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Abstract

In traditional classrooms a second language is taught via thematic word sets, grammatical explanations, and patterned syntactic practice. This study compared the traditional teaching approach to a scaffolded teaching approach, consisting of words taught within a narrative context. Five fifth-grade students were taught Spanish as a second language during a ten-week intervention. Vocabulary learning and sentence generation were measured following each session, as well as a pre-posttest measure. Results showed that print was an important support used by participants in the traditional condition. However across time, vocabulary learning and sentence length increased significantly more in the scaffolded condition.
Chapter 1: Literature Review

In our increasingly more global world, learning a second language is important for English speakers. While there are different viewpoints on how to best teach a second language, much remains unknown about what factors influence the ease at which a second language is acquired. This study compared two methods of learning Spanish for 5th grade non-Spanish speakers. One method followed more traditional techniques, including teaching a core vocabulary for a topic, such as “food,” and then using the vocabulary in short sentences. The second involved teaching the vocabulary in the context of a picture while using scaffolding techniques to facilitate the use of new vocabulary and grammar to communicate the information (See Appendix K). The effects on vocabulary learning and generating sentences in Spanish were examined.

Learning Language

All typically developing children achieve fluency in their native language. However, some second language learners never achieve native-like fluency. Researchers have searched for explanations to account for these limitations. Among the explanations offered are age at the time of acquisition, learning style, personality factors, language environment, degree of language exposure, and cross-linguistic influences (Brown, 2000). One important difference is the language input received by the learner. The first language learner normally learns his native language with the family in a communicative context with maximal exposure to the language in his environment. On the other hand, the second language learner can have a variety of learning contexts. These contexts can range from natural acquisition settings, where the learner is in contact with native speakers many hours per day, to instructional contexts. In the classroom setting the
learner may only have contact with the target language a few hours a week and may only interact in that language through classroom activities.

If one looks at the input in the first and second languages in naturalistic settings, many similarities are apparent. Adults generally communicate with a child learning his native language in “motherese.” Motherese is a special register of speech designed to facilitate young children’s language acquisition. It is characterized by short utterances, clear articulation, higher pitch, a wider intonation range, slower tempo, and simplified concrete language anchored in the “here-in-now” (de Boer, 2005; Gleason, 2005). Furthermore, parents “scaffold” communicative attempts made by their children, though prompting words, asking questions, and expanding utterances produced by the child as if to help the child translate ideas into words. Interestingly, native speakers naturally adopt a similar communication style when interacting with a foreign speaker who demonstrates limited proficiency in a language. Termed “foreigner talk,” this interaction style has characteristics similar to motherese. Native speakers slow down speech, emphasize clear articulation, increase volume on key words, use simpler vocabulary, repeat more, use more gestures, and modify grammatical complexity. In addition, native speakers talk more in the here-and-now, make more comprehension checks, and use shorter responses (Freed, 1981). According to Hatch (1983, as sited by Ellis, 1985), foreign talk not only promotes communication, it establishes a bond between the native speaker and non-native speaker and serves as an implicit teaching function.

Form-Focused Approaches

In the traditional classroom, the second language learner typically is exposed to language in a very structured way. Vocabulary is often presented in thematic groups, such as foods, the family, and pastime activities. Syntactic structures, such as subject-
verb agreement, are presented and analyzed individually. Then these structures are practiced in listening, oral, written, and speaking activities which emphasize a given syntactic pattern. Communication in this setting may occur in guided role-play activities or in response to teacher initiated questions. This instructional style has been described as “form-focused instruction,” or a teaching approach designed to focus attention, either implicitly or explicitly, on the correct form of the language (Spada, 1997, as cited by Brown, 2005). Traditional language teaching for English native speakers often focuses on part-to-whole relationships. It views language as a hierarchy of skills, which when mastered, is expected to result in a functional whole (Norris & Hoffman, 1993).

Similarly, form-focused instruction in the foreign language classroom often includes explicit definitions of parts of speech, discussions of rule usage, and curricula sequenced by grammatical or phonological categories.

An input-oriented approach developed by Van Patten is an example of the ideology of focus-on-form and grammatical development in a Spanish classroom. The goal of VanPatten’s “processing instruction” is to draw the learner’s attention to the forms causing a comprehension breakdown. This approach considers that beginning learners have few attentional resources and that learners can have linguistic biases due to the first language. As explained by Collentine (2005), the approach uses focused practice to “train learners to process input differently so that they will notice more morphosyntactic information when listening to or reading Spanish.”

Form-focused instruction is an outgrowth of a long history of methodologies and approaches in second language acquisition teaching. According to Hammerly (1986), from classical times though the Renaissance, Latin and Greek were taught inductively and with a focus on communication. However, as Latin became a dead language the
focus of teaching shifted to reading and writing. As modern language began to be taught, focus on reading and writing continued through the traditional or Grammar-Translation teaching method. This method emphasized memorization of grammar rules, vocabulary lists, and rigorous translation from the native to the second language.

**Natural Language Approaches**

Backlash against the Translation-Grammar method in the 19th century resulted in natural language learning approaches based on observations of child language. Methods such as the Natural Method and the Direct Method emphasized inductive teaching exclusively in the target language with no translation or grammar rules taught. This method did not meet with widespread success and soon fell out of favor.

With World War II, communication became a central focus of second language teaching. In addition, the behavioral psychological theories of the day emphasized habit formation and highly influenced the understanding of foreign language learning. Language teaching methods, such as the Audiolingual Method, focused on native-like pronunciation and oral proficiency through mimicry and patterned oral drills. However, practice of mechanical pattern drills and dialogues did not result in fluency for the majority of learners.

Chomsky’s view of language learning as an innate process changed the focus of second language teaching. Methods and approaches emphasized cognitive and affective factors and discovery learning. For instance, the Natural Approach by Krashen emphasized providing the learner with comprehensible input and lowering the learner’s “affective filter” in order to reduce speaking anxiety (Hammerly, 1986). However, according to Richards and Rodgers (1986), the Natural Approach’s greatest claim was
that it emphasized comprehensible and meaningful practice activities, rather than just grammatically precise utterances.

**Current Classroom Methodologies**

Over the last few decades researchers have frequently discussed the merits of the communicative language teaching approach (Richards & Rodgers, 1986; Hammerly; 1986; Sato & Kleinsasser, 1999; Hadley, 2001; Brown, 2000; Cook, 2001; Lightbrown & Spada, 2006). This approach considers meaning and contextualization of primary importance to language learning. The goal of instruction is communicative competence, not exclusively grammatical accuracy or precise native-like pronunciation. According to Brown (2000) language techniques of this approach are “designed to engage learners in the pragmatic, authentic, functional use of language for meaningful purposes.”

