The Effects of Dialogic Reading on the Oral Language of Diverse Kindergarten Students

Abigail Figgins
Brigham Young University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd

Part of the Education Commons

BYU ScholarsArchive Citation
https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd/9500

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu.
The Effects of Dialogic Reading on the Oral Language of
Diverse Kindergarten Students

Abigail Figgins

A thesis submitted to the faculty of
Brigham Young University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Science

Connie Summers, Chair
Douglas B. Petersen
Kendra M. Hall-Kenyon

Department of Communication Disorders
Brigham Young University

Copyright © 2022 Abigail Figgins
All Rights Reserved
The Effects of Dialogic Reading on the Oral Language of Diverse Kindergarten Students

Abigail Figgins
Department of Communication Disorders, BYU
Master of Science

The purpose of this study was to determine if dialogic reading involving diverse kindergarten students would significantly affect narrative language. Various studies have corroborated the effectiveness of dialogic reading instruction on the expressive vocabulary of monolingual children. However, few studies have examined oral narrative language outcomes, especially with diverse students. A total of 142 kindergarten students were randomly assigned to a treatment group or control group. Each child in the treatment group received 14 weeks of whole-class dialogic reading instruction from their kindergarten teacher two times per week for 20 minutes each session in their classroom. The dialogic reading program included explicit target vocabulary instruction based on unfamiliar vocabulary selected from each storybook. The oral narrative language (narrative retells and personal narratives) of each child were assessed using the CUBED Narrative Language Measures subtest (NLM). Results indicated that students in the control group and the treatment group (including culturally and linguistically diverse students) showed no significant difference in their narrative retell scores after the intervention. However, students (including CLD students) in the treatment group demonstrated significant improvement in their personal story generations when compared with the control group after dialogic reading intervention. The current research gives implications for current kindergarten education by indicating that a focus on early dialogic reading can augment oral language skills and therefore academic skills later in elementary school.
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DESCRIPTION OF THESIS STRUCTURE

This thesis, *The Effects of Dialogic Reading on the Oral Language of Diverse Kindergarten Students*, is written in a hybrid format. A hybrid format combines elements of traditional master’s thesis requirements with elements of journal publications formats. Portions of this thesis may be submitted for publications in other journals if the thesis author is listed as one of the contributing coauthors.

Appendix A is the large group narrative intervention fidelity checklist, Appendix B provides the pretest CUBED Narrative Language Measures subtest (NLM), Appendix C is the NLM Flow chard, and Appendix D displays the annotated bibliography.
Introduction

Early oral language skills are predictive of academic success in elementary school. Studies have revealed that kindergarten oral language facilitates reading comprehension in the later elementary school grades (Roth et al., 2002). For example, Roth et al. (2002) conducted a longitudinal analysis to determine the relationship between oral language and early reading development. The researchers measured oral language (metalinguistics, structural language, and narrative discourse) and reading ability (word recognition, pseudoword reading, and passage comprehension) in a group of 39 kindergarten students. These measures were readministered in the first and second grades. The study concluded that oral language skills predicted success in second grade reading comprehension (Roth et al., 2002). Similarly, Thompson (2017) measured kindergarteners’ oral language and comprehension of a text read out loud. The students’ abilities were assessed through standardized testing done at the school for kindergarten students. The findings of this study showed a strong positive connection between oral language and reading comprehension. Furthermore, Thompson (2017) concluded that, based on their findings, kindergarten classrooms should incorporate specialized instruction on oral language skills because of the strong causal effect it has on reading comprehension.

Miller et al. (2006) examined if discourse measures including narrative production would predict reading achievement within and across languages for bilingual and culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) children. More than 1,500 Spanish-English bilingual students in kindergarten through third grade were recruited for this study. Oral narratives, passage comprehension measures, and word reading efficiency data were collected for each participant. Results indicated that oral language in Spanish predicted reading ability in Spanish and that oral language in English predicted reading ability in English. Additionally, cross-language scores
showed that English oral language predicted Spanish reading scores and Spanish oral language predicted English reading scores. Spanish and English oral language skills facilitated higher reading within and across languages (Miller et al., 2006). This study reveals that oral language not only predicts reading comprehension in Caucasian monolingual students but in CLD populations as well.

**Reading to Learn**

Reading comprehension skills are important for academic success for all students in contemporary and diverse classrooms. By the fourth grade, students begin to learn the curriculum through reading academic texts (Chall & Jacobs, 2003). This phenomenon referred to as reading to learn includes reading to better understand a topic or reading to learn new academic information (Maclellan, 1997). By fourth grade, if a student is having difficulty with reading comprehension, they will likely have difficulty with learning the new academic curriculum. In the fourth grade, students begin to encounter texts with academic and decontextualized vocabulary and concepts. In order for students to learn from these texts, they must have adequate reading comprehension skills. Students who do not have these skills often experience what is referred to as a “fourth-grade slump” in which they have difficulty with the less familiar and decontextualized curriculum (Chall & Jacobs, 2003, p. 2). The fourth-grade slump is apparent in students who were previously performing at the level of their peers but begin to decline in their progression in the fourth grade, due to reading comprehension difficulties (Chall & Jacobs, 2003).

Reading is a key determiner of later academic success, but many students are currently reading below the expected level. The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP, 2019) revealed that reading scores were lower in 2019 than they were in 2017. By the fourth
grade, only 35% of students were at or above the NAEP reading achievement levels indicating that 65% of students are reading at a level lower than expected (National Assessment of Educational Progress, 2019). CLD students are particularly at risk for lower levels of reading comprehension. Similar to monolingual Caucasian students, Black and Hispanic students exhibited lower reading comprehension scores in 2019 than in 2017, and approximately 80% were not reading at a proficient level (National Assessment of Educational Progress, 2019).

CLD students in the school systems often encounter teachers and administrators who are undertrained and underprepared to accurately and effectively work with children who have diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds (Becker & Deris, 2019). This is a direct result of the lack of research regarding early childhood oral language intervention that teachers can implement with all students, including those who are CLD. CLD students are more likely than their monolingual peers to be placed in special education courses and many unnecessarily stay in these courses throughout their academic career (Becker & Deris, 2019). This is not best practice for CLD students and has an influence on their academic careers as they are not placed in the programs that would best support their oral language development and subsequent reading comprehension.

Academic oral language intervention has been shown to facilitate reading comprehension in young students from both Caucasian monolingual and CLD backgrounds (Miller et al., 2006; Roth et al., 2002) and could be a highly effective intervention in preparing students for more academic and decontextualized reading in later elementary school. Because studies have revealed that oral language is predictive of reading comprehension (Roth et al., 2002), oral language intervention employed in the kindergarten years, especially an intervention that is efficacious for diverse CLD children, could help augment reading levels in the later elementary school years.
Evidence-Based Practices in Dialogic Book Reading

Dialogic reading is heavily researched and evidence-based practice that exhibits a positive influence on the language development of young children (Arnold et al., 1994). As parents and teachers are often the primary communicators with their children, their communication patterns have a notable influence on a child’s development. Dialogic reading interventions have evidence of being effective in augmenting young children’s oral language development, with a particular emphasis on vocabulary (Rosa-Lugo & Walsh, 2008).

