

**A COMPARISON
OF A NON-SPOKEN RESPONSE MODE
AND
A SPOKEN RESPONSE MODE
IN A TEST OF
PHONOLOGICAL AWARENESS**

MAUREEN CASEY

**In partial fulfilment of the requirements for the
MASTERS DEGREE IN
AUGMENTATIVE AND ALTERNATIVE COMMUNICATION
Centre for AAC
FACULTY OF ARTS
UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA**

**Pretoria
February 2004**

OPSOMMING

Die doel van hierdie studie was die vergelyking van twee verskillende responswyses wat gebruik kan word vir die assessering van kinders met erge gestremdhede en geen of baie min funksionele spraak. Agt-en-veertig tipies ontwikkelende Graad Een kinders is op lukraak wyse in twee groepe verdeel. Daar is van hulle verwag om individueel te reageer op negentig fonologiese bewustheidsvrae d.m.v. 'n gesproke "Ja/Nee" of 'n onuitgesproke "Ja/Nee" antwoord deur hul keuse met die oë uit te wys (eye-gaze) op 'n uitwys oordragbord (E-tran). Al die kinders het die helfte van die vrae geantwoord in elk van die drie fonologiese bewustheidstake in die gesproke en die ongesproke respons modaliteit. Kinders in Groep Een wat eers op die gesproke en daarna op die ongesproke modaliteit geantwoord het is vergelyk met die kinders in Groep Twee, wat eers op die ongesproke en daarna op die gesproke modaliteit reageer het. Die respons modaliteite is vir orde effek gekontroleer en geanaliseer deur gebruik van ANOVA. Geen statisties betekenisvolle verskille is gevind nie, wat die gelykwaardigheid van die twee respons modaliteite bevestig het. Uitwys met die oë het geen onregverdigde voor- of nadele aan die deelnemers besorg nie. Hierdie bevindinge dui dus daarop dat a.g.v. die vergelykbaarheid van die respons modaliteite, uitwys met die oë gesien kan word as 'n billike en geldige respons modaliteit in die assessering van "Ja/Nee" response by kinders. Hierdie bevinding het betekenisvolle implikasies vir verdere ondersoek na die gebruik van hierdie respons modaliteit by kinders met erge gestremdhede en min of geen funksionele spraak.

Sleutelterme

- Aanvullende of alternatiewe kommunikasie
- Uitwys met die oë
- Geen of min funksionele spraak
- Fonologiese bewustheid
- Toets akkommodasies
- Toets geldigheid

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study was to compare two different modes of response, which could be used in the assessment accommodations of children who have severe disabilities and with little or no functional speech. Forty-eight typically developing Grade One children from four classes were randomly assigned into two groups. They were individually required to respond to ninety phonological awareness questions using either a spoken "Yes/No" response or a non-spoken "Yes/No" response by using eye-gaze to indicate their choice on an Eye-gaze transfer board (E-tran). All the children answered half of the questions in each of the three phonological awareness tasks presented in the spoken and the non-spoken mode of response. Children in Group One, who answered the spoken mode first and the non-spoken mode second, were compared with children in Group Two, who responded in the non-spoken mode first and the spoken mode second. Other children in Group One, who answered in the non-spoken mode first and the spoken mode second, were compared with children in Group Two, who responded in the spoken mode first and the non-spoken mode second. The response modes were controlled for order effect and analysed using ANOVA. No statistically significant difference was found, which confirmed the equivalence of the two modes of response. Eye-gaze provided the participants in this study with neither unfair advantage, nor unfair disadvantage. Hence, the findings suggest that due to the comparability of the response modes, eye-gaze can be seen as an equitable and valid response mode in the assessment of "Yes/No" responses in children. This finding has significant implications for exploring the use of these response modes on children with severe disabilities and who have little or no functional speech.

Key terms

- Augmentative or alternative communication
- Eye-gaze transfer board (E-tran)
- Little or no functional speech
- Phonological awareness
- Test accommodations
- Test validity

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to extend sincere thanks to the following individuals who contributed to the study, particularly:

- Professor Erna Alant for her patient guidance and support throughout this study. Her considerable insight, wisdom and passion for the field of Augmentative and Alternative Communication is truly inspirational.
- My family for their love, encouragement and continued support.
- Mrs Rina Owen, Department of Computer Sciences, University of Pretoria, for her knowledge, advice and assistance with the statistical analysis.
- My friend Jill Rose who began the journey with me.
- My friends from near and afar who encouraged and offered support throughout the study.
- My friends and colleagues at the CAAC who believed both in me, and the value of the study.
- Mrs Ina Bruwer who conducted the language edit of this study.
- My friend Mrs Marlies Grindlay who conducted the technical edit for this study.
- Mr Ian McLeod, headmaster of Crawford College who without hesitation welcomed me into his school to conduct the study.
- Mrs Karin Horn, HoD of Crawford who supported the process and gave up her office for me to conduct the testing.
- The Grade One teachers of Crawford College for their full cooperation, assistance and interest during the study.
- The children who participated with earnestness and determination.