Furthermore, Richards and Rodgers (1986) state that communicative language teaching requires use of negotiation of meaning, information sharing, and interaction. Typical classroom activities of this approach include interactive games and task-based activities.

However, despite the many changes in foreign language methodology over the years, the Grammar-Translation method “to this day [remains] a standard methodology for language teaching in educational institutions” (Brown, 2000). Yet, according to Richards and Rodgers (1986), the Grammar-Translation method is “a method for which there is no theory.” Ellis’ (1994) review of the literature sited two studies that showed mixed results concerning students’ ability to retain learning via direct grammar. For instance, White (1991) found that after 5 months of adjective instruction, students largely lost their knowledge of correct adjective placement. In contrast, Harley (1989) found that 3 months after grammar instruction in the French past tense forms, learners had maintained and even increased their knowledge. Lightbrown (1991) examined the extant
research and concluded that “. . . the findings of these experimental studies can be interpreted as showing that, when form-focused instruction is introduced in a way which is divorced from the communicative needs and activities of the students, only short-term effects are obtained.”

So, if the Grammar-Translation method is not effective over time, why aren’t more teachers practicing communicative language teaching? Sato and Kleinsasser (1999) documented the opinions and practices of communicative language teaching by second language teachers in Japan. They found that “although most teachers reported using communicative teaching activities, such as role-playing, games, survey, group work, and simulations. Unfortunately, those things were rarely observed. . . Most relied on traditional practices: teacher-fronted, repetition, translation, explicit grammar presentation, practice from textbooks, and little or no second language use or culture integration.” When asked about incorporating communicative language teaching into their lessons, teachers reported that preparation for this approach was time intensive. Moreover, Gatbonton and Segalowitz (2005) found that when teachers believe that learning has reached the point where reinforcement of new forms is needed, they tend to return to non-communicative means for achieving that goal.

If a methodology could be used that requires relatively little preparation and yet maintains the communicative properties of meaningful interactions, then teachers may be encouraged to incorporate these strategies into the classroom. Storytelling in response to a picture depicting a narrative would provide one such context. A narrative provides endless opportunities for talking about the picture at a continuum from easy to difficult levels, including labeling and describing objects depicted, interpreting actions, intentions, and emotional states, drawing inferences using prior knowledge for situations similar to
those depicted, inserting dialog to speak conversationally in the role of the characters, and momentarily isolating a specific word or construction and analyzing it for the characteristics of its form and function before returning to narrative mode (Norris & Hoffman, 1995). In this manner a single picture can provide the focus of natural and communicative interactions across several days of instruction. Within and across days, the level of difficulty in concepts, word structure, and syntax can be increased to meet the needs of the individual learners and provide opportunities for each participant to talk at their own level. The teacher could use the scaffolding and motherese characteristic of the support provided for first language acquisition as well as “foreign talk.”

This study will explore the efficacy of using scaffolded language interactions in response to a narrative picture for 5th grade English speakers learning Spanish as a second language. The specific questions of this study are:

1. Will a greater number of Spanish vocabulary words be learned using a scaffolded language learning approach compared to the traditional foreign language instructional approach?

2. Will more Spanish words be produced per utterance in writing (i.e., a rough measure of beginning to form connected utterances) using the scaffolded versus the traditional instructional approach?
Chapter 2: Methods

Five fifth-grade students were taught Spanish using both a traditional and a scaffolded language learning approach. Students met after school twice weekly (Wednesday and Friday) for one-hour sessions with a graduate student from LSU who also is a certified teacher in Spanish/ESL. Participants met for pretesting during the first week, followed by a 6-week intervention period (during which each student attended 8-10 individual sessions depending on absences), and ending with posttesting during the 8th week.

Subject Description

The subjects were 5 fifth-grade students ranging in age from 10;1 to 10;10 years. Participants were recruited from a flier distributed by the school to those attending their extended day program (see Appendix A). None of the students had any identified disability, history of language delay or disorder, and all were performing in the average range academically according to parent report. All of the students performed in the average range or above on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test – Third Edition (PPVT-3) (Dunn, 2006) administered at pretest (see Table 1). In addition, none of the students had receptive or expressive abilities in Spanish, all had typical language development in English, and none had more than casual exposure (television or other media exposure) to Spanish.

Assessment Instruments

Each child was administered three tests at the beginning of the study to assess language levels in their native language (English) and the target language (Spanish). In addition, a parent questionnaire was used to obtain a history of the child’s development of the native language and prior exposure to Spanish.
PPVT-3 (English)

This test measures vocabulary acquisition in English. This test was administered at pretest to assess students’ general measure of language abilities and learning.

Parent Questionnaire

The questionnaire consisted of 25 questions regarding the child’s native language developmental history, academic history and current status, and exposure to Spanish currently and in the past (see Appendix E).

Preschool Language Scale – Fourth Edition (PLS-4) (Spanish)

This is a test of early Spanish language proficiency that assesses knowledge of Spanish vocabulary, syntax, morphology, and basic concepts. The norms for 6-year-old children were used (highest norms available on this test). Given that none of the subjects spoke Spanish, the receptive and expressive language of the subjects in Spanish would be expected to be that of a beginning native speaker of the language and the norms were interpreted accordingly. This test was administered at pretest to assess students’ previous knowledge of Spanish and to verify that subjects were non-Spanish communicators (receptively and expressively).

Spanish Vocabulary

This test was comprised of a 100-word vocabulary measure developed by the researcher to assess knowledge of Spanish word vocabulary selected from the lessons (50 words from the scaffolded sessions, 50 words from the traditional lessons). The test was in multiple choice format. Each question was comprised of a written Spanish word that was pronounced by the examiner and a choice of 4 possible definitions written in English that were also read by the examiner. Students were required to circle the correct response
in their booklet. This test was group administered at pretest and repeated at posttest (see Appendix F).

Table 1.
Subject Characteristics at Pretest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>%ile*</th>
<th>PLS-4 (%ile*)</th>
<th>Speech/Language Delay?</th>
<th>Exposure to Spanish?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10;1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>&lt;1%ile</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10;1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>&lt;1%ile</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10;9</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>&lt;1%ile</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10;10</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>&lt;1%ile</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10;11</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>&lt;1%ile</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Compared to norms for 6 year age level, highest norms available for this test

Materials

The materials for this project included pictures for the scaffolded language condition and a Spanish textbook for the traditional condition.

