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ABSTRACT

This study sought to establish patterns that parents observe during storytelling so as to contribute to children’s literacy outcomes. The objectives included examining the current storytelling patterns and to assess the relationship between the parents’ storytelling patterns with vocabulary development, reading comprehension and reading fluency. Theoretically, this research was based on the narrative paradigm theory, which states that all meaningful communication is in the form of storytelling. This theory was used to examine the effectiveness of the storytelling patterns observed by the parents and how they influence literacy outcomes. The study used experimental, ethnography and correlation research designs. The researcher chose the samples from the five selected rural primary schools of Sironko district in eastern Uganda. A total of four hundred respondents were directly involved in the study. Pearson’s Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (r) was used to establish relationships, while Descriptive Analysis was used for qualitative data. Findings indicate experiment percentage impact points of 64%, 71%, and 57.5% for vocabulary, comprehension and fluency respectively. There was significant relationship between storytelling patterns and: (r = .798, p = .000, sig .000) comprehension (r = .842, p = .05, sig .000) and fluency (r = .758, p = .05 sig .000). In conclusion, it discovered that if parents observed certain patterns in their storytelling practice, children’s literacy competences improve. It was recommended that parents be guided on how to appropriately enrich their storytelling patterns in order to improve children’s literacy outcomes.
CHAPTER ONE  
INTRODUCTION  

1.0 Introduction  
This chapter presents the background to the study, statement of the problem, objectives of the study, significance and scope of the study. The background is presented in three sections; historical, contextual and conceptual perspectives. 

1.1 Background to the study  
1.1.1 Historical perspective  
Literacy is very important to both adults and the young children across the globe. UNESCO (2000) highlights literacy as one of the human rights. Indeed, any basic education to be regarded as good quality should be able to equip the pupils with literacy development for life and further learning. UNESCO (2017) confirms that literate parents are more likely to keep their children healthy, help in the development of literacy among the young children and send their children to schools. Unlike illiterate people, literate individuals are better placed and able to access education and employment opportunities.

UNESCO (2000) shows that although the global literacy rate has increased significantly over the years, literacy development is still low among the young children in most developing nations. The claimed increase in literacy does not take into consideration the rapid world population growth. The statistics also show that the increase is mostly concentrated in developed countries yet there is fast growing population in developing nations. This analysis calls for all stake holders in the sub Saharan region to get involved if the illiteracy trend is to be reversed.
In Uganda, formal literacy development and assessment started with formal education which was introduced by voluntary organizations before the real beginning of colonization (Ssekamwa, 2001). The voluntary groups came to Uganda to spread Christianity but they found societies in Uganda illiterate. The first task was to help Ugandans to read, write and do Arithmetic. However, many Ugandans did not embrace it since it was meant for few groups. Effort to effect the development of literacy grew since 1880s to 1950s during the colonial government which increased the number of schools. In order to improve literacy rates in Uganda, the colonial government appointed the de Bunsen commission in 1952 so as to improve on the education system where literacy could be developed. The Commission recommended a) the expansion of secondary education in order to provide teachers for primary and junior secondary school b) the expansion of facilities for both primary and secondary c) The establishment of new primary schools.

After independence, the Government appointed another commission called the Castle Commission in 1963. Since Education had been accessed by a few Ugandans, the Castle Commission came up with strong emphasis on quality of education for all. Although the concept of literacy was not underpinned, the education for all was highly intended for developing a literate society. From then onwards, literacy was emphasized in order to achieve personal and political liberation; and as a tool for development. Large-scale literacy programs and campaigns began taking place in Uganda but this could not match the growth of literacy development. Literacy in Uganda at Primary six (6) remained below average at 40.15% up to 2013 (EMIS, 2014).

With the rise of the National Resistance Movement (NRM) in 1986, a series of commissions to investigate education situation in the country were put in place. An Education commission known as the Education Policy Review Commission (EPRC), under the chairmanship of Professor Senteza Kajubi was appointed in 1987. This commission set a genesis for the
Universal Primary Education (UPE) in Uganda. Following the Education Policy Review Report, the government formed the White Paper Committee that came out with the Government White Paper on Education published in 1992. The White paper adopted the major recommendations from the EPRC on primary education reform including universalization of basic education. In 1997, UPE was put in place with emphasis on enabling the children to access education. The UPE policy however has been operating with various challenges most notably low literacy levels among the UPE graduates.

Since implementation of UPE, various studies have been carried out to address the low literacy outcomes among the primary graduates in Uganda. Notable among them are; National Assessment of Progress in Education (NAPE), Uwezo (Swahili word meaning “we can”) and Early Grade Reading Assessment (EGRA). These have continuously painted a worrying picture about the children’s reading skills both in the local languages and English. EGRA (2010) reveals that 51% of pupils in Primary two (2) in central region and 82% in Bugisu region cannot read a single word in their mother tongue and English. The recent NAPE (2016) report indicates low levels of literacy achievement. Over 41 % of pupils in primary three (3) in Central Uganda and 75 % in Eastern Uganda have been found below the desirable literacy levels. Sironko District is among the worst performing districts. The best way to turn the unpleasant literacy statistics among school going children is by involving parents meaningfully. In rural areas, parents who take keen interest in developing their children’s literacy are a minority (Ssentanda, 2014). Research shows that the earlier parents become involved in their children’s literacy practices, the more profound the results and longer lasting the effects (Mullis et al., 2004). Uwezo (2015) found that 40% of the parents in Uganda are only involved by way of checking learners’ books rather than engaging in various activities to teaching - learning. Further, studies continue to show that many parents are not aware of the benefits if they get involved in their child’s education at home (DCSF, 2007).
1.1.2 Conceptual perspective

This section explains the key concepts that are essential to the study. The term parent for example has been used to refer to the caregiver or offspring to a certain species. In humans, a parent is a caregiver of a child who is not necessarily a biological father or mother (Rupp and Resslerb, 2009). This study therefore uses the term parent who is not necessarily biological but rather a role model who has been entrusted to the children as they pursue education. These parents tell stories following particular patterns.

A story, according to this study, means a narrative or prose that is told by word of mouth. In Africa, stories are commonly used by the society to transmit history, literature, law and other knowledge across generations without writing. In relation to story, storytelling refers to the act of narrating a story or stories. Storytelling patterns are critical to metalinguistic awareness of the learners of language. A number of studies have provided evidence that literacy can be predicted by metalinguistic awareness (Tong X.L et al., 2011; Zhang et al., 2012; and Yeung, 2011).