CONTENTS		PAGE
READING		
OPSOMMING.....		I
ABSTRACT.....		II
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS		III
CONTENTS		IV
CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY		1
1.1 PROBLEM STATEMENT		1
1.2 DEFINITION OF TERMS.....		4
1.2.1 Alternative Assessment		4
1.2.2 Augmentative and Alternative Communication		5
1.2.3 Eye-gaze Transfer Board		5
1.2.4 Little or No Functional Speech		5
1.2.5 Phonological Awareness.....		5
1.2.6 Test Accommodations		6
1.2.7 Test Modifications.....		6
1.2.8 Test Validity		6
1.3 OUTLINE OF CHAPTERS		6
1.4 ABBREVIATIONS.....		7
1.5 SUMMARY.....		8
CHAPTER TWO LITERATURE STUDY		9
2.1 INTRODUCTION		9
2.1.1 Aims of this Chapter		9
2.2 BACKGROUND.....		9
2.2.1 Assessment.....		9
2.2.2 Assessment of Children with Little or No Functional Speech.....		10
2.2.3 Assessment Reform in South Africa.....		12
2.3 TEST ACCOMMODATIONS, MODIFICATIONS AND ALTERNATIVE ASSESSMENT		14

2.3.1	Test Accommodations	15
2.4	LITERACY ISSUES: The Importance of Phonological Awareness	20
2.5	ISSUES IN PHONOLOGICAL AWARENESS.....	23
2.5.1	Phonological Awareness in Children with LNFS	25
2.5.2	Assessment of Phonological Awareness.....	27
2.6	CONCLUSION.....	28
2.7	SUMMARY	28
 CHAPTER THREE METHODOLOGY.....		29
3.1	INTRODUCTION	29
3.2	RESEARCH QUESTION	29
3.3	AIMS OF THE STUDY.....	29
3.3.1	Main Research Aim	29
3.3.2	Sub-aims.....	29
3.4	RESEARCH DESIGN.....	30
3.4.1	The Research Design.....	30
3.4.2	The Research Steps	32
3.4.3	Pilot Study	32
3.4.3.1	Objectives.....	32
3.4.3.2	School Selected for the Pilot Study	33
3.4.3.3	Procedure.....	33
3.4.3.4	Aims, Methods and Results.....	34
3.4.2.5	Summary.....	35
3.5	MAIN STUDY	35
3.5.1	Description of the School and Participants	35
3.5.1.1	Selection Criteria for All Participants	36
3.5.1.2	Comparability of Experimental Groups.....	37
3.5.2	Material and Equipment used in the Study	38
3.5.2.1	Measuring Instruments: Phonological Awareness Test	38
3.5.2.2	Equipment.....	40
3.6	DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURE.....	40

3.6.1 Test Procedure	40
3.6.2 The Use of an Assistant.....	43
3.7 DATA ANALYSIS AND STATISTICAL PROCEDURES	44
3.7.1 Data Capturing	44
3.8 SUMMARY	45
CHAPTER FOUR RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....	46
4.1 INTRODUCTION	46
4.2 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....	47
4.2.1 Overview of Group One and Group Two on all Tasks	47
4.2.2 Analysis of the Mean for Group One and Group Two on All Tasks.....	49
4.2.3 Analysis of the Spoken and Non-Spoken Modes for Both Groups on Each Task	50
4.2.4 Analysis of the Order of Tasks Presented for Each Group	51
4.3 SUMMARY.....	52
CHAPTER FIVE SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RESEARCH IMPLICATIONS.....	54
5.1 INTRODUCTION	54
5.2 SUMMARY OF RESULTS AND INTEGRATION OF RESULTS	54
5.3 CRITICAL EVALUATION.....	55
5.4 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH.....	57
5.5 SUMMARY	58

REFERENCES.....	59
APPENDIX A TOPA AND PALS	68
APPENDIX B DATA CAPTURE SHEET	78
APPENDIX C CODE FOR DATA CAPTURE SHEET.....	79
APPENDIX D LETTER TO PRINCIPAL.....	80
APPENDIX E LETTER TO PARENTS	82
APPENDIX F PERFORMANCE OF GROUP ONE AND GROUP TWO ON TASKS 1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A AND 3B	84
APPENDIX G PERFORMANCE OF GROUP ONE AND GROUP TWO IN THE SPOKEN AND NON-SPOKEN MODE ON ALL TASKS.....	87
APPENDIX H PERFORMANCE IN SPOKEN AND NON-SPOKEN MODES R GROUP ONE AND GROUP TWO	88
APPENDIX I INVESTIGATION OF THE INTERACTION BETWEEN THE TWO GROUPS ON ALL TASKS.	89

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1	Visual Representation of the Research Design for the Above-Average, Average and Below-Average cohorts.....	30
Table 3.2	Pilot Study: Aims, Methods, Results and Recommendations.....	34
Table 3.3	Visual Representation of Pruning of Participants.....	37
Table 3.4	Participant Selection Criteria, Method and Motivation for Inclusion.....	38
Table 3.5	Summary of Questions Posed in the Phonological Awareness Assessment.....	40

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 4.1	An overview of the Mean Scores obtained by Group One and Group Two for Tasks 1a and 1b, 2a and b, 3a and b.....	47
Figure 4.2	Analysis of the Mean for Group One and Group Two on Tasks 1a and b, 2a and b, and 3a and b.....	49
Figure 4.3	Analysis of Spoken and the Non-Spoken modes for Group One and Group Two per Task.....	50
Figure 4.4	The Performance of the Mean for Task Order 1, 2 and 3 for Group One and Group Two.....	51