Apricot Pictures

Apricot (Arwood, 1985) pictures are color illustrations of events, unique in that they depict the whole context of people sharing actions across time and causality in a single picture.

The 3 pictures used depicted the themes of catching butterflies, removing a cat from a tree, and going to the doctor (see Appendix J).

Traditional Lessons

Lessons from Paso a Paso (Myrian, Sayers, Wargin, 1996) and Bienvenidos (Schmitt & Woddford, 1995), beginning Spanish textbooks, were adapted to the 20 minute format. The 3 themes used were related to school, food, and community (see Appendix J).
Daily Vocabulary Probes

20 words (10 from the scaffolded picture lesson, 10 from the traditional lesson) was tested using the same multiple choice format as the Spanish Vocabulary test described above. This was a receptive measure of Spanish (see Appendix G).

Daily Sentence Formulation Probe

Pictures from that day’s scaffolded and traditional lessons were presented, and the students wrote 3 sentences in Spanish corresponding to the given picture. Spelling was not considered and the subjects were allowed to use English orthography to approximate Spanish words if they chose. The examiner reviewed the sentences and asked for clarification of any sentence that was not readable (see Appendix H).

Procedures

An alternating treatment single subject design was used. Subjects were seen in a group after school for one hour on Wednesdays and Fridays. Lessons took place at a small table in a classroom. The group received 20 minutes of instruction using an Apricot picture with scaffolded interaction and 20 minutes using a traditional picture and lesson. The order of presentation was alternated across sessions. Each day ended with a 10 minute probe.

Scaffolded Lessons

During each scaffolded lesson an Apricot picture (Arwood, 1985) was presented showing a variety of interrelated actions performed by people using objects (i.e., 4 children each involved with different aspects of the sequence of catching butterflies, such as chasing one with a net, putting one in the jar, and examining a butterfly). Each picture was used for 4 sessions, for a total of 3 Apricot pictures used during the study. The adult pointed to the relevant people and/or objects in the picture while modeling a verbal
relationship in Spanish (i.e., El niño sigue la mariposa = The boy chases the butterfly). The adult then asked one student to explain the action. If the student experienced difficulty, the adult used scaffolding strategies to assist the student to put the action relationship into words. If the student had no difficulty, then the adult reworded the sentence to one with greater complexity (El niño sigue la mariposa roja = The boy chases the red butterfly) and asked the student to explain it with scaffolding as needed. Following the individual’s attempt, the adult would recast the sentence in Spanish in its complete form (i.e., El niño sigue la mariposa roja con la red = The boy chases the red butterfly with the net.), ask the group to explain the picture, and then either choose to scaffold further or move on to the next relationship.

The following scaffolding strategies were used to provide support as the subject attempted to describe the picture (Norris & Hoffman, 1993):

**Cloze** – This comprised a verbal fill-in-the-blank technique, where the instructor began a sentence or phrase and then stopped, providing the student an opportunity to complete the utterance using a word or phrase, thus co-constructing an utterance longer than the student could produce independently.

**Binary Choice** – This was used when the student could not retrieve a word or phrase. The instructor modeled two possible choices, only one of which was correct, and the student selected the appropriate word or phrase from the choices presented.

**Phonemic Cue** – This is a prompt of the first phoneme, syllable, or other unit of the word. This was used when the student was unable to retrieve the word, but the instructor had reason to believe the word could be retrieved with a prompt for the pronunciation of the beginning of the word.
**Expansion** – This strategy was applied to nearly every turn in the interaction. The student produced as much of the utterance as he/she was able, and then the utterance was immediately recast in a slightly more complete form by the instructor.

**Traditional Lessons**

During each traditional lesson, a thematic picture was presented showing people engaged in an activity using objects that fit the target theme (i.e., a classroom with pencils, desks, teacher, white board etc). Other pictures in the lesson depicted individual items (a pencil, desk, or white board). Each picture was used for 4 sessions, for a total of 3 thematic pictures. The lesson was begun with labeling the different vocabulary words depicted, followed by choral repetition of the words. The words then were used in different exercises, such as response to Wh- questions, studying the verb conjugation or a sentence pattern in writing, and connecting the vocabulary in conversation to sentence patterns, which are practiced by substituting words into the same structure. The words then were used in either a listening to conversation activity, or in a role playing activity among the participants (i.e. Deme la pluma, por favor. = Give me a pen, please.). If the child was not able to produce the sentence, the instructor would model the words for the student to imitate.

**Probes**

Probes were administered each day following both instructional sessions. The probe was administered to all participants as a group. Students were spaced at individual desks for this activity.
Data Analysis

A two-way (teaching strategy by time) repeated measures ANOVA was used for all statistical data analysis. This analysis included assessment of vocabulary learning in each of the two conditions as measured by the number of vocabulary words taught across time and by the number of vocabulary words gained from pretest to posttest. Analysis of generated written Spanish included the mean number of Spanish words generated per sentence over time.
Chapter 3: Results

Students in this study were exposed to two different instructional conditions for a relatively short time period of ten 20-minute sessions for a total of 3 ½ hours of instructional time for each condition. The first question examined whether a greater number of oral Spanish vocabulary words would be learned under scaffolded language learning conditions. This question was measured using daily probes and through a pretest-posttest measure of the vocabulary taught across the 6 weeks of intervention. The second question used the number of words produced per utterance in writing as a rough measure of beginning to form connected utterances.

Vocabulary Learning

The number of vocabulary words learned per session, the number of Spanish words produced in writing per session, and the performance on a general Spanish language measure were compared for the relative effects of the two treatments.

Changes in Vocabulary

Measures of change in Spanish word learning included daily probes measuring the specific vocabulary taught each day, and a comprehensive vocabulary test administered at pretest and posttest which assessed all words taught over the course of the study. Both measures used the same multiple choice format with the same vocabulary words (the daily probes comprised of a subset of the comprehensive test) and 4 choices of possible word meanings that were similar, but not identical, for the daily probes versus the comprehensive assessment. Table 2 presents a comparison of the number of words per subject and group means for words correctly recognized for the traditional versus the scaffolded conditions across 10 sessions. Examination of the group means shows that
during the first four sessions, vocabulary learning was greater for the traditional instructional condition. On the fifth week the means were equal, followed by two weeks where once again the traditional means were greater. However, the means for the scaffolded condition were greater for two of the final three sessions. It appears that the early advantage accrued to the traditional condition was not maintained, and that as children gained repeated exposure to the scaffolded communications, learning rate increased. Overall, mean scores for the traditional condition declined from 9.8 to 6.5 words over the course of treatment, while mean scores for the scaffolded condition rose from 5.4 to 7.2 words.