Closely, the study conceived patterns as particular activities that a storyteller observes in order to achieve the intended goals. Pattern is used in this study to mean the particular techniques employed before, during and after telling sessions. It is the deliberate and remarkable ways that the storyteller, that is a parent observes in the storytelling session.

The study adopts the definition used by international, regional and national instruments to explain the term children. UNICEF (2011) defines a 'child' as a person below the age of 18. The Committee on Rights of the Child has encouraged State Party to review the age of the children to 16 and increase the level of protection for all children. However, this study uses the age of a child as a person below 18 years. This has been selected since it is the exact age in the 1995 Constitution of Uganda. Further, the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child defines child as a human being below the age of 18 years. Article 2 of the African
Charter defines a child as a human being below the age of 18 years. Article 4 of the African Charter also shows that a child has the right to education, to develop his or her personality, talents and mental and physical abilities to their fullest potential. This education includes the preservation and strengthening of positive African morals, traditional values and cultures. Parents are given responsibilities upon the children; to always act in the best interest of the children (Article 20 of the African Charter). Therefore, these international laws and conventions help to explain the meaning of a child or children, who are referred to as pupils. Early childhood development field regards early childhood as a period of one’s life between 0 to 8 years. For operational purposes a child in this research a person on average 7 years old because the child respondents were selected from primary two.

In order to figure out a connection between oral story tales within the context of the parent – child relationship, it was necessary to reconsider the question of what literacy is and how this can be influenced by patterns of parents’ oral storytelling. Many educators have differing opinions on how to define this concept. Often, literacy is viewed as the ability to read and write, in essence, the knowledge of letters and sounds and how people express themselves. However, most authors, as well as most educators, will agree that literacy is much more involved than simply reading and writing. McLane and McNamee (1990) claim that “Literacy is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon” (p. 2). Clinard (1997) Whose definition the study adapts states that literacy is “the ability to use thinking, speaking, listening, reading, and writing to solve problems; complete tasks; and communicate wants, needs, feelings, and ideas” (p. 3). While the education system in Uganda puts much emphasis on reading early and often as a key to developmental literacy, the skills listed above are testament to the “multiple literacies” that should be included in a conceptualization of children’s literacy.
1.1.3 Contextual perspective

The study was conducted in Sironko District which is located in Eastern Uganda. Whilst various studies have been conducted in Uganda about literacy development, (Parry et al., 2014, Uwezo 2014; 2015; 2016) there is none that concerns parents’ engagement in particular children’s literacy activities. It should be emphasized that whilst story tales are told by parents, information about the patterns they follow is limited. It is when the patterns observed are established that an assessment of how appropriate they are to literacy development can be made. This is the knowledge gap that this study sought to fill so that the parents’ storytelling activity contributes to children’s literacy outcomes.

It is true that most parents in rural areas of Sironko District are illiterate. Therefore, they hardlyly read any written stories but can tell oral stories to their children. Stories are a precursor to literacy because they enrich the child’s vocabulary, advance the child’s comprehension and boost the child’s language fluency. It was from this context that this study was organized so that the story telling process is made vital to literacy development. This was done with the view that if parents are guided on the appropriate patterns of telling the stories, pupils relate the stories at home to those at school.

1.2 Statement of the problem

There is substantial evidence that children in Uganda face challenges in literacy development. In a study by Uwezo (2014) for example, it was revealed that the national literacy proficiency of children in lower primary is at 47%. Findings by Uganda National Examination Board (2017) indicate that 59% of the learners in Sironko do not exhibit the desirable competences in literacy. The learners who lag behind in literacy development in lower primary find difficulty as their schooling continues (EGRA 2010, Uwezo 2014). This leads to increased
school drop outs, class repetition and under development of children’s potentials in different learning areas.

In studies conducted in other parts of the world, specific approaches of how parents can develop children’s literacy outcomes have been identified (Eithne, 2012; Mullis, 2014). Parents meaningfully contribute to literacy outcomes of children. Most of the available studies in Uganda however focus on general parental involvement in children’s learning (Parry et al., 2014; Drajeo, 2015; Uwezo (2013) without focusing on parent’s activities that improve literacy outcomes among their children. Yet, parents” communication activities could be patterned in a way that can enhance children’s literacy. The lack of adequate knowledge on how parents’ storytelling patterns can be enhanced to contribute to children’s literacy outcomes will continually deprive children of a profound force to improve their literacy outcomes. Therefore, the knowledge on how to improve storytelling practice by parents, to enhance children’s literacy propelled this study. The researcher perceived that the failure to engage the parents in the activities of teaching – learning meaningfully is detrimental to the education system. Parents are the first teachers of their children. This study was therefore carried out to establish parents’ storytelling patterns that enhance children’s literacy outcomes.

1.3 Purpose of the study
The purpose of this study was to establish parents” storytelling patterns that enhance children’s literacy outcomes.

1.3.1 Objectives of the study
The specific objectives of this study were to:

i. Examine the current parents” storytelling patterns with children in Sironko district.
ii. Assess the relationship between parents’ storytelling patterns and children’s vocabulary development in Sironko District.

iii. Find the relationship between parents’ storytelling patterns and children’s reading comprehension in Sironko District.

iv. Establish the relationship between parents’ storytelling patterns and children’s reading fluency in Sironko District.

1.4 Research question

Part of this study was guided by the following research question:

What are the current storytelling patterns that parents in Sironko employ when telling stories with their children?

1.5 Research Hypotheses

This study was also guided by the following research hypotheses:

**Ho1:** There is no statistically significant relationship between parent storytelling patterns and children’s vocabulary development at .05 level of significance.

**Ho2:** There is no statistically significant relationship between specific parents’ storytelling patterns reading comprehension at .05 level of significance.

**H3:** There is no statistically significant relationship between parents’ storytelling patterns and children’s fluency at .05 level of significance.

1.5 Scope of the study

1.5.1 Geographical

The study was carried out in five selected primary schools of Sironko District. The schools were selected from rural areas where storytelling is still a concentrated cultural practice by the parents. Sironko district is found in Eastern Uganda; created in 2000 from Mbale District.
It borders Bulambuli District to the North, Kapchorwa and Kween Districts to the North-East, Kenya to the East, Bududa District to the South-East, Mbale District to South-West, and Bukedea District to the West. It is approximately 22 kilometres, by road, north-east of Mbale, the largest city in the Bugisu Region of Uganda.

