
  - **No**
  - No relationship between the ability to monitor comprehension & memory
    - Not a “memory” thing

- **Language**
  - Narrative & CM: $r = .41$ **
    - **yes**
  - Expository & CM: $r = .27$
  - The children with the better “language skills” benefitted from STAMP in narratives
  - Everybody bombed expository
    - It’s a “language thing”
SUMMARY & INTERPRETATION OF COMPREHENSION OUTCOMES

**Narrative**

- **Poor Comprehenders**
  - STAMP improved performance for:
    - Comprehension outcomes
      - Explicit $d = .31$
      - Implicit $d = 1.04$
      - Story details $d = .29$
    - Needed the extra processing time

- **Good Comprehenders**
  - LT resulted in best performance for:
    - Comprehension outcomes
      - Implicit $d = .40$
    - Were able to make causal connections, recall, generate inferences without additional processing time afforded in STAMP

**Effect sizes**
SUMMARY & INTERPRETATION OF COMPREHENSION OUTCOMES

Poor Comprehenders
- STAMP improved performance for:
  - Implicit $d = .32$
  - Story details $d = .27$

Good Comprehenders
- STAMP improved performance for:
  - Implicit $d = .47$
  - Story details $d = .67$

Expository

Small effect sizes

- Poor Comprehenders
- STAMP improved performance for:
  + Implicit $d = .32$
  + Story details $d = .27$

Moderate effect sizes

- Good Comprehenders
- STAMP improved performance for:
  + Implicit $d = .47$
  + Story details $d = .67$

Poor comprehenders may have processed information more deeply, but with inadequate language knowledge & poorer working memory skills, could not benefit from STAMP to the same extent as children WITH good language skills & superior memory abilities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor Comprehenders</th>
<th>Good comprehenders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STAMP improved performance for:</td>
<td>STAMP improved performance for:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification ($d = 1.16$) &amp; resolution ($d = .83$) of anomalies in <strong>expository</strong> discourse</td>
<td>Identification ($d = 1.16$) &amp; resolution ($d = .95$) of anomalies in <strong>expository &amp; narrative</strong> discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ID $d = .94$</td>
<td>- Resolution $d = .88$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research has shown that when comprehenders have adequate content knowledge they have little difficulty taking an active role in comprehension (McNamara, Kintsch, Songer & Kintsch, 1996) by generating inferences and integrating information across sentences for use in comprehension monitoring.
In low-knowledge situations, comprehenders have been shown to infer less and identify more problems when problems do not exist.

Thus, expository discourse has the potential to pose significant problems in comprehension monitoring efforts, particularly for poor comprehenders.
FALSE DETECTIONS NARRATIVE

Started off in the same place!

Interfered with memory?

Double checked themselves more frequently

Resolved more problems

Poor Comprehenders

True detection
False detection
Look-backs
Resolution
DISCUSSION

- McKeown & Gentilucci (2007)
  - Think aloud did not improve comprehension of expository text for adolescents learning English as a second language (low language knowledge)

- Cote, Goldman & Saul (1998)
  - Think aloud improved comprehension of expository text for 6th graders but not 4th graders
    - Interference in processing “process”
Clarke, Snowling & Hulme (2011)
- Specific reading comprehension difficulties (similar to poor comprehenders)
- Text Comprehension training vs. Oral Language training vs. COM (combination of the 2)
TEXT COMPREHENSION TRAINING

- Reread, look-back, visualize, think-aloud, and self explanation
- Reciprocal teaching (clarification, summarization, prediction, question generation)
- Inferences
ORAL LANGUAGE TRAINING

- Vocabulary, reciprocal teaching with spoken language, figurative language, and spoken narrative
COMBINATION

- All of the above
FINDINGS

- All three treatments were effective in improving comprehension
- Gains were mediated by oral language knowledge
- Findings suggested that children’s reading-comprehension problems as “one facet” of a broader oral-language comprehension problem.
SLPs can support the core curricular standards through their efforts to provide effective instruction to students in comprehension and comprehension monitoring.

- Oral language instruction is crucial.

SLPs can consult with teachers to help them understand how oral language ability may “mediate” the effectiveness of some of the strategies and/or instruction they are providing in the classroom.
ONE-SIZE FITS ALL
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