Table 2
Spanish Vocabulary Learned Each Session as Measured by Probe Scores across 10 Sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Scaffolded</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Scaffolded</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Scaffolded</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Scaffolded</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table Continued)
5  Scaffolded  7  7  4  7  5  6.0
Traditional  8  8  7  7  0  6.0

6  Scaffolded  7  8  7 -  6  7.0
Traditional  9 10  9 -  5  8.25

7  Scaffolded  2  6  5  8  4  5.0
Traditional  8 10 10  8  7  8.6

8  Scaffolded  9  9  8  7 -  8.25
Traditional  6  4  4  7 -  5.25

9  Scaffolded  -  7  -  7  4  6.0
Traditional  -  8  -  9  8  8.3

10 Scaffolded  8  9  -  9  3  7.25
Traditional  5  5  -  7  9  6.5

To determine if this difference was significant, an analysis of variance (time x condition) was conducted. Results indicated that the differences between treatments was significant (F = 24.059, dF = 1,4;  P < .008, partial Eta Squared = .857).

To assess the longer-term learning of vocabulary words, the number of total words learned from pretest to posttest under the scaffolded and traditional instructional conditions was compared. Examination of pretest scores shows that subjects responded correctly to more of the words in the scaffolded condition prior to intervention, recognizing a mean of 20.8 words out of 50 compared to 16.8 for the traditional condition. Comparison of the gain scores shows that all but one subject learned more vocabulary words under the traditional than the scaffolded language condition. The traditional condition gained a mean of 5.6 more vocabulary words than the scaffolded condition.
Table 3
Pretest, Posttest, and Gain Scores for Spanish Vocabulary Test Measuring All Words Taught.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Scaffolded Condition</th>
<th>Traditional Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>Posttest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of a 2 (leading condition) by 2 (time of measurement) repeated ANOVA revealed a significant main effect for time with a very high partial eta squared (F = 25.293; dF = 1,4; P < .0007) indicating that both groups improved from pretest to post test.

However, the interaction effect was not significant (F = 6.630; dF = 1,4; P < .062). This indicates that subjects learned both groups of words at a similar rate from pretest to posttest.

**Written Words Produced Per Sentence**

The second question of this study addressed the number of written words produced in sentences that were written in response to the picture explored during that session. Each subject wrote three sentences, using as many Spanish words as they could to talk about the picture. In most cases, students included nouns, articles, and adjectives with a few occurrences of verbs and other parts of speech.
Table 4 shows the mean number of Spanish words per sentence for each subject across the three sentences. Examination of the means shows that for all but the first week, the majority of the subjects produced more Spanish words under the scaffolded condition than the traditional condition. For three of the weeks, all subjects produced more words under the scaffolded condition, and for three additional weeks, all but one generated more words under scaffolded conditions. This suggested an advantage accrued for learning to combine words under the scaffolded learning condition.

Table 4
Mean Number of Spanish Vocabulary per Sentence Generated in Writing by Probe Scores across 10 Sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Scaffolded</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Scaffolded</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Scaffolded</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Scaffolded</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Scaffolded</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scaffolded</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Scaffolded</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Scaffolded</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1 shows the average mean number of Spanish vocabulary words generated per sentence under the two conditions. The results of a 2 (teaching condition) by 8 (time measurement) repeated measures ANOVA revealed a significant main effect for condition (F = 3.486; dF: 1,4; P < .037) with a very strong partial eta squared of .705. The average value for the scaffolded condition was 3.095 compared to an average for the traditional condition of 2.678.

The results of this study showed that both the traditional and the scaffolded Spanish language learning conditions were effective in teaching vocabulary over a 6-week intervention period. However, the scaffolded condition was more effective in eliciting a greater number of Spanish words per written sentence.
Figure 1: Average Mean Number of Spanish Vocabulary Words Generated per Sentence
Chapter 4: Discussion

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effectiveness of contextualization on second language acquisition using the scaffolded versus the traditional approach. Students received both conditions using different vocabulary. The conditions were compared for vocabulary learning and for the number of Spanish words produced in written sentences.

Vocabulary Learning

The first question examined whether greater word learning would occur using the scaffolded compared to the traditional approach. Change in word learning was measured both in the short and long term. Short-term learning was assessed via daily probes consisting of the words taught during that session. These words comprised a subset of the total number of target Spanish vocabulary words to be learned over the course of the study. Results for the mean scores of Spanish vocabulary learned per session indicated that word learning increased under the scaffolded condition from first to last session, while it decreased under the traditional condition. The mean number of recognized traditional words declined from 9.8 to 6.5, while the mean number of recognized scaffolded words increased from 5.4 to 7.5, a statistically significant difference.

This finding indicates that initially word learning was superior in the traditional approach. In this approach, traditional vocabulary was presented in a thematic picture (i.e., a classroom) with the printed words superimposed on the scene or in isolated individual pictures with the printed word under each item. The target list consisted of items within a thematic context. For example, the first thematic context used was school. Vocabulary items in this context consisted of people (teacher, student), objects
(notebook, book, pencil, etc), and actions (write, talk) typically associated with a classroom.

In contrast, in the scaffolded condition, words were introduced within phrases describing a relationship of meaning depicted in a narrative picture. Strategies such as cloze or modeling were used to encourage the child to attempt to describe the relationship. Any words produced by the child were immediately expanded into a slightly longer utterance. For instance, the first vocabulary set was related to a cat being stuck in a tree. The target vocabulary consisted of words used to describe the characters (cat, dad, brother, etc), actions (climb, look, reach), and relevant objects (ladder, tree, branch) of the narrative. Also, target vocabulary included words to describe interrelationships between objects and/or characters (between, in front of, next to, etc). All scaffolded vocabulary words were presented orally, with no accompanying print.

Initially the scaffolded narrative approach provided a more difficult word-learning context. Children had to hear the word within a phrase without the benefit of print to isolate and provide alphabetic cues for the word. However, across time word learning accelerated as students began to hear and imitate words within the relationships. The narrative appeared to provide a motivating context where the picture could be talked about in unique and increasingly more complex ways each time it was discussed. New information could be incorporated, including more elaborate descriptions and character reactions. The narrative picture provided a dynamic learning context.