Dialogic reading has typically been researched in regard to vocabulary acquisition and retention (Ewers & Brownson, 1999). Ewers and Brownson examined how dialogic reading influenced novel vocabulary learning. The study included 66 Kindergarten students who were assigned to a passive or active (dialogic) storybook reading group. The active reading group was prompted to respond to “what” or “where” questions after reading a sentence containing a target vocabulary word. The passive group did not participate in dialogue after each target vocabulary word was read. Results indicated that the dialogic reading group learned more target vocabulary words than the passive group, suggesting that dialogic reading increased vocabulary retention and understanding (Ewers & Brownson, 1999). Additionally, a similar study examined dialogic reading with three-year-old children to determine the effect that asking questions while reading had on the child’s vocabulary acquisition (Walsh & Blewitt, 2006). Two groups of children received dialogic reading intervention. The treatment groups exhibited greater gains in...
vocabulary acquisition and knowledge than the control group (Walsh & Blewitt, 2006). This study corroborates the idea that dialogic reading can augment a child’s vocabulary development.

Roberts et al. (2019) conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis of 76 studies to examine the outcomes of parent training programs on subsequent child language development in children younger than six years old. Incorporated studies included research regarding parent trainings on various strategies including the use of dialogic reading, responsive and naturalistic strategies (e.g., responding to child communication). This analysis demonstrated that the implementation of dialogic reading communicative strategies elevated the preschool-aged child’s expressive language development including vocabulary.

These studies have indicated that dialogic reading is evidence-based and highly beneficial as it effectuates expressive language development. However, a limitation of these studies is that they almost exclusively focus on vocabulary growth and not on the development of other features of complex oral academic language. As oral academic language skills have been identified as having a remarkable influence on essential reading comprehension (Roth et al., 2002; Thompson, 2017) these outcomes should be examined more thoroughly. Additionally, these studies demonstrate insufficient or contradictory data on the effect of dialogic reading on the growing population of culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) children (Roberts et al., 2019).

**Insufficient Research With Culturally Linguistically Diverse Populations**

In addition to a lack of multiple oral language outcomes, the current research has rarely included CLD populations. It is concerning that CLD populations are not adequately included in current dialogic reading research as the percentage of culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD)
students in the United States school systems is rising and their academic and language needs are not being met (Becker & Deris, 2019).

The extensive literature review conducted by Roberts et al. (2019) manifested a lack of diversity among participants across all 76 included studies. The authors concluded that more research is needed to be conducted with CLD participants as these populations were notably underrepresented in the current research. Further, Mot et al. (2008) recognized that the results of their meta-analysis may not apply to CLD populations as there has been inadequate research conducted with this population. A descriptive review analyzing research with CLD populations (Manz et al., 2010) revealed that studies on dialogic book reading often neglected to report participant characteristics and demographics with one half of studies failing to provide linguistic backgrounds in the description of participants. The studies that did provide linguistic backgrounds had limited, if any, CLD representation in their participant groups.

Two studies that did focus on dialogic reading with CLD populations have demonstrated the efficacy of that intervention with diverse students. One study focused on parent-child dialogic reading (in English) with bilingual Hong Kong kindergarteners. The results revealed that dialogic reading improved English word reading and augmented phonological awareness in both English and Cantonese (Chow et al., 2010). A second study with two participating Latino parents and their preschool-age children (both children presented with a significant and congenital organic or motor speech impairment with less than 50% intelligibility) using augmentative and alternative communication (AAC) during storybook reading found that the parents implemented the storybook reading strategies and demonstrated maintained strategy use after the training. Additionally, both children showed significant increases in communicative turns taken and novel semantic concepts expressed after the training (Rosa-Lugo & Walsh,
2008). While the data regarding dialogic reading in CLD populations is preliminary, these studies provide evidence suggesting that dialogic reading may facilitate language development in CLD populations (Chow et al., 2010; Rosa-Lugo & Walsh, 2008).

The positive findings from these two studies somewhat contradict results from other dialogic reading studies (Manz et al., 2010; Mot et al., 2008; Roberts et al., 2019) where it was revealed the CLD families demonstrated a smaller effect size when compared with their monolingual Caucasian counterparts (Manz et al., 2010). The authors from these studies noted that CLD participants benefited less from dialogic reading programs than Caucasian participants. To address this contradiction in the data, Manz et al. (2010) conducted a descriptive review of 31 articles and a meta-analysis of 14 studies to analyze how the current data applies to CLD children. Their study revealed that due to insufficient research it could not be conclusively determined if dialogic reading is as effective with CLD populations as it is with monolingual Caucasian populations. Furthermore, most dialogic reading studies have not reported on the effect of that intervention on other oral language outcomes such as language discourse (e.g., narration). This pilot study aims to provide more data regarding the efficacy of dialogic reading on augmenting oral language with diverse kindergarten students. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to examine the effects of a dialogic reading instruction on the oral language of kindergarten children, as measured through oral narrative retelling and oral narrative personal generation, and to determine if CLD kindergarten students responded to the instruction differently than their monolingual Caucasian peers.
Research Questions:

1. To what extent does a dialogic reading intervention improve oral narrative retelling and oral narrative personal generation in kindergarten students when compared to a no treatment control group?

2. To what extent does a dialogic reading intervention improve oral narrative retelling and oral narrative personal generation in CLD kindergarten students when compared to a no treatment control group of CLD students?

**Method**

**Participants**

A sample of 142 kindergarten students were recruited to participate in this study. Approval was obtained from a university Institutional Review Board in the collection and analysis of all the data used, as the current study involved human participants. Participants were recruited from six different classrooms across three school districts in the same region of Michigan. Demographic information for each student that was available from the school district was obtained. Of the 142 students, 30 were CLD as defined as being an ethnicity other than Caucasian or by speaking more than one language in the home.

Classrooms were randomly assigned to one of two conditions: a treatment group that received dialogic reading intervention and a no-treatment control group. There were 70 kindergarten students in the shared storybook treatment group, and 72 kindergarten students in the control group.

**Procedures**

All students in each condition received a battery of pretest assessments completed in December and posttest assessments completed in May. Students in the treatment group received
large group dialogic book reading instruction for 14 weeks. The students in the no-treatment control group received kindergarten classroom instruction as usual.

**Dialogic Reading Group**

The participants in the treatment dialogic book reading group participated in dialogic reading with their classroom teacher biweekly for 15-20 minutes across 14 weeks. Each whole-class dialogic reading session had a particular emphasis on vocabulary instruction following Spencer et al. (2012) procedures. These procedures include having the classroom teacher select the target vocabulary words for each session from a list of unfamiliar words in the selected storybook. The target words were selected based on relevance to the context of the story and if possible, relevance to the participants’ academic goals and other classroom activities. The target words were readily teachable to young learners, meaning that they had child-friendly definitions that were easily understood by the students. Teachers were encouraged to ensure that the dialogic reading sessions were highly interactive. To accomplish this goal, students were encouraged to repeat each target word and the child-friendly definition and then connect the word to the context of the book and to their own lives and experiences. Students were then directed to use the new word in authentic contexts including embedding the new vocabulary into other classroom activities or assigning meaningful gestures to target words. After the interactive reading was complete, all the target words were reviewed and children were asked to repeat the word and definition as well as look at relevant pictures in the book. The target word was then added to a “word board” and used in subsequent classroom activities. A fidelity checklist was completed during the intervention sessions.
**No-Treatment Control Group**

Students in the control group received no dialogic reading instruction but rather participated in typical curriculum for a kindergarten class put in place for the beginning of the school year. The public-school kindergarten class in Michigan followed reading standards that included engaging with a text. For example, Kindergarten reading standards for the state of Michigan designate that students will learn to “ask and answer questions about key details in a text, retell familiar stories and key details, and identify characters, settings and major events in a story” (Michigan Department of Education, n.d., p. 11).