1.5.2 Content

The study focused on establishing the appropriate patterns of storytelling by parents so that the parents adequately contribute to formal literacy of their children. It was specifically focused on examining the current parents’ storytelling patterns and assessing the relationship between the storytelling patterns and vocabulary development, comprehension and reading fluency. The study conducted an experiment to achieve its purpose. The first stage of the study involved observing the storytelling sessions where the current story sessions were collected. Parents were interviewed on their practices. Each research site school and class had the experimental and control group. Whilst the experimental group was exposed to storytelling with emphasis on particular patterns by parents, the control group parents were urged to continue telling stories following their usual patterns. The experimental group parents were instructed on inclusion of specific patterns in their story sessions. To ensure that experiment plan is followed, the parents did most of the storytelling in designated places for support and observation by the research team. Smaller groups within the experimental group observed specific patterns in their story telling procedure. The study then tested how particular story telling patterns influenced children’s vocabulary, reading comprehension and reading fluency among the experimental group. In order to establish whether there was any influence, scores from pretest and posttests were compared descriptively and by statistical values. The findings of this study are presented in chapter four of this dissertation.
1.5.3 Time

The study will be valid for time period between 2007 and 2020. This is the period when the Universal Primary Education has been at its peak with increased enrolment in primary schools yet with low levels of literacy progress. It also falls within the time frame when the International community has been emphasizing literacy and numeracy development as cardinal goals in education. It is also assumed that by 2020 a follow up study will have been conducted for up to date results. Despite the consideration of 2007 to 2020, the actual study was conducted within four months in Sironko District. This was the period for collecting, analyzing and presenting data.

1.6 Significance of the study

It is hoped that the study enhances parents’ storytelling patterns to improve lower primary children’s literacy abilities in rural schools which in turn can provide school administrators, teachers and other stakeholders with strategies that enhance storytelling.

It is envisaged that the findings will help the school leaders in rural primary schools to be better informed in meeting needs of lower primary children as they plan, write and implement their respective school improvement plans.

This data will add knowledge to all stakeholders who educate lower primary children in rural schools hence, helping to close the gap between urban and rural school learners thus improving the country’s literacy levels.

This study will also enhance the ability of school personnel to improve their communication and outreach programs with parents in encouraging them to become better involved in children’s education.

It is finally hoped that the findings from this study are helpful to school leaders by providing professional development topics that their teachers can utilize to improve the reading
instruction of children. The data also helps school leaders to effectively enrich the learners enrolled in rural schools to improve on their literacy abilities.

1.7 Theoretical Framework
The study was grounded on the Narrative Paradigm Theory (NPT) developed by Walter Fisher (1987). The theory states that all meaningful communication is in the form of storytelling. The study particularly applied the coherence principle. The principle underpins the fact that any content to be communicated effectively can only occur when it makes sense to the listener. This is best achieved when the pattern of communication is coherent. Coherence is the degree of sense making in a narrative. According to the NPT, the effectiveness in delivery of a story is influenced by the structure of the narrative among other factors (Fisher, 1987). Accordingly, the storytelling patterns that the parent deploys determine whether the story is relevant to the child’s literacy development or not. Stories also create a sense of empathy from a cognitive and emotional position to help understand the experiences and world views of others (Lämsä and Sintonen, 2006). The study proposes that the assumptions of NPT match the challenges of story narration between the child and parent. In this sense, the focus is on patterns followed in telling stories as a strategic device to impart vocabulary, facilitate understanding and create an experience with language that propel oral fluency which is applicable in literacy conventions (Cunliffe and Coupland 2002).

1.8 Conceptual Framework
The conceptual framework presented below shows the relationship between the variables and how they work together to make sure that vocabulary, reading comprehension and fluency are developed within the child.
Figure 1.8: The Conceptual framework on parents’ storytelling patterns and vocabulary

In Figure 1.8, the dependent variable is literacy. The literacy components according to this study were vocabulary, comprehension and fluency. On the other hand, the independent variable is storytelling patterns. The storytelling patterns include those before the actual story session e.g. asking guiding questions, telling the story title, guiding the child to predict what the story is about. During the actual storytelling, parents explain new words, sing songs within the story parts and ask the child to predict the next word or event. After telling the story, the parent asks questions, allows the child to ask questions, asks the child to represent the story in a drawing, action and may also ask the child to retell the story. Stories, if told appropriately lead to metalinguistic awareness that is critical to literacy development.

The study identified other variables that would otherwise intervene in the study. These included parents” motivation, the individual differences among children and the influence of the class teaching/learning. These were however controlled by the nature of the study design, i.e. experimental design.
1.9 Definition of operational terms

**Storytelling** refers to the act of telling stories by one person to another or more.

**Storytelling patterns** are those marked, identifiable and deliberate activities or ways that a storyteller (parent) decides to observe when telling a story.

**Parents** refer to adults who assumes the duties of a mother or father to a child or children.

**Literacy** is the ability to use thinking, speaking, listening, reading and writing to solve problems, complex tasks, and communicate wants, needs, feelings, and ideas.

**Literacy outcomes** refer to the literacy results that a child exhibits after being engaged in various experiences, for this case storytelling. Literacy outcomes on this study were confined to vocabulary, comprehension and fluency.

**Vocabulary** refers to the words known or used by a child or group or a set of words compiled from written or oral sentences.

**Comprehension** refers to making meaning of what is viewed, read or heard. Comprehension includes understanding what is expressed outright or implied as well as interpreting what is viewed read or heard by drawing on one”s knowledge and experiences. Comprehension may also involve application and critical examination of the message in terms of intent, rhetorical choices and credibility.

**Fluency** refers to the ability to act (speak, read, write) with ease and accuracy. Research indicates that oral reading fluency is the ability to read text accurately, with sufficient speed, prosody, and expression. It is an essential component of reading because it permits the reader to focus on constructing meaning from the text rather than just decoding words.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction

In order to figure out a connection between oral storytelling within the context of the parent –
child relationship, it is necessary to reconsider literature about parents” oral storytelling
patterns and literacy development among children. This section attempts to review literature
on patterns of storytelling and literacy development among children. The literature is
presented under the four research objectives. It is important to note that a child’s language
begins from home. The parents and other people at home engage children in different tales,
more so story tales. Such tales help to develop children’s” metalinguistic awareness that is
critical to the formal literacy components. The literacy components of interest on this study
are vocabulary, reading comprehension and reading fluency.