In contrast, the traditional foreign language textbook pictures provided a more static representation of target vocabulary. The vocabulary was depicted in a thematic scene and highlighted with the Spanish word under a given picture. This amounts to a visual/graphic dictionary. Over time children’s attention level declined as the same static
picture was used repeatedly for several sessions. To stimulate continued interest in the traditional picture words, the instructor used a variety of pictures of the same target vocabulary. In addition, the instructor frequently used games, paired conversational activities, listening exercises, and basic grammar exercises in which a vocabulary word was substituted into a given syntactical pattern. These exercises were chosen to activate the children’s background knowledge and to provide a rich meaningful context.

While the picture in the traditional approach provided less interest and fewer opportunities for elaboration than the narrative picture, the print did provide a strong support for word learning. For the first 7 probes, more vocabulary words were recognized for the traditional condition, although the advantage continued to decrease across time. The printed representation of the target Spanish word provided a means to examine the phonetic structure of the word which helped subjects to examine and pronounce the form of the word. This support was not provided in the scaffolded condition, and it is noteworthy that the participants requested a written list of target words for this condition throughout the study. In the traditional condition, they used the graphic representations of target words to make metalinguistic comparisons between English and Spanish, such as the observation that nouns have gender in Spanish. For example, “el gato” (cat) is masculine, while “la silla” (chair) is feminine. The print provided a medium for this examination to take place that made this analysis easier. This suggests that the ability to use both the written word and the picture to access the meaning and form of a word assists second language learning for those who are good readers in a first language. The effect of print within the scaffolded condition should be explored in future studies.
**Long-term Vocabulary Learning**

While daily probes examine short-term recall of words, longer-term learning is the ultimate goal of second language learning. Therefore, the retention of words learned across time was measured using a pretest-posttest of the Spanish words introduced under both conditions. At pretest the children demonstrated previous knowledge of 16.8 out of 50 traditional words and 20.8 out of 50 scaffolded words. Analysis of words correctly recognized at pretest indicated that many of the words correctly identified were cognates in Spanish and English. Cognate words have similar spellings and parallel meanings in both languages. Therefore, they are relatively easy for second language learners to recognize and remember. Among the scaffolded target words in the study, all participants correctly identified 7 words: la medicina (medicine), el suéter (sweater), el uniforme (uniform), la oficina (office), el doctor (doctor), el termómetro (thermometer), and enfrente de (in front of). Among the traditional approach target words, 6 words were correctly identified at pretest across participants: el estudiante (student), las verduras (vegetable greens), las papas (potatoes), la sopa (soup), el pueblo (town), and el cuarto de baño (bathroom). Among those words, 2 items were identified as cognates: el estudiante (student) and el pueblo (pueblo, town), and others had phonological similarities. At posttest participants reached similar levels of knowledge in both conditions, with 30.2 words recognized in the scaffolded condition and 31.8 in the traditional condition. Results indicated that total words learning from pretest to posttest was significant. That is, the total number of Spanish words learned and retained from both conditions combined increased within the short time of intervention. However, the interaction between conditions was not found to be significant, indicating that the rate of learning was similar under both conditions from pre- to posttest.
These findings suggest that the conditions facilitating vocabulary learning are complex and interactive. Early in learning, an isolated vocabulary approach may hold advantages over a contextualized approach, but with repetition, the context of a narrative picture supports vocabulary learning at an accelerated rate. However, in this study both conditions resulted in equally good retention of words across six weeks.

**Spanish Words per Written Sentence**

The second research question assessed whether more Spanish words were produced in writing using the scaffolded versus the traditional instructional approach. Over the course of the study, subjects received only 3 ½ hours of exposure to written Spanish in the traditional instructional condition, and none in the scaffolded condition. In addition, they were exposed to written Spanish during pretest/posttest assessments and during the daily vocabulary probes. Therefore, the children were not expected to demonstrate mastery of the Spanish spelling system during this study. Instead, the examiner accepted developmental spelling of Spanish words for both the scaffolded and traditional conditions. Developmental spelling consisted of Spanish or English sound-letter correspondences for a given Spanish word. For example, the native English speaker may misperceive and misspell Spanish word “el árbol” as “el albol” since the sound /r/ is produced with different articulations in English and Spanish (retroflexive vs. alveolar trill). Therefore, word approximations and correctly spelled Spanish words were accepted as evidence of Spanish learning.

The number of Spanish words generated in writing was measured by daily sentence probes. The mean number of Spanish words per sentence (across three sentences per day) were measured over the 10 sessions of the study for each condition. Results indicated that the children produced significantly more written Spanish words per
sentence in the scaffolded condition (more generated in 7 out of 10 sessions) compared to the traditional condition (3 out of 10). In addition, examination of the average number of words produced over the ten sessions for all subjects indicated a greater number of words produced in the scaffolded condition per sentence (3.095) compared to the traditional condition (2.678). These results suggest that teaching a second language in a narrative context facilitates using words productively within sentences to a greater degree than generating disconnected sentences in traditional instructional practices.

Narratives require children to interpret pictures in a manner that connects objects and characters through action. To accomplish this, children must recognize the event depicted and mentally create a possible scenario by associating pictured events to prior knowledge symbolically through language. In the current study Spanish vocabulary was contextualized with the narrative picture. Thus, the examiner focused on the salient objects, events, people, and actions illustrated in the picture and scaffolded the language using the people and objects depicted to help subject establish referents for the unknown Spanish words. Word meaning was communicated using the visual illustration, and also physical gestures, manipulation of props, and English translation as needed. The events in the narrative pictures were very common and familiar, allowing subjects to easily activate background knowledge for similar experiences. These properties enabled children to begin to discriminate Spanish words and assign them meaning within the relationships of meaning talked about within the picture. The subjects then attempted to express these relationships in their written sentences.

In contrast, the traditional approach used a given theme, such as school, to facilitate word learning. However, results of this study show that presentation of isolated words within a given theme does not result in greater Spanish word use in written
sentences compared to the scaffolded approach. The thematic pictures used in most second language textbooks do not tie word meaning to action-based events. The typical textbook picture may show a “lápiz” (pencil), “regla” (ruler), and “boli grafo” (pen) on an “escritorio” (desk) with their corresponding printed words. In this instance, the student must create his own abstract links to background knowledge, retrieve conceptual knowledge of the word or translate it to the first language, and then create a context for future use of the new second language term. Thus, generating sentences would require more demands on the learner for language that is not directly supported by the picture.

**Limitations and Future Research**

This study provided support that the scaffolded approach facilitated Spanish second language vocabulary acquisition by English speakers in recognized word tasks over time and in sentence generation tasks. However, there were several limitations.