**Measures**

All 142 participants in both the treatment and control groups were administered universal screening of oral language pretests in December and posttests in May. The universal screening of oral language utilized the CUBED Narrative Language Measures (NLM; Petersen & Spencer, 2012) retell subtest (narrative retell), and personal story generation subtest. Each subtest was utilized in both December and May to track progress across all measures of oral language. Speech-language pathologists and paraprofessionals assigned to the participating schools administered the narrative retell benchmark pretests and posttests.

**Narrative Retell**

Oral narrative language was measured using the Narrative Language Measures (NLM) Listening subtest of the CUBED assessment (Petersen et al., 2022). The narrative retell subtests were used in this study and were employed to assess the participants’ narrative retells and personal story generations. The NLM forms for narrative retell have measures for both the comprehension of and production of story grammar with additional measures for aspects of complex language within personal narratives. The NLM has parallel benchmark forms including
three for fall, three for winter, and three for spring. It also contains 16 progress monitoring forms for kindergarten students (Petersen & Spencer, 2012). The three-winter parallel benchmark forms of the kindergarten NLM listening subtest of the CUBED were administered for pretest and the two spring benchmark parallel forms of the kindergarten NLM were administered for posttest.

To administer the pretests and posttests, the research assistants followed the script included in the NLM administration instructions. They read the model story and then asked the child to retell the story while only providing neutral prompts. The children’s retells were recorded with digital audio recorders to ensure accuracy and consistency with scoring. In accordance with the NLM scoring rubric the narrative retells were scored using the NLM scoring procedures. Following the scoring rubric, participants received sub-scores from 0-2 depending on which story elements were included in their retell. Story grammar elements and language complexity were analyzed and scored in the NLM. Language complexity includes features such as the use of temporal coordinating conjunctions (then), causal subordinating conjunctions (because), and temporal subordinating conjunctions (after & when). These language complexity features were scored for their frequency. All the sub-scores were combined to acquire a total NLM score. Individual administration of the three stories took approximately 3-5 minutes and scoring took another 4-5 minutes for each participant. Preliminary psychometric analyses indicate that the NLM has excellent reliability and validity (Petersen & Spencer, 2012).

**Personal Story Generation**

The participants were individually prompted to elicit personal stories by being asked if they had ever had a similar experience to the story that was just modeled in the narrative retell. These personal stories were then audio recorded. The personal stories were later scored using the
NLM Flow Chart Scoring for the personal story also included sub-scores for both story grammar and language complexity. Elements of story grammar (e.g., the characters, problem, solution) were given a total score of 0-4 points. Different aspects of language complexity were also given a total score between 0-4. The total scores (each between 0-4) were summed together for a total personal story generation score between 0-8.

**Interventionists and Fidelity of Intervention**

Classroom teachers were the main interventionalists in this study. Each classroom teacher was trained in dialogic book reading using the Spencer et al. (2012) procedures which served as a framework for providing embedded explicit vocabulary instruction during shared book reading. During the intervention phase, which lasted 14 weeks, each classroom teacher was observed 5 times by an SLP researcher. While the classroom teacher was administering the dialogic book reading intervention, the SLP completed a dialogic reading fidelity checklist from Goldstein et al. (2016). The SLP then gave the classroom teacher personalized feedback based off their observations with the fidelity checklist. The average fidelity of intervention implementation was 97.8% with a range of 91% to 100%

**Test Administration Fidelity and Scoring Reliability**

All participating kindergarten classroom teachers and speech-language pathologists observing the treatment conditions underwent a three-hour training on how to both administer and score the NLM. Those scoring the exams were instructed to follow the scoring guidelines as outlined on the NLM including the guideline to score the retells in real time. The recorded audios of the kindergarten participants were used by a research team comprised of undergraduate and graduate speech language pathology students who randomly selected 30% of narrative retell pretest and posttest measures to rescore in order to ensure accuracy and fidelity. Although the
scores were based off the recording, they were instructed to score in real time in accordance with NLM administration guidelines. Percent agreement was calculated by taking the number of agreements and dividing by the number of agreements plus the number of disagreements. The resulting number was multiplied by 100. The mean agreement was 96.4% (range 64%-100% for the NLM retell.

The research team, comprised of undergraduate and graduate speech language pathology students, was comprehensively trained on how to score the personal story generations. These research assistants were asked to read the NLM subtest section of the CUBED manual and were given extensive training on how to use the NLM flowchart to score the personal stories. Research assistants were only allowed to score if they were able to get a 90% agreement across the scores they gave for personal story generations using the NLM flowchart. Again, independent research assistants who were also thoroughly trained on the NLM section of the CUBED handbook and the NLM flowchart rescored 30% of the personal story pretests and posttests based off the audio recordings to ensure scoring and administration fidelity. The mean agreement of the personal stories was 93% and ranged from 74%-100%.

A comprehensive fidelity of test administration examination was conducted for both measures of oral language from both the pretest and posttest data. The fidelity examination included 30% of all administered measures of oral language (narrative retell and personal story generation) from both the pretest and the posttest. An independent research assistant went through all the selected measures by listening to the audio recording and completing an extensive administration checklist for both of the measures. The administration checklist laid out all required steps for accurate and comprehensive administration of that particular assessment tool. The percentage of accurate steps completed was calculated for each selected sample. The overall
mean fidelity of test administration for the NLM retells and personal stories was 96.5% (range 88%-100%).

**Results**

In order to examine the extent to which dialogic reading improved the oral narrative retelling and personal story generation of kindergarten students in a treatment group compared to a control group (question 1), we conducted an ANCOVA and an independent sample t-test.

**Pretest Comparisons and Assumptions**

Two independent samples t-tests were conducted to examine if the two dependent variables (narrative retells and personal stories) were significantly different at pretest. The means and standard deviations for the pretest are found in Table 1. Results indicated that the narrative retell outcome was not significantly different between groups at pretest, \( p = .40 \). However, the personal story outcome was significantly different, \( p = .04 \). Because there was a significant difference in one of the outcomes at pretest, we conducted an analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) to examine whether there were significant differences between groups at posttest across the two outcome measures. Assumptions necessary to conduct an ANCOVA were examined and were met, which indicates that the covariate as an equal regression coefficient across both groups. Levene’s test of equality of error variances was not significant for posttest narrative retell, \( p = .72 \) and for personal stories, \( p = .12 \). Homogeneity of regression assumption was also examined for the narrative retell pretest and personal story pretest covariates, and results indicated that the interaction was significant for the narrative retell covariate, \( p = .01 \), not meeting the assumptions of an ANCOVA. Yet for the personal story covariate, the assumption of homogeneity of regression was met, \( p = .38 \). Because the pretest narrative retell scores were not significantly different between the treatment and control groups, and because the homogeneity of regression
assumption was not met, we conducted an independent samples t-test for the posttest narrative retell outcome. However, because the pretest personal stories were significantly different between groups, and because the assumptions of an ANCOVA were met, we conducted an ANCOVA for the posttest personal stories using the pretest personal stories as the covariate.