2.1 Parents’ storytelling patterns.

According to Burns et al. (1999), “As adults, we sometimes view conversation as a luxury –
an extra in our busy lives, however, for young children whose developing minds are striving
to become literate, talk is essential – the more meaningful and substantive, the better” (p. 36).
The patterns that the parent follows when telling story tales make a difference. Although
episodes of oral storytelling between young children and their parents or other adult
caregivers may begin as non-verbal, journey through cooing and babbling, slowly find
linguistic structure. More researchers are espousing that storytelling serves as an effective
bridge into early literacy (Miller & Mehler, 1994; Phillips, 1999; Ryan, 2000). For example,
Glazer and Burke (1994) stress the importance of a young child retelling a story (after
listening to it), in that it enhances the child"s sensitivity to story structure; and he or she can
remember and comprehend more effectively, which in turn guides the child in creating his or
her own stories. In fact, these authors claim that story retellings can signal acceleration towards literacy. Oral storytelling was presented as a practice with positive emergent literacy outcomes for very young children.

A creative alternative to print-based literacy development is oral storytelling that is shared between parents and young children. Storytelling is clearly a social experience with oral narrative, incorporating linguistic features that display a “sophistication that goes beyond the level of conversation” (Mallan, 1991, p. 4). For this reason storytelling acts as an effective building block easing the journey from oracy to literacy (Phillips, 1999).

During storytelling, children should be allowed to ask questions. To children, the repeated questions attempt to get a story that will give them a context and a culture in a form that makes the answer make sense Howard (1991). In line with Howard, Gray (1997) contends that a child’s question is actually an attempt to get a narrative (story) response from a parent or other caregiver that makes sense at the child’s developmental level. The narrative responses are how children make sense of their lives and develop their views of the world (Gray, 1997). In essence, vocabulary, language skills, and knowledge about the world are acquired during interesting conversations with responsive adults (Burns et al., 1999). The parent should pattern the story to ensure that they are interesting as much as possible. This helps to build and maintain motivation for stories and literacy among children.

According to Heath (1983), parent storytellers have several ways of inviting audience evaluation and interest. They may themselves express an emotional response to the story’s actions; they may have another character or narrator in the story, or they may detail actions and results through direct discourse or sound effects and gestures. All of these methods of calling attention to the story and its telling distinguish the speech event as a story, an occasion for audience and storyteller to interact pleasantly, and not simply to hear an ordinary
recounting of events or actions. It is important that the story should be told in such a way that it relates to the child’s everyday life.

Parents are a child’s first and most significant teachers (Ryan, 2000); their attitude toward reading is a crucial influence on future literacy development. Contemporary researchers are beginning to suggest that the most significant issue we are facing today regarding emergent literacy is not an inability to read, but rather, a lack of interest in reading (Ryan, 2000). This lack of interest has been referred to as aliteracy (Ryan, 2000). During the first months and years of life, children’s experiences with language and literacy can begin to form a basis for their later reading success (Bergin, 2001; Burns et al., 1999). Therefore, vocabulary, language skills, and knowledge about the world are acquired during interesting conversations with responsive adults – most importantly, parents. The key to building motivation as a foundation for emergent literacy is to keep in mind that knowledge about and love for literacy can develop only through experience (Burns et al., 1999; Snow et al., 1998) and these skills grow from “speaking.” In fact, talking with young children appears to be just as significant as reading early and often when discussing possible keys to emergent literacy. Traditionally, formal instruction in reading focused on the development of mastering word recognition and comprehension (Burns et al., 1999; Snow et al., 1998); however, the landscape has grown to include “multiple literacies.” The notion of multiple literacies recognizes that “there are many ways of being and becoming literate and that how literacy develops and how it is used depend on the particular social and cultural setting in which a child learns” (McLane & McNamee, 1990, p. 3). Young children are motivated by personal interest. When given the opportunity to choose their own pathways to literacy, children will be more involved, interested, and motivated to return for more of the same (Burns et al., 1999; Ryan, 2000; Snow et al., 1998). At the same time, researchers are in agreement that “language stands head and shoulders over all other tools as an instrument of learning” (Butler, 1980, p. 3). Young children then need to
be walled by dialogue. Story tale or narrative is a simple practice that builds upon itself. It can be as simple as a good morning song or a question that is regularly asked when a child comes back from school (e.g., “what did you learn at school, Akugana?”)

In unpacking the features associated with how to build a foundation of drive to boost literacy among children, three recommendations for practice emerge from the literature. The first characteristic of building a foundation of motivation is to always remember that oral storytelling must remain fun and enjoyable or the child will lose interest (Phillips, 1999; Ryan, 2000). Indeed, research has shown the most important characteristic for emergent literacy development is enjoyment (Burns et al., 1999; Ryan, 2000; Snow et al., 1998). Further, since 1983, more research has shown that there is a direct correlation between emergent literacy success and a positive attitude toward the activities involved in encouraging literacy development (Ryan, 2000). Oral storytelling should follow the child’s interests, be stopped when the child grows bored, and be presented using interesting and novel methods. The key to the effective implementation of this characteristic of building a foundation of motivation is to begin talking to, singing to, making faces with, and sharing as many experiences with a child as soon as the child is born. It is important to start talking, follow the child’s interests, vary the methods of “storytelling,” know when to stop, and have fun! (Burns et al 1999). Burns et a (1999) further intimates the second characteristic of building a foundation of motivation for emergent literacy is that parents and other adult caregivers are encouraged to engage in oral storytelling as much as possible. Beginning at birth, infants should be “invited” into a conversation every time they are in the company of parents. At first, these episodes of narrative building will take the form of a parent or adult caregiver speaking and making eye contact with the child and the child is encouraged to offer eye contact in return. The nonverbal cues offered by very young children will continue to develop and become more complex as he or she grows and develops, (Burns 1999). Eye contact will
turn to smiles and smiles will turn to cooing and cooing will turn to phonemes and attempted words. From listening comes speaking and through both, come early literacy development (Cramer & Castle, 1994; Ryan, 2000). Therefore, it is important to remember to give young children something to listen for – something that provides an opportunity for engagement. This may include giving guiding questions that he/she will answer after the story. The parent may also tell the child to count the number of times a certain word is mentioned etc. this will encourage listening out for information. While speaking with very young children, Burns et al (1999) encourage parents to vary their vocal tones, ask questions, nod and shake their heads, and model the type of response they wish to receive from their children. Children should also be exposed to as many contexts and experiences as possible, with parents constantly offering dialogue. As the child continues to grow, a call and response can be used to begin early morning stories.