Firstly, the vocabulary tests used for pre/posttest and the daily probes had design weaknesses. The tests were written so that 50% of the questions assessed vocabulary knowledge under the scaffolded condition and 50% assessed vocabulary knowledge under the traditional condition. Items within conditions were selected at random, but items between conditions were not intermixed. Daily probes were written in a similar fashion, but the researcher alternated the order of scaffolded and traditional words so that vocabulary of a given condition was not presented first on every probe. Since all of the words of one condition were presented before words of the second, learner fatigue or frustration during testing could have affected results between conditions. An improvement for future studies would be to intermix vocabulary words across conditions.

Study results indicated that at pretest study participants correctly recognized several of the target vocabulary words. This may have been due to the use of cognates as
some vocabulary items or due to poorly designed English multiple choice selections for each Spanish vocabulary item. In addition, pretest results indicate that there was a difference in the number of words correctly identified between conditions. This meant that learners did not start with equal baseline data between conditions at the beginning of the study. In future studies it is recommended that the reliability of Spanish vocabulary test be established through a pilot test in order to eliminate difference in vocabulary knowledge between conditions. In addition, it is recommended that cognates either not be selected as target vocabulary or that their use be balanced between conditions. Cognates can be used as support for communicating meaning of other target words. For instance, if the target word is “tomar” (to take), the researcher could teach that word in the context of “El paciente toma la medicina” (The patient takes the medicine). Thus, the target word “tomar” is supported by 2 cognate words: “el paciente” (patient) and “la medicina” (medicine) in the context of a doctor’s appointment.

This study had a small population of five 10-year old participants, who were on grade level and tested within normal limits for English vocabulary knowledge. Future research is needed to replicate the results with larger populations of different ages, abilite levels, and second language proficiency levels.

Print was an important support used by participants in the traditional condition. Future research is needed to examines the use of print within the scaffolded language learning approach.

This study represents a first attempt to examine the effects of using scaffolded language in a narrative context as a forum for second language learning. The initial results are promising and support natural language learning for older children learning a second language.
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Appendix B

Consent for School Participation

**Project Title:**
The Effectiveness of Contextualization on Second Language Acquisition Using the Structural Discourse Semantic Model

**Performance Site:**
Baton Rouge Center of Visual and Performing Arts

**Investigator:**
The following investigator is available for questions, M-F 9:00am -6:00pm.
Alice Johnson
Graduate Student
Communication Sciences and Disorders Dept.
(225) xxx-xxxx (home)/ (504) xxx-xxxx (cell)

**Purpose of the Study:**
The purpose of this research project is to develop effective methods of teaching Spanish as a second language. The study will compare language acquisition following use of the scaffolded language learning approach and the traditional foreign language instructional approach.

**Inclusion Criteria:**
Children 9 to 12 years of age who are native speakers of English, have not previously been exposed to Spanish, and who demonstrate normal speech, language, and cognitive development.

**Description of the Study:**
Spanish will be taught to 4th or 5th grade students over an 8-week period, 2 days per week. Participants in the study will be recruited from a flier disseminated to the parents by the school. Classes will be offered as part of the school’s after-school enrichment program, and the school will provide classroom space where Spanish classes will be conducted. The study will compare the students’ Spanish language learning using the scaffolded language learning approach and the traditional foreign language instruction approach. In the scaffolded language learning approach, the investigator will model verbal relationships in Spanish, while pointing to appropriate people or objects in a picture. If the child experiences difficulty following the adult model and expressing these verbal relationships, then the investigator will use scaffolding strategies, such as a binary choice, to help the child understand meaning and context. In the traditional foreign language instruction approach, the investigator will use a thematic picture, which includes vocabulary centered on a target theme, such as foods. The examiner will verbally label the vocabulary words pictured, have the child repeat the words heard, and then lead the child in various oral or written exercises to practice the vocabulary in common Spanish sentence patterns. Each approach will be implemented for 20 minutes during 12 sessions over the course of the study. Following administration of each
instruction approach, daily vocabulary and sentence probes will be administered in order to track language development over time. In addition, pretests and Posttests will be administered to assess Spanish and English proficiency and to record any change in language ability during the course of the study.

Benefits:
The children will have the opportunity to learn Spanish, which may prepare some children for further formal language study in middle school. The study may also identify learning strategies to help second language learner better acquire a foreign language.

Risks:
There are no known risks.

Right to Refuse:
Participation is voluntary, and a child will become part of the study only if both child and parent agree to the child’s participation. At any time, either the child may withdraw from the study or the parent may withdraw the child from the study without penalty or loss of any benefit to which they might otherwise be entitled.

Privacy:
The results of this study may be published, but no names or identifying information will be included for publication. The child’s identity will remain confidential unless disclosure is required by law.

Financial Information:
There is no fee for participation in the study nor is there any compensation to the parent or child for participation.

Signature:
The study has been explained to me and all my questions have been addressed. I may direct additional questions regarding the specifics of the study to the investigator. If I have questions about subjects’ rights or other concerns, I can contact Robert C. Mathews, Chairman, Institutional Review Board, (225) 578-8692. I agree to allow my child to participate in the study described above and acknowledge the investigator’s responsibility to provide me with a signed copy of this consent form.

_________________________________   ______________________  
Mr. Mark Richterman       Date
Principal
Baton Rouge Center for Visual & Performing Arts
Appendix C

Parental Permission Form

**Project Title:**
The Effectiveness of Contextualization on Second Language Acquisition Using the Structural Discourse Semantic Model

**Performance Site:**
Baton Rouge Center of Visual and Performing Arts

**Investigator:**
The following investigator is available for questions, M-F 9:00am -6:00pm.
Alice Johnson
Graduate Student
Communication Sciences and Disorders Dept.
(225) xxx-xxxx (home)/ (504) xxx-xxxx (cell)

**Purpose of the Study:**
The purpose of this research project is to develop effective methods of teaching Spanish as a second language. The study will compare language acquisition following use of the scaffolded language learning approach and the traditional foreign language instructional approach.

**Inclusion Criteria:**
Children 9 to 12 years of age who are native speakers of English, have not previously been exposed to Spanish, and who demonstrate normal speech, language, and cognitive development.