**Table 1**

*Pretest Means and Standard Deviations Across Conditions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shared Storybook</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative Retell</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>11.03</td>
<td>6.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Story Generation</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>17.23*</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *p* < .05; Narrative Retell = CUBED Narrative Language Measures: Retell; *N*=Sample Size; *M* = mean; *SD* = standard deviation.

**Posttest Narrative Retell Outcome**

The means and standard deviations for the post-intervention scores are found in Table 2. An independent samples t-test indicated that there was no significant difference between the treatment and the control group at posttest for the narrative retell outcome, *t* = .45, *p* = .33.

**Personal Story Outcome**

The result of the ANCOVA indicated that there was a significant difference for the posttest personal story between the students in the dialogic reading treatment group compared to the students in the control group, even after controlling for pretest personal story performance *F*(1,78) = 6.93, *p* = .01, partial eta squared = .08 (8% of the variance).
Table 2

Post-Intervention Unadjusted and Adjusted Means and Standard Deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unadjusted</th>
<th></th>
<th>Adjusted</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shared Storybook</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Shared Storybook</td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative Retell</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>9.79</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Story</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>19.47</td>
<td>7.55</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p < .05; Narrative Retell = CUBED Narrative Language Measures: Retell; N=Sample Size; M = mean; SD = standard deviation.

In order to examine whether CLD children responded differently than the monolingual Caucasian students, we followed the same analysis procedures applied to the entire sample, to just the students who were considered CLD. Pretest analyses indicated that for the narrative retell, CLD students in the treatment group (n = 17; M = 10.41; SD = 6.94) did not perform differently than CLD students in the control group (n = 13; M = 9.77; SD = 6.35), p = .40. For personal stories at pretest, there were no significant differences between the CLD students in the treatment group (n = 11; M = 16.09; SD = 9.67) and the CLD students in the control group (n = 10; M = 14.90; SD = 10.38), p = .39. Because there were no significant differences at pretest for both outcome measures, we conducted independent samples t-tests to examine whether there were significant differences between the groups at posttest.

**Narrative Retell Posttest: Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students**

An independent samples t-test for the narrative retell posttest outcome was not significant, t = -.09, p = .46. The treatment group mean was 10.41 (SD = 5.06), the control group mean was 10.23 (SD = 4.92).
Personal Stories Posttest: Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students

An independent samples t-test for the personal story posttest outcome was significant, $t = -2.97$, $p = .004$. The treatment group mean was 18.89 (SD = 7.29), the control group mean was 9.36 (SD = 7.02).

Discussion

By the time students reach the fourth grade, a large percentage are not reading as expected (NAEP, 2019). When students read below grade level, they begin to fall behind in academic curriculum. This gap in performance and expectations is particularly detrimental to CLD students who often do not get the academic support that they need. These CLD students are left to fall further and further behind or are overrepresented in special education services with lowered expectations (Becker & Deris, 2019). Current research indicates that early oral language development in kindergarten can augment later reading comprehension and subsequent academic success in later elementary school (Thompson, 2017). The aim of this study was to determine if dialogic reading was an effective way to increase oral language skills as measured by personal story generation and narrative retells in kindergarten students. A second aim of this study was to obtain preliminary data to determine if dialogic reading was an effective method of increasing oral language skills in CLD kindergarten students. The results of this study revealed that dialogic reading did not influence the narrative retell scores of the participants as there was not a significant difference between the control group and the treatment group. However, the results revealed that dialogic reading did have an effect on personal story generation as there was a significant difference between the control group and the treatment group. The results analyzed with CLD students showed a similar trend.
Narrative Retell

To our knowledge, this is the first study to examine the effect of dialogic reading on narrative language skills. The majority of previously conducted dialogic reading studies were designed to determine how dialogic reading affected expressive vocabulary in young students. While this current study reveals preliminary data on how dialogic reading affects narrative retell in kindergarten students, more research needs to be conducted in order to reveal a more comprehensive understanding of that relationship. This lack of significant difference between the control group and the treatment group may be related to the skills emphasized during the dialogic reading intervention. As children were read the stories, they were asked to define the vocabulary and use the target vocabulary in familiar contexts (Spencer et al., 2012). The children were not asked to identify parts of the story or engage in learning the story grammar. They also did not retell or recall parts of the story. Current literature has shown that explicit instruction on story grammar does augment narrative retell (Green & Klecan-Aker, 2012). This is not to suggest that dialogic reading could not impact narrative retell skills. Students who participate in dialogic reading instruction must listen to stories repeatedly. This repeated exposure could influence narrative retelling. Future research should continue to examine this possibility by increasing the number of intervention sessions and duration of the intervention over time.

The CLD students included in this study also did not exhibit an increase in their narrative retell skills. There is a deficit of research on dialogic reading and narrative retell outcomes with CLD students. Because this was a pilot study to examine the effects of dialogic reading on CLD students, there were not many participants in the CLD portion of this study. There were 30 CLD kindergarten students total included in this study: 17 in the treatment group and 13 in the control group. It is possible that the CLD students in the treatment group did not show a significant
increase in their narrative retell skills because the dialogic reading intervention may not have been culturally responsive or appropriate. For example, Kleeck (1994) explained that mainstream Western culture favors dyadic interactions with young children as including face-to-face communication. However, many cultures favor multiparty interactions where the child is held by the caregiver facing outward. The caregiver then would help the child initiate and maintain interactions with a third party which is different than a dialogic reading interaction. Furthermore, Western children are encouraged to initiate conversations with adults, however in other cultures this is uncommon, and children are only encouraged to speak when they are addressed (Kleeck, 1994). More research needs to be conducted to determine how to ensure that dialogic reading practices are culturally responsive and how this effects the narrative language outcomes for CLD students. This study provides preliminary data regarding how narrative retell skills are affected by dialogic reading treatment in CLD students, but a larger study with more participants is needed to draw more definitive conclusions.

**Personal Story Generation**

The current study revealed that dialogic reading did have a significant effect on the personal story generation of kindergarten students and the CLD students included in this study. The students who participated in dialogic reading scored significantly higher on the personal story generation task than the students in the control group. These results show a significant difference even when the posttest scores were leveled using an ANCOVA with the pretest scores as the covariate.

This current study gives evidence and specificity to the meta-analysis conducted by Roberts by revealing that dialogic reading does specifically increase the personal story generation skills of kindergarten students (Roberts et al., 2019).
which aspects of language can be improved through dialogic reading. These results are also
aligned with the current literature regarding dialogic reading with CLD students, which indicates
that dialogic reading can help CLD students augment expressive language skills in all their
spoken languages.

A possible reason why the students in this study improved their personal story generation
was because the dialogic reading framework encouraged making personal connections. This
framework was heavily based off the procedures designed by Spencer et al. (2012). This
framework includes selecting vocabulary words that will be unfamiliar but useful academically
to the students. The instructor then defines these target words once they are found in the story in
a child-friendly way. The children were then encouraged to relate the word to their own lives and
use it in familiar contexts to them. Relating the target vocabulary words to their own contexts
and experiences may have augmented the students’ ability to generate more academic personal
stories based on their own personal experiences.