The third characteristic necessary for building a foundation for motivation for emergent literacy is to recognize that emergent literacy encompasses much more than simply reading and writing. It is a multifaceted skill that involves abilities, beliefs, attitudes, expectations, and much more (Ryan, 2000). According to McLane and McNamee (1990): For many children, the beginnings of literacy appear in activities such as pretend play, drawing, conversations about storybook plots and characters, and conversations about the words on street signs or the labels of favorite foods. Such activities make it clear that children are actively trying to use – and to understand and make sense of – reading and writing long before they can actually read and write. As a young child is exploring oral storytelling and other forms of shared verbal and nonverbal interaction, it is important to remember that he or she loves the sound of his or her parents’ voices. Even more, young children like to know that their parents believe in them and their abilities. One way to convey this belief is by having an
attitude toward storytelling that is conducive to providing close, personal attention from someone the child loves.

A child’s interest level affects his or her level of motivation (Ryan, 2000) and “the discovery of a child’s interests is an essential first step in the motivation process” (Thomas & Loring, 1983, p. 40). Parents and other adult caregivers can help young children become motivated to approach emergent literacy by: (1) making oral storytelling interactions (in all forms and variations) fun and interest-based; (2) inviting infants, toddlers, and young children into these interactions as often as possible, using a variety of contexts and levels and involvement; and (3) demonstrating an attitude of belief in a child’s abilities and potential.

A lot of scholars, authorities and authors who have explored storytelling and literacy do not guide parents on appropriate patterns that parents should integrate in their story sessions. Besides, they do not show how if any of the patterns should be sequenced. It is against this background that this study was conducted to examine the patterns that parents exhibit when telling stories with the aim of examining which ones can enhance literacy outcomes.

2.2 Storytelling patterns and Vocabulary

Vocabulary knowledge is a core component in language proficiency and provides much of the basis how learners speak, listen, read and write (Carr, 2005). Snow and Oh (2011) consider it a reliable indicator of early and later literacy outcomes. For normally developing children, vocabulary is highly correlated with other indices of language knowledge. For instance, it is strongly associated with reading comprehension (Hirsh, 2003). Research indicates that listening comprehension is also highly predictive of overall academic success (Jalongo & Li, 2010). Sénéchal, Ouellette and Rodney (2006) point to two important facts in respect of vocabulary. Early individual differences in vocabulary goes some way in explaining variances in children’s success in reading comprehension; there is a positive
relationship between vocabulary growth and phonological awareness, with vocabulary growth seen as resulting in a re-organization of how words are stored in memory.

Neuman (2011) makes a case „for placing vocabulary at the forefront of early literacy instruction”. In recent years there have been calls for more attention to be given to the development of listening skills so that children may be enabled to listen more attentively and extend their vocabularies (The Rose Report, 2006). Nunan (1997) argues, however, that listening is neglected in classrooms because it is regarded as the „Cinderella skill” of language, taking second place to its sister skills of speaking, reading and writing. As much as listening is emphasized here the authors do not tell us whether it is passive or active listening that that benefits the listener more. By listening actively the child would benefit from the clarifications from the communicator who is the story teller. They are able to ask for meaning of new words and thereby enriching their vocabulary.

Neuman (2011) refers to what she terms „the striking differentials in vocabulary between low-income children and their middle-income peers”. By age 3, children from disadvantaged backgrounds hear only about one quarter of the words that their more advantaged peers hear (Hart & Risley, 1995). Neuman(2011), Hart & Risley (1995) research findings are purely from a society that is different from societies in Uganda. In the setting of Sironko though, the children from low income status families equally have opportunities of exposure to the language. They have more time with their parents in the gardens, at the grazing grounds that the high income status families may not since the parents spend most of the time at their formal work places. While with their children the parents then engage their children in story tales.

Contrary to research with children of low income backgrounds in western countries (e.g. Dickinson & Tabors, 2001) which found that, for those children, opportunities to learn new
or rare words were limited, both in the home but also sometimes in the preschool context, it is different with Sironko community. The language community is so rich that the children whether from low or high income status are exposed to words adequately. Community and members of the extended families engage children in various oral tales.

In relation to vocabulary development in early childhood, a striking finding of the EPPE study in England (Sylva et al., 2011) is that three quarters of the educational settings had not made any difference in growth in vocabulary. This prompted the authors to suggest that early education settings need to explore more effective means of supporting oral language development, for instance they suggest through peer play. They also suggest more frequent use of activities such as story discussion, informal discussion and recalling of shared experiences in order to further support important aspects of early literacy. Juel (2006) urges educators to carefully analyze word meanings in text with children.

Harris et al. (2011) suggest that by paying close attention to the ways in which children develop vocabulary and grammatical learning in the first few years of life, educators can learn important strategies for vocabulary development for children (3-8 years). They make some critical observations, for instance, children’s comprehension leads production dramatically in the first year; a responsive adult who points things out in the environment and who honors children’s communicative attempts is very supportive for babies” learning; embedding words in sentences is crucial to illustrate word meaning and influence the learning of grammar. Moving on from the earliest stages, toddlers and young children need to learn relational words such as verbs, adverbs, adjectives and spatial prepositions and these all need attention at the preschool level but, as Harris et al. (2011) observe, as with other aspects of language they are best learned in meaningful contexts and in sentences that are typical of children’s everyday language. According to Harris et al. (2011), a key observation from the literature is that …when young children ask „What is that?“ they are more interested in what
kind of thing it is—that is what its intended function is—than what it is called … vocabulary learning is not about learning words in isolation but about acquiring the concepts for which the words stand.

Informal discussion would appear to offer a particularly good context within which to respond to children’s interest in talking about, naming and learning about their world. Where children’s initial interest is extended in the interaction with the adult and where new and increasingly complex words, language structures and meanings are introduced in interesting and playful ways, then the conditions are favorable for children to develop increasingly complex vocabulary, syntax and grammatical structures, i.e. academic language.

2.3 Storytelling patterns and Comprehension development

Comprehension involves in-the-head processes, which are elusive and largely invisible, and products which are somewhat more visible (Kintsch, 1998). If comprehension is in processes as described by Kintsch, then there should be stages of the processes that require the input that needs certain patterns to trigger them off. (Harrison, 2004; Pearson, 2009) drew elements of comprehension theory together when he described reading comprehension as beginning with the decoding of words, processing of those words in relation to one another to understand the many small ideas in the text, and then both unconsciously and consciously, operating on the ideas in the text and the reader’s response to those ideas, responses that often depend greatly on the prior knowledge of the reader.

