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Norm-referenced test-this is an assessment in which two test takers performance is compared with the performance of people in a norm group. Norms are a set of scores that represents the distribution of test performance in a norm group. The research articleis ''The Phonological Awareness Scale of Early Childhood Period (PASECP). The research study was developed in a particular region of Istanbul.

1. Questions regarding the study.

a) Were the items used in the (PASECP) valid and reliable?

b) Was there a difference in phonological skills between the attending school children paired to the children who were not attending school?

c) Does the phonics awareness of children who are brought up in a low-income family differ from a child who comes from an upper middle-class family?

2. The Variables Studied

The research was used to develop a measuring tool that would determine the phonological awareness levels of children in early childhood programs. The researcher wanted to make sure that the (PASECP) tool was being used and was valid and reliable in the study of the article. The criteria for evaluating technical accuracy of test states “ Evidence of at least one type of validity should be presented for the major types of inferences for which the use teat of a test is recommended.” (Lehr, Ysseldyke, & Thurlow, 1986). The target population was composed of 60-72-month-old children in which lived in the city of Istanbul. 2011-2012 was the school year that the study was performed. 27 children were also selected who did not go to preschool, they were selected to determine the structural validity of the scale that was developed.

3. Sample

The first information was collected from 106 students that were enrolled in a preschool. In the norm study, the target population was composed of children that were the age of 5 to 6 years old. The study used the cluster sampling method, to determine the cities, schooling types and the different population demographics. “ Cluster sampling is an example of two stage sampling. First stage a sample of areas is chosen. Second stage a sample of respondents that are in those areas are selected.” (Chaturedi, 30) When using cluster sampling the population is divided up into units, which is based on geographical contiguity. 27 children who are not in a preschool program were chosen by random sampling. The number of samples was 733.

4. Gathering of Data

The teachers used the phonological awareness scale, which has eight sub directories of phonological awareness. In total there are 78 test items. The test was looking for beginning sound detection, are the children able to generate a new word from what is related to the desired phoneme. Are they able to group the words with the same sounds, can they blend the sounds and are they able to separate the syllables. The child’s alphabetical knowledge was also tested. The test is administered individually to students. The testing period lasted for approximately 15 minutes per each child.

5. Results

The valid of the test. From the data collected and the scale items that were measured all of them related to phonological awareness. The scale had validity according to the specialists. The study stated that the test passed reliability. The individuals that were taking the test were ranked from the highest to lowest on the scale. “ 78. 3% of the research group is state school pupils and 18% at a private educational institution. 3. 7 % of the pupils did not go to school.” (Sari & Acar, 2013.) The researchers also tested children who did not go to a preschool and were also in a variable of different economic levels of family income. The research found that students who came from higher income levels had an increase in scores, rather than the students who came from a lower income level. The research stated that students who came from a private school setting had a significantly higher score compared to those who go to a public school or do not even attend a preschool. The results of the research were pretty strait forward. One item that I found useful was that the testing time was limited to only 15 minutes per student. The test was performed in a one on one setting. I feel that the 15 minutes is plenty of time for the student to concentrate and be able to perform at their best ability. Any longer of time the students will lose concertation.

6. What did I learn.

I felt that linguistic development is very important to start within the early years of childhood. The study talked about the socio-economic level of the family. As I am very aware of this, because I have taught in a very low economic level school. It’s so important to engage and develop reading and writing skills with these children and all children. If this test was available for use in my school system, I would use it. Because of the structure of the test. The test time length is 15 minutes long. The results determined that linguistic development of students that are at a medium to high economic level had better scores than those of a lower level of economics. According to Whitehurst and Lonigan (1998), ''If the child starts formal education without these basic literacy skills, the development difference among his/her peers will increase as literacy skills become more complex.”

Criterion-Referenced

The context of the study was to see if Instructional Conversation (IC) used in the classroom for instruction would work or not. The focuses would be on teaching through small group dialogue. This study will involve ELL students (English language learners) with the emphasis on the elementary language arts program. The small groups module will focus on promoting higher order thinking that will help the students with their reading comprehension and other areas. Such as math, science and social studies. The research article on the study is called Early RCT findings for ELL elementary student learning outcomes after a two-year pedagogical intervention.

1. Questions regarding the study.

Will the ELL students taught by IC teachers perform significantly above the ELL control students in the targeted areas, which is in reading and English language arts and in any of the standardized content areas. Did the non-ELL students perform significantly different from the ELL control students in language. This study was a multi cohort design which was conducted for 3 years and it involved schools were the children were clustered.

2. The Variables Studied

There are 12 school districts that were involved in this study. The study took place in the state of Georgia, with the ELL concentration of (10-48%). The teachers were found through local meeting and were given incentives for their participation. The study was a two-year commitment.

3. The Sample

121 teachers completed the trial. The cohorts analyzed the data from 1527 students that were picked from randomly assigned classrooms. The student sample is a split of the following, 761 non-ELL students and 766 ELL students. The total sample was of 3 rd grade and 5th grade students. The ELL students also reserved

services from the ESOL department.

4. Gathering of the Data.

The study used the standard student scores from the Georgia Criterion-Referenced Competency Test (CRCT). This test contained the following subjects, English Language Arts, Reading, Math, Science and Social Studies. The data was gathered by two of the cohorts. They measured the ELL students’ condition and gender. The group of teachers were given feedback and were monitored. The teachers were also required to complete logs and they were videotaped during the small group lessons.

5. The Results.

The study indicated that the ELL students taught by the IC teachers did perform significantly above the other students in English language arts, Mathematics and Science. The Ell girls in 5 th grade did outperform their other female control counterparts. There were no apparent effects of the IC teacher on non-ELL students. The study did show that the ELL students reading, and other subject areas did improve with the IC approach. Students working with the IC teachers did have a higher performance rate in science and math. I would incorporate small learning groups into my classroom. I feel that it helps the struggling students. By giving them opportunities to use different strategic skills is always a plus. Small settings will also help the ELL students with their reading comprehension.

6. Information Learned.

The data showed that small group instruction works. In realty can it be done all the time in the classroom. Maybe with the help of a teachers aid. Small groups should be added to the classroom structure because it has been proven by this study that it does work. But it only worked for the ELL students and not the non-ELL students.

Compare and Contrast.

Both studies had the same emphasis on academic performance in the Language Arts area. The first study was about seeing if a test on phonological awareness a valid way of testing was used. Both studies had an emphasis on socio-economic levels of the children and families. The second study only pinpointed on the ELL students and the non-ELL students and the community. Plus, the students in the second study were older, they were in the 3rd and 5th grade. The first study dealt with younger children who were in preschool and just learning the elements of the English language. Both studies came to a favorable outcome. On each of the questions that were asked in the study, the first study showed that the socio-economic lead in the students did have

an affect on their linguistic development. The second study showed that the students who meet up with the IC teacher in small groups did academically well on their standardized tests, that were given to them by the State of Georgia. This type of small group did help the ELL students in so many ways.
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