Clinical Impressions

The study has revealed that dialogic reading with kindergarten students produced a
significant increase in their personal story generation when compared with a control group. CLD
students included in the research showed a similar result. This finding has implications for the
academic success of young students as oral language skills are highly related to later reading
comprehension skills in fourth grade (Thompson, 2017). This indicates that dialogic reading
implemented at kindergarten could be a factor in facilitating academic success in the later
elementary school years. Furthermore, this finding is especially relevant for CLD students who
are often overrepresented in special education classes (Becker & Deris, 2019) as dialogic reading
increased their oral language scores as well. This has practical implications as dialogic reading
could augment CLD students’ oral language and subsequently could increase their academic performance. Group dialogic reading in kindergarten classrooms may be an effective treatment that could help prepare students for reading comprehension demands in the fourth grade.

**Limitations**

While this study used valid and reliable methods of assessment and scoring, implemented evidence-based treatment methods of dialogic reading, and had a strong experimental design, there are some limitations. Primarily, due to the lack of research regarding dialogic reading and narrative oral language outcomes, this study utilized techniques of dialogic reading created to augment vocabulary acquisition. This is because most dialogic reading studies have focused on vocabulary. These dialogic reading guidelines (Spencer et al., 2012) have been used in several research projects as an evidence-based practice to embed explicit vocabulary into authentic dialogic reading. While these studies have shown that dialogic reading augments vocabulary growth in young children, they have not determined if dialogic reading would affect oral narrative retell and personal story generation. As explicit instruction in story grammar has been shown to increase narrative retell and personal story generation (Green & Klecan-Aker, 2012), future studies should examine how a dialogic reading program could include story grammar instruction and how this treatment method could affect narrative retell skills. Also, we did not specifically measure vocabulary, which may have underrepresented the impact that dialogic reading had on oral language.

A second issue involves the quasi-experimental design of the study. Groups were randomly assigned at the classroom/teacher level using already assigned and established classrooms. Students were assigned to a classroom and teacher by school administration, meaning that it was not random at the individual child level. Each classroom had a teacher as the
interventionalist. Although each teacher was trained to provide the information in a similar way, and a fidelity checklist was completed for the interventions, it is possible that different teachers could have achieved different results based on a variety of factors including personality, rapport, and other unaccounted for classroom routines.

A third limitation of this study is that only 30 CLD students were included in this study. As one of the main research questions was to determine whether dialogic reading intervention would lead to an increase in oral language skills in CLD students, a larger sample size would have been more beneficial. Future research should conduct a similar study with more CLD students and culturally responsive material.

**Implications for Future Research**

The current study was designed to primarily determine if classroom integrated dialogic reading would affect the oral language skills as measured by narrative retell and personal story generation in kindergarten students. A secondary aim of the study was to determine if dialogic reading practices would also augment the oral language skills of CLD students. Results indicated that students in the control group and the treatment group (including CLD students) showed no significant difference in their narrative retell scores after the intervention. However, students (including CLD students) in the treatment group demonstrated significant improvement in their personal story generations when compared with the control group after dialogic reading intervention. This study has practical implications for kindergarten education, as dialogic reading could augment students’ oral language skills and could subsequently increase their academic performance. Group dialogic reading in kindergarten classrooms may be an effective treatment that could help prepare kids for reading comprehension demands in the fourth grade.
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APPENDIX A

Fidelity Checklist

Embedded Vocabulary Intervention

General Procedures
Read aloud to your class from a children’s storybook for approximately 20 minutes, twice a week. Embed the explicit vocabulary instruction into storybook reading.

Before the Story: Preparation
1. Select an interesting book from within your classroom storybook collection or at the library.
2. Read through the book, searching for 2-3 target vocabulary words to teach your students.
   * Select words that are useful to the students and their meanings are supported by context or illustrations.
   * Words should be unfamiliar to the children, have high utility, occur frequently in books, and encountered in conversations.
3. Complete the Embedded Lesson Bookmark and use it as a guide during the lesson.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>During the Story: Explicit Instruction</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Connect the vocabulary word to the content of the story.</td>
<td>Look at the pictures of Elie. Elie is enormous! (Picture of Elie Elephant climbing on the bus, bus is lifting.) She is really big. She is almost too big for the bus!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Give opportunities to repeat and produce the word.</td>
<td>Let’s see. Can you think of something that is enormous? What about... a school bus? I mountai... Or a building? Those things are really big.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Say the word and ask the children to repeat the word. Say the definition and ask the children to produce the word in response to the definition.</td>
<td>Now, pretend you are going to give Elie a hug. Remember, she is enormous, so make your arms really big. Whew!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Make connections between the word and the children’s lives.</td>
<td>Tell me, what does enormous mean? Really big. That’s right!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give examples that provide information about the meaning of the word by relating to the child’s everyday experiences. Use the same language as the definition.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Provide an activity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give the children an opportunity to complete an activity (pantomime, etc.) related to the word and its meaning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ask children to provide the definition of the word.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide children with the word and ask children to answer with the definition. Model the correct definition.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After the Story: Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Review words and definitions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review the vocabulary word and definition. Remind children of the story context and include an opportunity for them to say the words and the definitions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have children answer questions or list examples that relate to the word. Provide opportunities for children to say the word. Include nonexamples.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

Pretest CUBED Narrative Language Measures

Examining says, "I'm going to tell you a story. Please listen carefully. When I'm done, you are going to tell me the same story. Are you ready?" Examiner reads the story word for word at a moderate pace with normal inflection.

Yesterday, Holly and her friend clambered onto the bus. They quickly went up the steps because the bus was about to leave. Holly's friend sat in the seat that was by the window. But Holly didn't want her to sit there because it was her favorite seat. She was mad. Her friend was in her usual window seat. Holly decided to politely talk to her. Then she said, "Excuse me. Will you please move? I typically sit there." Then her friend said, "Okay. No problem. You can sit by the window." After her friend moved, Holly sat adjacent to the window. When Holly sat down, she was happy because she could see out the window.

Examining says, "Thanks for listening. Now you tell me that story." After student appears to be done, examiner says, "Are you finished?" Prompt: (up to 5x), "It's OK. Just do your best," and/or "I can't help, but you can just tell the parts you remember."

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STORIES GRAMMAR (SG)</th>
<th>2 POINTS</th>
<th>1 POINT</th>
<th>LANGUAGE COMPLEXITY (LC)</th>
<th>EPISODES (E)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Character</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>a girl / the girl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>2 [I]</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>go through the bus</td>
<td>too</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>could sit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>didn't like it / cried</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>planned / decided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempt</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>asked for help</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequence</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>she helped</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>did it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End feeling</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>happy / relaxed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STORY QUESTIONS (SQ)</th>
<th>1x</th>
<th>VOCABULARY QUESTIONS (VQ)</th>
<th>1x</th>
<th>SPELLING (S)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who was this story about?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Q: they clambered onto the bus because it was about to leave. What does clamber mean?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where was Holly in the beginning of the story?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Q: does clamber mean to fall down or scramble?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why was Holly mad?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Q: Holly's friend was in Holly's seat. What does typically mean?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What did the story mean?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Q: Does typically mean usually or never?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did the story end?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Q: Holly sat adjacent to the window. What does adjacent mean?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONAL GENERATION</th>
<th>2x</th>
<th>STORY QUESTIONS TOTAL (SQ)</th>
<th>1x</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turn on audio recorder. Examiner says, &quot;In this story, someone was sitting in Holly's seat. Tell me a story about a time when someone was in your seat.&quot; If the student doesn't tell a story, encourage the student (up to 3x) to produce a thematically related story. Score the story using the NLM Now Chart (see Examiner's Manual for details).</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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NLM Flow Chart Used for Scoring the Personal Story Generations
APPENDIX D
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https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.86.2.235