In this quotation, Pressley draws together much of the emphases in the research literature on reading comprehension since the late 1970s (ref. Pearson, 2009). Drawing on and extending Pearson’s (2009) use of metaphor (Dwyer, 2010) the reader may be viewed as a builder, a fixer, an assembler, and as a responder. The metaphor of the reader as builder draws on schema theory where the reader draws on prior knowledge to make sense of the text.
(Anderson, 2004). Readers actively draw on prior knowledge to iteratively connect with, sift, refine and organize information to construct meaning from text (Anderson & Pearson, 1984; Pearson et al., 1990). This is where storytelling becomes important. Stories and how they are told enrich the child’s prior knowledge. Readers draw on a range of prior knowledge sources in print-based texts including world knowledge (Anderson & Pearson, 1984), domain and topic knowledge (Alexander, 1992; Alexander et al., 1995), informational text structure knowledge (Armbruster, 1986; Goldman & Rakestraw, 2000), and linguistic knowledge (Anderson, Spiro & Anderson, 1978). These prior knowledge sources are supplemented when reading in an online environment with knowledge of the architecture of online informational text structure knowledge and internet application knowledge.

The reader as fixer (Pearson, 2009) draws on the reader as a met-cognitive, self-regulatory, problem-solver, where the reader operates on ideas within the text and questions the text (Baker & Carter Beall, 2009). The process of generating questions heightens children’s awareness of reading comprehension in a number of ways. Children who generate questions are more active and more involved in the reading process than those who merely answer teacher-generated questions (Singer & Donlon, 1982). Further, asking questions may sensitize the reader to pay selective attention in reading specific paragraphs and integrate information across texts read. The levels of questions asked enable children to build knowledge structures from text. Instruction in generating questions on narrative and informational texts has impacted positively on reading comprehension.

The reader as assembler draws on cognitive models, such as propositional models and cognitive flexibility theoretical models (Spiro, Coulson, Feltovich, & Anderson, 2004). Kintsch for example, suggests that comprehension occurs at the surface, micro level, operating at a lexical and grammatical interpretation of information contained in the text and a text base macro level where the reader processes the surface level of the text with current
reader knowledge and updates and elaborates this model to develop a situational model where the reader transforms the text into knowledge.

The reader as responder draws on reader-response theory where the reader transacts with the text adopting an efferent or aesthetic stance and critical literacy theory (Comber & Simpson, 2001) where the reader assesses the accuracy, believability, currency, trustworthiness, depth, authority and author motive to source, corroborate and integrate information across multiple sources. Reader response, however, does not occur in a vacuum and social perspectives, such as socio-cultural and socio-constructivist theories relate to the reader, the text, the activity and the context within which reading response occurs (Smagorinsky & O’Donnell-Allen, 2000).

Reading strategies and reading skills are at opposite ends of a continuum. Whereas strategies are effortful, deliberate, active, goal directed, conscious and purposeful actions on the part of the reader to construct meaning from text, skills are characterized by automaticity, fluency, effortlessness and effectiveness, often without the explicit conscious control of the reader (Alexander P., 2006). Reading strategies have been described as „skills under consideration” (Paris et al., 1983). Furthermore, it appears that the good reader has the ability to „shift seamlessly” between the automatic uses of a reading skill to the effortful use of a reading strategy.

The literature attests to the fact that cognitive reading strategies can be taught (Duffy et al., 1987) and that strategy instruction leads to a concomitant rise in achievement in reading comprehension (National Reading Panel (NRP), NICHD 2000; Shanahan et al., 2010). Despite the fact that informational text is ubiquitous in society, there is a paucity of informational text in primary schools (Duke, 2000). The literature attests to the importance of the inclusion of a balance of genres, including both narrative and informational texts, from
the earliest grades (Shanahan et al., 2010). Informational texts include domain specific vocabulary to convey concepts. Internal text cues, such as compare/contrast, generalization/example and problem/solution and external cues, such as table of contents, headings, visual images, and graphs may add to the complexity of reading informational texts if the reader is unaware of these text structures and the need to apply suitable skills and strategies in reading them (Kletzien & Dreher, 2004).

Parents can scaffold readers to develop reading skills and strategies by adopting the gradual release of responsibility model (Duke & Pearson, 2002). Initially the teacher takes complete responsibility for demonstrating and modeling a strategy. This is followed by guided practice and a gradual release of responsibility to the child where the teacher scaffolds the development of autonomy within the child, as the child takes responsibility for both activating and monitoring the use of a particular strategy. Strategies should be introduced and mastered singly. However, over time the child should develop a repertoire of strategies which they can independently orchestrate when reading.

In summary, good readers are strategic, motivated and set goals for reading. They are selectively attentive, make conclusions, and incorporate information across texts. They activate and connect with prior knowledge, attend to text structure, visualize, ask questions of the text, determine importance, critically evaluate as they read, retell information, summaries and synthesize as they read. They process text before, during and after reading (Afflerbach, 2009). Strategies can be taught using the gradual release of responsibility model. Comprehension strategies should be developed from the earliest levels of the primary school across a range of genres and modalities (both print and digital).
2.4 Storytelling patterns and fluency development

According to Rasinski et al. (2011), reading fluency is “a characteristic of reading that occurs when readers” cognitive and linguistic systems are developed to the extent that they can read with sufficient accuracy and rate to allow for understanding of texts and reflecting its prosodic features”. Indeed through appropriate story patterns by the tellers, the child’s cognitive and linguistic systems are developed and enriched.

Nichols et al. (2009) suggest that readers first begin to read accurately, then with speed and then incorporate features of spoken language such as grammar and punctuation. In this way fluency can be both a predictor and an outcome. For example, word reading fluency, depending on whether it is measured by speed or accuracy, is thought to predict future reading fluency. In the beginning reader, fluency can be viewed as developmental in nature: it first refers to letter reading, then word reading and finally the reading of phrases, sentences and passages. This pattern replicates the speaking pattern that is oral.

Reading fluency is also greatly influenced by the orthography of the language the reader is learning to read in. It is suggested that beginning readers in regular orthographies develop reading accuracy quickly due to the regular letter sound connection and simple syllabic structure of the language. This is common with most of the Bantu languages like Lumasaaba. The impact of orthography on reading fluency is mainly as a result of the impact of antecedent skills (e.g. phonological awareness), as stated above. The simple letter sound relationships in Lumasaaba mean that beginning readers can quickly learn to read any word using their decoding skills, and have very high word reading accuracy soon after beginning to read. Even children with reading difficulties will achieve high reading accuracy but may not achieve fluency due to the slow speed at which they read. This presents a difficulty with comparing reading fluency across languages as many studies of reading ability measure accuracy or speed rather than accuracy and speed.
Theoretically, as with word decoding, recognition speed and accuracy improve, fluency develops, more cognitive resources become available for processing the meaning of what is being read, and comprehension improves. However, reading fluency is not only a result of word recognition skills, even though it is heavily reliant on them. As described by Nichols et al., (2009), beginning readers learn to read orally with the features of spoken language such as “expression, stress, pitch, and suitable phrasing”. Beginning readers learn these concepts through instruction from their teacher and experience of listening to and reading text. “Thus, fluency helps enable reading comprehension by freeing cognitive resources for interpretation, but it is also implicit in the process of comprehension as it necessarily includes preliminary interpretive steps” (NICHHD, 2000). And so it can be suggested that fluency is both a result of, and contributor to, the development of skilled reading. Thus, some aspects of fluent, expressive reading may depend on a thorough understanding of a text in the first instance. Other aspects—quick and efficient recognition of words and at least some aspects of syntactic parsing—appear to be prerequisites for comprehension.