**Description of the Study:**
Over a period of 8 weeks, 2 days a week, the investigator will teach Spanish using the scaffolded language learning approach and the traditional foreign language instruction approach. In the scaffolded language learning approach, the investigator will model verbal relationships in Spanish (such as, “the boy chases the butterfly), while pointing to appropriate people or objects in a picture. If the child experiences difficulty following the adult model and expressing these verbal relationships, then the investigator will use scaffolding strategies, such a binary choice, to help the child understand meaning and context. In the traditional foreign language instruction approach, the investigator will use a thematic picture, which includes vocabulary centered around a target theme, such as foods. The examiner will verbally label the vocabulary words pictured, have the child repeat the words heard, and then lead the child in various oral or written exercises to practice the vocabulary in common Spanish sentence patterns. Each approach will be implemented for 20 minutes during 12 sessions over the course of the study. Following administration of each instruction approach, daily vocabulary and sentence probes will be administered in order to track language development over time. In addition, pretests and Posttests will be administered to assess Spanish and English proficiency and to record any change in language ability during the course of the study.
Benefits:
The children will have the opportunity to learn Spanish, which may prepare some children for further formal language study in middle school. The study may also identify learning strategies to help second language learner better acquire a foreign language.

Risks:
There are no known risks.

Right to Refuse:
Participation is voluntary, and a child will become part of the study only if both child and parent agree to the child’s participation. At any time, either the child may withdraw from the study or the parent may withdraw the child from the study without penalty or loss of any benefit to which they might otherwise be entitled.

Privacy:
The results of this study may be published, but no names or identifying information will be included for publication. The child’s identity will remain confidential unless disclosure is required by law.

Financial Information:
There is no fee for participation in the study nor is there any compensation to the parent or child for participation.

Signature:
The study has been explained to me and all my questions have been addressed. I may direct additional questions regarding the specifics of the study to the investigator. If I have questions about subjects’ rights or other concerns, I can contact Robert C. Mathews, Chairman, Institutional Review Board, (225) 578-8692. I agree to allow my child to participate in the study described above and acknowledge the investigator’s responsibility to provide me with a signed copy of this consent form.

Parent’s Signature: ___________________________ Date ___________________________
Appendix D

Child Assent Form

I, __________________________________________________________, agree to be in a study to find ways to help children learn another language. As part of this study, I will learn Spanish in a class. I will learn to say new words in Spanish; I will talk about pictures in Spanish; and I will write in Spanish. There will be no homework, and I do not get a grade for being in this class. But, I can decide to stop being in this study at anytime, and I will not get in trouble.

______________________________________         _____________________
Child’s Signature     Age  Date

______________________________________         _____________________
Witness        Date
Appendix E
Parent Questionnaire

Please answer the following questions about your child. All information will be kept confidential.

Person completing this form: _____________________________
Date: ________________

Relationship to child: _____________________________

IDENTIFICATION

Child’s name: __________________________ Birth date: _______________ Age: ____
Address: _________________________________ Home phone: ______________________
_________________________________ Other phone: ___________________

Parent or Guardian’s name: ________________________________________________

Classroom Teacher’s Name: _____________________________ Grade ______

LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT HISTORY:

• What language is spoken at home?

• Did your child have normal speech and language development?

• Is your child well understood by family, friends, and unfamiliar people?

• Do you question your child’s ability to understand?

• Do you question your child’s ability to express himself?
ACADEMIC HISTORY

- Describe your child’s previous school performance. Has your child ever repeated a grade?

- Describe your child’s current school performance.

- Does your child have a history of a reading delay or disability?

- Does your child have a history of a learning or behavioral disability?

HEALTH

- Do you have any concerns regarding your child’s vision and/or hearing?

- Does your child have any special needs or health concerns?

SECOND LANGUAGE HISTORY

- What is your child’s native language?

- Does your child speak a second language?

- Has your child ever studied or been exposed to Spanish or any other foreign language? If so, please describe and indicate for how long.

- Is your child currently enrolled in a foreign language class?
Appendix F

Vocabulary Test (Sample)

Listen to the Spanish word. Then choose the correct English word, which has the same meaning. Circle your answer.

Example: El sombrero  
   a) house     b) to sit     c) hat     d) above

The correct answer is “C” because a “sombrero” is a hat.

1. el almuerzo  
   a) tree     b) lunch     c) city     d) teacher

2) el pueblo  
   a) town     b) hand     c) blackboard     d) student

3) la tiza  
   a) room     b) to read     c) chalk     d) paper

4) la silla  
   a) man     b) teacher     c) chair     d) book

5) el arroz  
   a) floor     b) clock     c) rice     d) ladder

6) el compañero  
   a) classmate     b) mustache     c) ham     d) city

7) las raíces  
   a) between     b) roots     c) to call     d) in front of

8) la mano  
   a) to carry     b) hand     c) sleeve     d) to run

9) El cielo  
   a) tail     b) tree     c) sky     d) bank

10) comer  
   a) salad     b) where     c) pen     d) to eat
Appendix G

Daily Vocabulary Probe

Listen to the Spanish word. Then choose the correct English word, which has the same meaning. Circle your answer.

Example: El sombrero
a) house      b) to sit      c) hat      d) above

The correct answer is “C” because a “sombrero” is a hat.

1. Los pantalones
   a) sweater  b) shoes  c) dog  d) pants

2. La blusa
   a) picture  b) blouse  c) season  d) grandfather

3. Sobre
   a) over  b) to call  c) man  d) purple

4. El árbol
   a) tail  b) tree  c) sky  d) bank

5. el gato
   a) fur  b) grass  c) cat  d) to walk

6. llevar
   a) to carry  b) hand  c) sleeve  d) to run

7. la rama
   a) skirt  b) ladder  c) branch  d) finger

8. los calcetines
   a) short  b) paws  c) eras  d) socks

9. entre
   a) between  b) roots  c) to call  d) in front of

10. subir
    a) fall  b) to go up  c) eye  d) whiskers

11. la mesa
    a) vest  b) clock  c) table  d) student
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Spanish Word</th>
<th>English Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>el libro</td>
<td>a) book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) ceiling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c) to work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d) pencil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>la tiza</td>
<td>a) room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) to read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c) chalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d) paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>hablar</td>
<td>a) to listen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) pen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c) blackboard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d) to speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>el pupitre</td>
<td>a) desk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) to write</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c) math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d) to sit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>la silla</td>
<td>a) man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c) chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d) book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>el compañero</td>
<td>a) open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) to talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c) classmate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d) teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>el estudiante</td>
<td>a) student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) boy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c) class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d) to read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>el cuaderno</td>
<td>a) calculator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) mustache</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c) lady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d) notebook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>el papel</td>
<td>a) pen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) to stand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c) paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d) cover</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H

Daily Sentence Probe

Write three sentences in Spanish about each picture.