Arnold et al. investigated the effects of videotaped dialogic reading training to traditional direct teaching methods. 64 mother-child dyads with children ranging in age from 24-34 months participated in the study. The families were middle to upper SES with the mothers having an average of 15.0 years of education. The mother-child dyads were divided into three groups: (a) video training condition, (b) direct training condition, and (c) control. The child participants were pretested using the Reynell and the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Revised. All groups were provided with audiotapes and asked to record at least four reading sessions per week. The videotape group received two segments of training. The first segment was 20 minutes long and the second was 15 minutes long. The didactic instruction and modeling/examples were highlighted with true mother-child dyads in the videotaped format. Treatment lasted for four weeks, at the conclusion children’s language skills were re-evaluated using the EOWPVT, the Verbal Expression subtest of the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities (ITPA), and the grammatical closure subtest of the ITPA. The direct teaching group performed better than the control group, and the videotaped group performed better than the direct teaching group. *Relevance to Current Study:* The abovementioned study investigated dialogic
reading with mother-child dyads with preschool aged children; similar demographics as the current study.


This study was designed to identify the role that staff member’s efficacy played in determining if ELL students in the public-school systems had language differences or language disorders. The researchers recognized that ELLs are overrepresented in the special education courses as there were not sufficient or adequate programs and resources to help facilitate success for ELL students. Professionals were placing ELL students into special education classes by default. This study surveyed 18 child study team members who work with large Hispanic ELL populations. Overwhelmingly, the staff members related that they did not feel competent when making decisions regarding ELL students and whether they had a disability or a disorder and would often place the child into special education classes when they were unsure of the child’s ability. As many school staff are not properly or formally trained in ELL assessment, many students spend years of their educational careers in unnecessary special education courses. This article is relevant to my research study as it underscores the challenges faced by ELL students. Many are not receiving the services that they need and as a result are in unneeded special education courses and taken out of the mainstream classroom. *Relevance to Current Study: CLD populations in the school have unique language needs. A dialogic reading program tailored to their linguistic and cultural backgrounds could be another effectual resource to aid in the language development of CLD students.*

The researchers recruited 30 children from grades 2, 4, and 6 for a longitudinal study and these children were followed for two years each until grades 3, 5, and 7. The study was created to examine reading comprehension and low-income status. Low-income status was determined by the child’s eligibility for a free-lunch program. At the start of the study each participant was administered several tests of language and reading. Preliminary results showed that low-income children read at the same level as their average income peers until the fourth grade which was reported as the “fourth-grade slump.” The researchers examined these results and determined that the words encountered in fourth grade reading were less familiar. The children’s language was enough for academic demands for school before the third grade but in the fourth grade their language skills were not adequate for the new academic demands. The researchers assert that more complex and academic oral language would have helped these students achieve more academically. **Relevance to Current Study:** This study was created to determine an effective methodology to augment young children’s oral language in order to facilitate higher levels of reading comprehension and subsequent academic success in the later elementary school years. This study gives evidence that strong academic oral language schools early in life can be an effective treatment method to overcome the “fourth grade slump” and be successful academically in the later elementary school years.


https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9817.2009.01414.x

Chow et al. (2010) investigated the effects of dialogic parent-child reading (in English) on 51 Hong Kong kindergartners learning English as a second language. The study was conducted to determine how the dialogic reading in English affected the child’s English and Cantonese skills to better examine the relationship between first and second language development in young children. Three participant groups were created, a dialogic reading group, a typical reading group, and a control group. The children were both pre- and post-tested using English word reading (from Hong Kong textbooks), English receptive language with the PPVT-III, English phonological awareness, Chinese character recognition, Cantonese receptive vocabulary test, and Chinese phonological awareness. A one-hour training was given to the dialogic reading group. The parents were trained on using the PEER technique and were provided with twelve English storybooks to use throughout the training. Parents were to read twice a week for 20-minutes at a time for twelve weeks. Intra-group gains in the dialogic reading group indicated that the dialogic reading had improved English word reading and augmented the child’s English and Chinese phonological awareness. *Relevance to Current Study*: The current research emphasized working with CLD children. Furthermore, the abovementioned research indicates that dialogic reading in one language may facilitate greater phonological awareness in another meaning this research will benefit the families by augmenting the child’s home and second languages.

The researchers designed this project in order to determine if active shared storybook reading had a positive effect on the vocabulary acquisition of kindergarten students. The researchers created an experimental design with 66 kindergarten students. The participants were randomly assigned to an active or passive storybook reading conditions. All participants were administered the Senechal Vocabulary Test-Adaptive (SVT-A) for targeted word knowledge. The active storybook group actively participated in storybook reading while answering a question directly after each sentence that contained one of the selected target words. The passive participants listened to the story book without actively engaging with the text or the target vocabulary words. The study revealed that active participants acquired significantly more vocabulary words than the passive participants.

*Relevance to Current Study*: The current study aims to embed explicit vocabulary instruction into shared story book reading. This study by Ewers and Brownson provides a framework on how to embed vocabulary words into shared book reading in a similar pattern adopted by this study. Additionally, this study reveals that embedding vocabulary instruction leads to enhanced vocabulary acquisition. This study seeks to add on to the Ewers and Brownson study by researching if embedded instruction aids overall oral academic language skills.

Green et al. conducted a pilot study to evaluate an intervention program designed to increase the oral narrative intervention program with 24 students from a university laboratory for children with language learning disabilities. Children were ages 6-9. Oral narratives were administered before and after the intervention and all narratives were recorded. Students were prompted on personal narrative production by being read a narrative. They were then told “I am going to tell you a story. Listen to me carefully so that you will know what a story is. Then I’m going to ask you to look at a different picture and make up a story of your own. Are you ready?”. Each story was then divided into T-units. Treatment was given in the laboratory classrooms and was given for 13 weeks. The intervention consisted of small group sessions (8 students) that were 30 minutes long biweekly. Three graduate students conducted the intervention and were supervised by the authors of the research. The first six sessions focused on teaching initiating event, action, and consequence of the story. The next six session included review and implementation of these ideas with fill in the blank activities. The next four session focused on feelings and character emotions. The final sessions focused on establishing a setting. The results revealed preliminary data that gives evidence to the idea that story grammar treatment can have a measurable effect on the students’ personal narrative production. 

Relevance to Current Study: This study seeks to promote oral academic language skills through dialogic reading. While examining the limitations of this study, it was determined that explicit instruction on story grammar leads to augmented oral language skills. A dialogic reading program that incorporates some of these elements may lead to increased narrative skills in future research.

https://doi.org/10.1044/2015_JSLHR-L-15-0227

The researchers designed a study around storybook reading that included embedded vocabulary instruction and comprehension skills. The study recruited 195 preschool students who were at risk for language and reading comprehension abilities from 32 different classrooms. Each classroom was randomly assigned to the experimental or control conditions. Those in the treatment (experimental group) were administered prerecorded stories three times a week over the course of the academic school year. These prerecorded stories included embedded vocabulary and comprehension lessons. Those in the control group were administered the recorded stories without the embedded lessons. The preschoolers in the experimental group demonstrated a significant increase in vocabulary knowledge and both groups developed the same in comprehension skills.