Reading fluency is thought to be dependent on the development of several different skills. Leppänen et al. (2008) for example stress the importance of decoding skills in early reading development as they provide the basis for automaticity in word recognition and identification. Such decoding skills include letter knowledge, word knowledge, and the ability to name rapidly. Georgiou et al. (2008), in their study of predictors of word decoding and reading fluency across languages varying in orthographic consistency, found that phonological and orthographic processing contributed to reading skills, including fluency, in first and second grade Greek children. Leppänen et al. (2008) in their longitudinal study of Finnish children found that „the best predictor of reading comprehension and reading fluency at the end of grade 4 was letter knowledge at the beginning of kindergarten“'. A similar pattern was found in previous research by the same team in 2006, when they suggested that, at least in regular
orthographic languages, letter knowledge is an important early antecedent skill of reading fluency in the beginning reader.

The relationship between reading fluency and reading comprehension has been described as complex (Pikulski & Chard, 2005). According to Stecker et al (1998) review of fluency research, „The issue of whether fluency is an outgrowth of or a contributor to comprehension is unresolved. There is empirical evidence to support both positions” (p. 300). However, in the end they concluded, „Fluency has been shown to have a „reciprocal relationship” with comprehension, with each fostering the other”. 
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

This chapter presents research methods, the design, the study area, population, and sample size, sampling techniques, methods of data collection, instruments and analysis.

3.1 Research methods

The study utilized both qualitative and quantitative research methods. The quantitative research methods utilized objective measurement and statistical analysis of numeric data to understand and explain phenomena, Ary et al (2002). The quantitative approach helped in the analysis and presentation of numeric data gathered from the experiments (pretest/posttest). Qualitative methods on the other hand helped the researcher to understand the problem from the research participants’ perspective Hobberg (1999). The qualitative approach was used in the presentation of non-numeric data in form of explanations mostly gathered from the interviews.

3.2 Research design

The study integrated a number of designs due to the nature of data gathered and data analysis approaches used. Experimental (pretest, posttest) research design was used to collect data because it was possible to subject the variables on treatment. A correlation research design was also used to establish the relationship between specific parents’ storytelling patterns and literacy development. A correlation research study design was to collect data that helped to describe in quantitative terms the degree to which variables are related. An ethnographic approach was also used to collect the current patterns of storytelling by parents and also during the experiment.
3.3 Location of the study
The study was conducted in rural homes and primary schools in Sironko District. The district is found in Eastern Uganda; created in 2000 from Mbale District. It borders Bulambuli District to the North, Kapchorwa and Kween Districts to the North-East, Kenya to the East, Bududa District to the South-East, Mbale District to South-West, and Bukedea District to the West. It is approximately 22 kilometres, by road, north-east of Mbale, the largest city in the Bugisu Region of Uganda. The dominant language spoken by the people is Lumasaba and therefore, the language of instruction in lower primary.

3.4 Study population
The study targeted parents and pupils as the population of the study and the pupils selected were particularly from primary two. The pupils were selected from the five schools where this study was conducted. The study engaged the pupils being the main recipients of the parents’ story tales and also the ones whose literacy development is the target. In fact, this study was organized for the common advantage of the pupils.

The study also utilized parents of the selected pupils since they form part of the main variable of this study. Besides, it was their input in terms of storytelling that was measured by the pre and posttests.

3.5 Sample size
The sample size for the study was a 400 participants. These included 200 pupils; 100 pupils in control and 100 in experimental groups. The study also involved 200 parents. 100 parents were observed while telling stories in the first phase. It is at this stage that the current patterns were examined. All parents were engaged in telling stories to their children in the second phase of the study.
3.6 Sampling techniques

Purposive and cluster sampling techniques were used for this study in order to select the participants to this study. Purposive sampling was used to select the five primary schools. The purpose was to select rural schools where storytelling patterns are concentrated. The researcher used purposive sampling technique since it cannot go wrong and can easily and judges the extent to which certain respondents would be knowledgeable to the research topic or the objectives.

Cluster random sampling technique was used to select the pupils using the class lists that were availed to the researcher by the primary two teachers of the schools. Random sampling techniques were used to avoid bias in the selection process. Cluster sampling was used to ensure gender balanced sample. Parents were selected purposively. All parents of children in the experimental group were selected. The size of the sample and the sampling techniques which were used to the corresponding groups is presented in Table 3.1 of this section.

Table 3.1: Sample size and techniques

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Sampling technique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learners</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>cluster sampling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Purposive sampling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: primary data; size guided by Krejcie & Morgan 1970 table

Five schools were purposively selected as these were considered located in areas were storytelling is a common cultural practice. The total number of children in the schools was four hundred thirty from which a sample of two hundred children were selected using cluster sampling method. This number was preferred because it is within the statistically
recommended number (Krejcie & Morgan 1970). The parents whose children had been selected were included in the study.

3.7 Research instruments

In order to get the first hand information, primary methods of data collection were used and these included tests (pre-test and post-test), interview guide and observation tools.

3.7.1 Pre-tests and post-tests

Two sets of tests (appendices 1-6) were administered to both the control and experimental groups; before the treatment (pre-test) and after the treatment phase (post-test). Treatment was administered to only the experimental group. The tests administered targeted the literacy components on the study.

3.7.1.1 Vocabulary test

Vocabulary was assessed using five subtasks; identification of pictures, description of activities in pictures, giving of alternative/ opposite words to given words, use of given words in sentences and giving a correct word to complete a sentence. The pictures were adapted from SHRP reading materials and the thematic curriculum resource books, NCDC 2000.

3.7.1.2 Comprehension test

Comprehension test involved listening comprehension and reading comprehension tasks. A story was read to the respondents. The learner was expected to listen to the text and answer orally, questions related to the story. The questions were in the text question (knowledge), comprehension and inferential (in-my-mind question). Twenty seconds were allowed for each response.
For oral passage reading and comprehension, the learner was presented with a passage in the local language. The learner was expected to read correctly and quickly in two minutes. After reading they were asked oral questions up to where they stopped.