Picture A

1. ___________________________________________________________________

2. ___________________________________________________________________

3. ___________________________________________________________________

Picture B

1. ___________________________________________________________________

2. ___________________________________________________________________

3. ___________________________________________________________________
Appendix I

Target Vocabulary Sets

Set #1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scaffolded Picture:</th>
<th>Traditional vocabulary illustration:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Cat in the tree” theme</td>
<td>School vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spanish Words</strong></td>
<td><strong>English Translation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El árbol</td>
<td>Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La rama</td>
<td>Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El gato</td>
<td>Cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirar</td>
<td>To look at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subir</td>
<td>To climb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llevar</td>
<td>To carry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La escalera</td>
<td>Ladder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los pantalones</td>
<td>Pants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los zapatos</td>
<td>Shoes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El tronco</td>
<td>Tree trunk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El suéter</td>
<td>Blouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los calcetines</td>
<td>Socks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sobre</td>
<td>Over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al lado de</td>
<td>Next to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entre</td>
<td>Between</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enfrente de</td>
<td>In front of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Set #2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scaffolded Picture:</th>
<th>Traditional vocabulary illustration:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Catch the butterfly” theme</td>
<td>Food vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spanish Words</strong></td>
<td><strong>English Translation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La niña/ el niño</td>
<td>Girl/ Boy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La mariposa</td>
<td>Butterfly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La red</td>
<td>Net</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La jarra</td>
<td>Jar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tener</td>
<td>To have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correr</td>
<td>To run</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonreír</td>
<td>To smile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentro</td>
<td>Inside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La tapa</td>
<td>Top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volar</td>
<td>To fly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirar</td>
<td>To look at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agacharse</td>
<td>To bend down</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spanish Words</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
<th>Spanish Word</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El doctor</td>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td>La ciudad</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La enfermera</td>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td>El pueblo</td>
<td>Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La inyección</td>
<td>Injection</td>
<td>El campo</td>
<td>Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La medicina</td>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>Vivir</td>
<td>To live</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El termómetro</td>
<td>Thermometer</td>
<td>Edificio</td>
<td>Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enfermo</td>
<td>Sick</td>
<td>La calle</td>
<td>Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El vestido</td>
<td>Dress</td>
<td>El piso</td>
<td>Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El uniforme</td>
<td>Uniform</td>
<td>Las escaleras</td>
<td>Stairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La piel</td>
<td>Skin</td>
<td>El ascensor</td>
<td>Elevator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La corbata</td>
<td>Tie</td>
<td>La casa</td>
<td>House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El saco</td>
<td>Jacket</td>
<td>La sala</td>
<td>Living room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La varicela</td>
<td>Chicken pox</td>
<td>El comedor</td>
<td>Dining room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La oficina</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>La cocina</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las mangas</td>
<td>Sleeves</td>
<td>El cuarto de baño</td>
<td>Bath room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayudar</td>
<td>To help</td>
<td>El dormitorio</td>
<td>Bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preocupado</td>
<td>Worried</td>
<td>El carro</td>
<td>Car</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
tomar        |To take             |dormir        |To sleep            |
Appendix J

Vocabulary Pictures

1. Scaffolded pictures (Aprcot, 1995)
   1a. Cat in a tree
   1b. Catching a Butterfly
   1c. Doctor’s Appointment

2. Traditional pictures
   2a. School: (Myriam et al, 1996)
   2b. Food: (Myriam et al, 1996)
   2c. Home and Community: (Schmit & Woodford, 1995)
1a. Cat in a Tree
1b. Catching a Butterfly
1c. Doctor’s Appointment
Vocabulario para conversar

la sala de clases

¿Cómo estás?
la pizarra

el profesor
la profesora

el estudiante
el compañero

la estudiante
la compañera

el libro
la mesa

la hoja de papel
el bolígrafo

el pupitre

También necesitas...

¿Cómo se dice ___ en español?
¿Cómo se escribe ___?
Se escribe ___

How do you say ___ in Spanish?
How do you spell ___?
It's spelled ___
2b. Food

comer: (yo) como (tú) comes
la comida
la merienda
más o menos
¿Qué asco!
verdad?
me encanta(n)
to eat: I eat you eat
meal
afternoon snack
more or less, sort of
Yuk! That’s disgusting!
Isn’t that so?, right?
I love (something)
siempre always
nunca never

¿Y qué quiere decir…?
en el desayuno / en el almuerzo / en la cena
prefiero, prefieres

También necesitas...

la sopa de tomate
el pescado
la sopa de verduras
las papas al horno
el pan
las verduras
la sopa de pollo
el bistec
el arroz
el pollo
Vocabulario para conversar

¿Qué te gusta comer?

- As your teacher reads the words aloud, put your finger on the appropriate pictures.
- As your teacher reads the name of a meal aloud, point to a food you like to eat at that meal.
- As your teacher names each food, raise your right hand if you eat it often and your left hand if you seldom eat it.
2c. Home and Community

La familia Castillo vive en un apartamento. Ellos viven en el quinto piso. Ellos suben al quinto piso en el ascensor. No suben por (toman) la escalera.


Note the ordinal numbers (first, second, etc.).

- primer(a) sexto
- segundo séptimo
- tercer(a) octavo
- cuarto noveno
- quinto décimo

Primero and tercero shorten to primer and tercero before a singular masculine noun.

- el tercero piso la tercera calle a la derecha
- el primer piso la primera calle a la izquierda
PALABRAS 1

¿DONDE VIVE?

la ciudad
el pueblo
el edificio
la avenida
la calle
el campo
los suburbios
las afueras
la ciudad
a la izquierda
a la derecha
el quinto piso
el cuarto piso
el tercer piso
el segundo piso
el primer piso
la planta baja
Appendix K

The Situational Discourse Semantic Model

Norris and Hoffman’s Situational Discourse Semantic (SDS) Model (1993) is a guide to maintain whole language environments in intervention settings. It is based on the premise that general understanding is acquired before specific knowledge and that familiar content is learned before the least familiar. The SDS Model recommends that language focus on a central topic and that complexity be controlled according to the learner’s developmental ability. Complexity is measured by situational, discourse, and semantic contexts. The situational context refers to the level of contextualization. An event is “contextual” when objects and actions have concrete references. On the other hand, decontextualized experiences can be inferred from the text or from previous knowledge. Discourse context is the language level on which a person can express himself about a given topic, while semantic context refers to the level of abstraction with which information is communicated.

In this study the situational, discourse, and semantic contexts of language were modified through scaffolding in order to facilitate the second language acquisition of Spanish.
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