*Relevance to Current Study:* This study is to the best of our knowledge one of the first dialogic reading studies to exam oral language outcomes. This study confirms that dialogic reading does improve vocabulary skills, but this study aims to determine if dialogic reading will also improve oral language skills. Furthermore, this study provided a framework for the fidelity checklist that was utilized by this study to ensure that the intervention was being employed in the same manner across the experimental classrooms.

The purpose of this article is to examine who mainstream north American culture influences the type of intervention used in parent training programs and the inherit bias that this training/treatment carried when it is employed with those of various CLD populations. Primarily, different cultures have dıffıdent views on who is the primary caregiver, in the United States, it is typically the parents but in other cultures it may be older siblings. Furthermore, mainstream Western culture favors dyadic interactions with young children including face to face interactions. However, many cultures including Mexican Americans, favor multiparty interactions where the child is held by the caregiver facing outward. The caregiver then would help the child initiate and maintain interactions with a third party. Various cultures have different views on the value of talk as well. Western parents encourage their children to talk as much as possible, but many other cultures value quietness in children and view silence as a sign of intelligence. When initiation conversations, Western children are encouraged to initiate conversations with adults; however, in some other cultures this is uncommon, and children are only encouraged to speak when they are addressed. Western culture has also influenced the concept of intentionality in early intervention techniques. Western parents may engage in expansion and extensions to increase a child’s utterance. However, some people from other cultures believe that they cannot know or assume what another thinks or feels and will not expand on a child’s utterance. The researchers conclude that language use is a cultural phenomenon used to both reflect and transmit cultural values and beliefs. The
authors argue that SLPs in the field should get to know the values of each family with whom they interact and build a treatment plan that best reflects those unique values.

Relevance to Current Study: This study will be implementing a dialogic reading program that was created for Caucasian middle-class families and it will be important to know the implicit cultural bias’s that accompany this program and how to best make this program work for the CLD populations who will be participating.


Maclellan designed this article as an analysis of what it means to “read to learn” in higher education. He relates that reading to learn is a central facet of learning in higher education but asserts that this may be problematic for many students who do not have adequate reading abilities to keep up with the demands of the academic curriculum of higher living. The researcher explains that reading to learn is essentially learning from expository text. He relates that it has been determined that many students in higher education are not proficient readers. Maclellan relates that if students are unable to learn from their reading, they will have difficulty academically. He mentions that part of this problem is that students may not have a lot of experience with academic expository texts. The researcher concludes that this difficulty of “reading to learn” can be addressed by teachers. He relates that teachers can help students learn how to summarize texts and introduce academic language in order to summarize and talk about read texts. Relevance to Current Study: Maclellan’s study has given evidence to the current study regarding how students “read to learn” for higher academic learning. This reveals that reading comprehension is highly relevant and related to academic success in the later school
years and facilitating reading comprehension through oral language is highly beneficial for later academic success.


Manz et al. (2010) conducted a descriptive review of 31 articles regarding parental intervention to children between the ages of 2-6. A meta-analysis was conducted with 14 of these articles. The purpose of these reviews was to investigate how the current data regarding to parent-child book reading applies to CLD children and to low-income children. The review was not focused on a singular intervention strategy, however the studies centered around parent-child storybook reading. Ten of the included meta-analysis studies focused specifically on dialogic reading. The descriptive review revealed that participant characteristics and demographics were often neglected in the description of samples and in the data analysis. Ethnicity and native language were not reported in half of the 31 studies. If reported, ethnic groups and English Language Learners were underrepresented. Latino children were often not included. The authors described an “imperative need” to establish external validity for family-based literacy intervention in diverse families. Additionally, the meta-analysis showed that Caucasian families had a large effect size with treatment. However, minority families showed a negligible effect size with treatment. *Relevance to Current Study:* Not only does this study underscore the gaps in research with CLD populations but it reveals that minority families often
exhibited a smaller effect size in treatment when compared to their Caucasian peers. Furthermore the authors indicate that external validity needs to be established for literacy programs with CLD families, this study aims to accomplish that goal.


The researchers designed this project to determine if oral language (as measured by lexical, syntactic, fluency, and discourse measures in a narrative generation) predict reading achievement in bilingual children. The researchers in this study recruited more than 1,500 participants which were Spanish-English bilingual students who were attending grades kindergarten through third. At the start of the study oral narratives were collected in both Spanish and English for each participant along with measures of passage comprehension and word reading efficiency. The results were aligned with what other similar research projects have revealed, that oral language skills predict and have a positive effect on reading comprehension skills. However, this study revealed that oral language skills in one language have cross-language implications for reading comprehension as well. The study revealed that oral language skills in Spanish would predict reading skills in Spanish and that oral language skills in English predict reading skills in English. Additionally, the study revealed that oral language skills in English predicted reading skills in Spanish and oral language skills in Spanish predicted reading skills in English. *Relevance to Current Study:* The current study includes CLD students some of whom speak more than one language. This article provides evidence that oral language skills in one language are beneficial to reading skills in all of the child’s known
language. This article provides evidence that augmenting English oral language skills may be beneficial to the participant’s English reading skills and their reading skills in other known languages.


Mol et al. performed a meta-analysis of 16 studies conducted from 1988-2007 regarding the effect of parent-child dialogic reading on subsequent vocabulary development. 626 parent-child dyads of various SES backgrounds were examined with children ages 2-6 being represented. The researchers hypothesized that dialogic reading would (a) augment the effects of typical book reading, (b) affect expressive language skills more than receptive, (c) be more successful with younger children, and (d) would be more effective for affluent children from higher SES backgrounds. Dialogic reading was defined “according to the following three principles: (a) the use of evocative techniques by the parent that encourage the child to talk about pictured materials; (b) informative feedback by incorporating expansions, corrective modeling, and other forms that highlight differences between what the child has said and what he might have said; and (c) an adaptive parent sensitive to the child’s developing abilities” (Mol et al., 2008, p. 8). The 16 examined studies were similar as they all included parent training, typically developing children, and evaluated the outcome variables as changes in expressive or receptive vocabulary. Expressive and Receptive vocabulary were measured through the Expressive One-Word Picture Vocabulary Test, The Expressive Vocabulary Subtest of the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities, mean and/or total length of utterances of
the child during videotaped reading sessions, Peabody Picture Vocabulary test, and the
Bracken Basic Concept Scale. The meta-analysis demonstrates a $r=.29$ correlation
between dialogic reading and expressive vocabulary development. Additionally, evidence
supported the hypothesis that these techniques would better benefit younger learners (2-
3-year-old’s benefited the most). Furthermore, at risk groups benefit less than other
groups. Researchers recommended that when working with at-risk or CLD populations
intervention standardized on affluent or middle-class white populations may not be
appropriate for these clients. Relevance to Current Study: This relates to the research as it
delineates which age demographics would best benefit from this program and how to
seek out intervention programs specifically for CLD populations. Furthermore, it
highlights the gaps in research with CLD populations and proposes that current parent
training programs may not be culturally appropriate for CLD populations.

screening, progress monitoring, and intervention planning. Perspectives on Language
Learning and Education, 19(4), 119-129. https://doi.org/10.1044/lle19.4.119

This research article was designed to present a novel language assessment tool, the
narrative language measures (NLM). The NLM was created as a language tool to assesses
language, monitor progress, and serve as a guide for future interventions. This article was
created to delineate the components of the NLM and explicate the uses and intent behind
the creation of the NLM. The NLM has several forms and assessment tools for different
grade levels and aspects of oral spoken language. The NLM was designed to be aligned
with authentic and socially relevant language use as well as being economical and time
efficient. The NLM includes standardized administration and scoring procedures as well
as adequate psychometric properties. The NLM has been proven to detect language growth over time which makes it an effective tool for progress monitoring. Relevance to Current Study: The NLM was selected to determine oral narrative retell scores for the students in this study. This tool was selected as it has standardized procedures to ensure continuity and fidelity across administration as well as the tools ability to detect changes in language growth.


The researchers designed this project to determine the effects of a multitiered system of language support (Story Champs) on the oral and written language of kindergarten students as measured by narrative retelling, personal stories, writing, and expository language. 686 kindergarten students were recruited from four school districts and twenty-eight classrooms were randomly assigned to either the treatment or the control groups. The treatment group was administered 14 weeks of multitiered language intervention through story champs. The treatment group showed significant gains across all measured outcomes. Relevance to Current Study: This research revealed insights to the NLM and how it is scored and administered. The study demonstrated a similar framework and demographics of students and how students were placed into treatment or control groups.

Roberts et al. (2019) conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis of 76 studies to examine the association of parent training with language and communication outcomes in young children. The study involved randomized and nonrandomized trials where parents were instructed on how to use specific strategies (including dialogic reading) to augment their child’s language development. All included studies had a control group which did not receive experimental intervention. All studies included had a mean age of younger than six. Findings indicated overall positive associations of parent trainings with child language outcomes and parental use of support strategies. Additionally, across all parent training studies, children with language impairments were highly represented. Children with or at risk for language disorders benefited as a result of parent training as well. Roberts et al. (2019) conclude that more research needs to be done across various cultural and linguistic groups. Additionally, only half of the studies reported outcomes as a result of the study. The researchers argue that future research should look to study the association between parent training and parental use of language support strategies.

*Relevance to Current Study:* The systematic review reveals that parent trainings do have a positive association with child language outcomes. However, there is a gap in the research with CLD populations as they are significantly underrepresented in the data. This study aims to address the gap in the research and determine effectiveness of parent training programs with CLD populations.

https://doi.org/10.1177/1525740108320353
This study used a single-subject, multiple-baseline-across-subjects design to determine the effects of a parent-training program on the communication of two participating Latino parents and their children using AAC during storybook reading. The researchers acknowledged the gap in research as few studies have been conducted with AAC and CLD populations. However, they mentioned that this is concerning because it is estimated that by the year 2050, 40% of school-aged children in the United States will come from homes where English is not the first language. Both parents reached the established criterion for implementing the storybook reading strategies. Furthermore, they demonstrated maintained strategy use. In addition, both children showed significant increases in communicative turns taken and novel semantic concepts expressed.

*Relevance to Current Study:* This research indicates that parent-training programs in communicative book reading is effective with Latino families which gives evidence that a dialogic reading program could be effective with CLD populations as well.


The researchers created this study to determine the relationship between oral language and early reading development. For this study, the researchers recruited 39 kindergarten students. They administered a broad range of oral language measures in metalinguistics, structural language, and narrative discourse. They also measured reading ability through word recognition, pseudoword reading, and passage comprehension. They administered these measures again in the first and second grades. The researchers then completed a regression analysis to identify parsimonious models to explain natural variance in early
childhood reading. The study revealed that early semantic abilities which were defined by oral definitions and word retrieval were the main predictor of second grade reading ability not phonemic awareness. Phonemic awareness was the main predictor of single-word reading but oral language skills was the main predictor in reading comprehension. The researchers conclude by relating the importance of oral language skills to later reading comprehension by the second grade. *Relevance to Current Study:* This study was created as the current literature has revealed that early childhood oral language skills are predictive of reading skills later in academia. This is why this study aims to augment oral language skills in young children as it has a positive effect on the child’s later reading comprehension ability and academic success.


The researchers delineate an extensive framework for dialogic book reading procedures that embed explicit vocabulary instruction. First, the interventionalist will select target vocabulary words from the reading. This may be just 2-3 words depending on the age of the student and should be unfamiliar to the student. The words should be relevant to understanding the context of the story and if possible, relate to classroom activities or academic goals. The word should also be teachable, in that it has a meaning that can easily be taught and understood depending on the age of the listener. Once the words are selected, interventionists should design an explicit instruction that can be utilized during the book reading and will last for about three minutes. The explicit instruction will include a child-friendly definition and instruction on how it relates to the context to the
book. Instruction will also include opportunities for the child to say the word and
definition and opportunities to make a connection between the word and everyday
experiences. A gesture may also be assigned to a target word. This explicit instruction
should also include a framework which allows the child to use the word in a variety of
contexts. Once the story is over, the target words will be reviewed. This review includes
repeating the words and definition and possibly looking at pictures in the book to talk
about the words. The target words would then be added to a “word wall” and used in the
teacher’s future classroom instruction. Relevance to Current Study: The experimental
group in the current study underwent shared book reading with embedded vocabulary
instruction based heavily off of the framework by Spencer, Goldstein, and Kaminski.
This framework gave structure to the study which allowed the intervention to be
performed the same way in each classroom.

Thompson, R. K. (2017). The role of oral language in kindergarten students’ comprehension
[Doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina]. University of South Carolina
Scholar Commons.
https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=5146&context=etd.
Thompson conducted a qualitative research study in which she examined two classes of
kindergarten students in a title one school in the southern part of the United States. The
researcher took standardized tests used for kindergarten students already in use in that
school for oral language and reading comprehension. The research created this project to
better determine the effects of oral language on reading comprehension as the researcher
noted that many incoming kindergarten students exhibited “a lack of preparedness for
reading.” The research question for this study was to determine how a kindergartener’s
oral language skills affected their ability to understand a text read aloud to them. Findings of this study demonstrated a strong positive connection between oral language and reading comprehension. The researcher brought this data to her colleagues who are teaching professionals. The research group determined that the data has implications for kindergarten curriculum and decided to provide additional oral language instruction in their own kindergarten classrooms in which they work. Relevance to Current Study: This study draws on current literary evidence that oral language skill in kindergarten lead to higher levels of reading comprehension. As this study provides evidence to this idea, it gives purpose in this project which aims to determine an evidence-based and authentic intervention system to augment young children’s oral language skills.


The researchers designed this study to determine the effects of dialogic reading on the child’s novel vocabulary word acquisition. Three-year-old’s were recruited for this study and were assigned to three different conditions. The participants were either placed in the vocabulary eliciting questions group, the non-eliciting questions group and the no questions group which served as the control group. Each participant was assessed on their vocabulary skills before being placed into one of the intervention groups to ensure that general vocabulary comprehension and starting word knowledge were commensurate across all three groups before intervention. Children began the intervention which lasted for four week and in which each participant read the same three books (several times each). The study revealed that both of the treatment groups showed higher levels of novel
vocabulary comprehension than the control group. This indicates that the type of dialog isn’t as important but what is important is creating a dialog around the reading. 

Relevance to Current Study: This current study is drawing on previous frameworks of dialogic reading meant to enhance vocabulary skills in young children. Walsh and Blewitt’s study reveals that asking vocabulary specific questions does enhance a child’s novel vocabulary comprehension. This study seeks to add more to the results of this study by determining if vocabulary eliciting questions can augment a child’s language skills overall.