The learners were also tested on word and sentence comprehension. The questions were also in the text and in my mind questions. Learners were also tested on picture comprehension. The pictures were adapted from SHRP reading materials. All the tests were written and conducted in Lumasaaba which is the language of instruction in this area.

### 3.7.1.3 Reading fluency tests

The learners were presented with three tasks to test their reading fluency; a list of words, sentences and passage. The read words per minute were counted to work out the reading fluency. The learners were also expected to read the given passage correctly and quickly in two minutes.

### 3.7.2 Observation tools

The research team observed the story telling patterns of the parents. These observations were during the story telling sessions and the observed patterns were noted down with remarks such as strongly observed, weakly observed or not observed. Follow-up questions aimed at understanding why parents observed certain patterns.

### 3.8 Data collection procedure

The researcher first visited the District Education office in order to obtain permission to access the schools. At the district, the list of schools was obtained and the telephone numbers of the five purposively selected schools were obtained.

The first stage of data collection mainly involved identification of the research assistants and respondents. At the schools, the head teachers were informed of the intention of the
researcher and the intended procedure of the study was revealed. The primary two teachers were requested and duly assisted in the research; they were particularly helpful in organizing the pupils. The research assistants were trained on their role, ethics and procedure of the study. Using the class register, forty learners in each of the site schools were selected using systematic sampling method. The selected learners were randomly assigned to two groups; control and experimental groups. Both groups were given a pretest.

The second stage involved the selection of parents and observation of their story telling patterns by the researcher or the research assistants. The selected parents were briefed about the purpose and nature of the study. They were also assured of confidentiality and requested to allow the researcher/ assistant observe as they tell their children stories. The researcher/ assistant observed and took note of the patterns exhibited in the story sessions. The patterns were observed until they were exhausted, i.e. repetitions of patterns observed. The identified patterns were compiled and used with the experimental group. The parents were later engaged in discussions to justify the observed patterns and the information served as the qualitative data.

The last activity in data collection was conducting a post test for both groups and the results were used to establish the relationship between particular storytelling patterns and the literacy components.

3.8 Reliability and validity

3.8.1 Reliability
Reliability refers to the extent to which research findings can be replicated (Merrian 1998). It tests to see whether the results can be the same if the same situation is repeatedly studied over and over again. Reliability of a study majorly lies with the instruments and measures used to collect data. Data in this study was collected using two instruments; tests for the children and
questionnaires for parents. It was therefore necessary that the reliability of both instruments were catered for. To ensure reliability of tests, three measures were used; test retest, use of parallel forms and fairness measures.

3.8.1.1 Parallel forms reliability:
The test items were written parallel to those of Uwezo (2015) pre test and NAPE (2017) for the post test. These are deemed professional and unquestionable tests. The vocabulary, comprehension and fluency items were in line with class themes as stipulated in the Primary two class. The items originally written in English were translated in accordance with the Lumasaaba orthography. Care though was given to the dialect of the area where the study was undertaken. Several centre coordinating tutors were engaged in editing and refining the test items.

3.8.1.2 Fairness:
Fairness of a test refers to its freedom from any kind of bias. The test should be appropriate for all qualified testees irrespective of race, religion, gender, or age. Caution was taken to set items in such a way that they would not disadvantage any respondent or group on any basis other than the examinee’s lack of knowledge the test was intended to measure. The items were particularly reviewed by experienced EGR tutors who had participated in NAPE and Uwezo test administration. Any item that was identified as displaying potential bias or lack of fairness was revised or dropped from further consideration.

3.8.1.3 Test retest reliability
The tests were then piloted by way of test and retesting to check reliability. The test items were administered on two occasions on the same selected sample of 15 learners in the same school but different streams. The reliability of the tests was assessed using the T-Test
statistical analysis method in the SPSS program. The results for both tests are presented in the table 3.2 below.

3.8.2.0 Validity of the Test
Validity refers to the extent to the relevance of the instruments in measuring what it is supposed to measure. Validity refers to whether or not the test measures what it claims to measure. It deals with the question of how research findings match reality (Merrian, 1998).

3.8.2.1 Validity of the tests
As mentioned earlier, the test items used in this study were parallel to those professionally drawn by the known organizations; Uwezo and NAPE. However two measurers were particularly ensured to avoid the threat to construct validity: a) appropriate items were set to cover each construct and b) the language level and terminology used in the test were familiar and to the level of the learners across the groups. More so the language used was the mother tongue of the learners in both groups.

The content validity of the test was established by conducting item analysis. This was done with the assistance of five people who are competent in test item setting. The persons identified vague items and modified them. Finally the content validity of the instrument was computed for the question item sections using the formula adopted from Amin (2005). The results of the analysis are shown in Table 3.2 below.

Table 3. 2: Content Validity Results for the Test questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.853</td>
<td>.852</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.2 shows that the Cronbach’s validity was .852. This means that the test instrument was valid. This is because validity index of above 80 is usually regarded as good (Amin, 2005).

### 3.8.2.3 Reliability of the Test

The reliability of the content in the tests was assessed using the Test Retest method after a pilot study. Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient in the computer SPSS program was used to calculate the reliability. The test-retest results is shown in Tables 3.3.1 and 3.3.2

**Table 3. 3.1 Test-Retest results for the pretest**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Test mean scores</th>
<th>Re-test mean scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>13.90</td>
<td>13.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension</td>
<td>11.40</td>
<td>10.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>10.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table 3.3.1 shows a minimal change between the test and retest mini scores indicating a good reliability of the pretest instrument. The second administration of the tests was done after some adjustments had been made on the tests following identification of errors in them after the first administration of tests.

**Table 3. 3.2 Test-Retest results for the post test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Test scores</th>
<th>Re-test mean scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>13.85</td>
<td>13.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension</td>
<td>12.45</td>
<td>12.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td>10.15</td>
<td>10.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3.2 shows minimal differences between the pretest and retest mean score for all the aspect showing that the post test was valid.
It was also important to ensure that there was internal consistency of the items. This was done to determine the extent to which the content of the questions was consistent in eliciting the same responses when administered at different times to the same group (Amin, 2005). Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficient was used to compute the internal consistency of the instrument for the second administration (See Appendix 10).

The alpha coefficients of the scales were ranging from .828 – .863. This shows that they had a better internal consistency after the second administration. George and Mallery (2003) categorize the rule of thumb of above .800 as good while Osborne and Waters (2002) noted that most authors assume that reliability estimates (Cronbach alphas) of .7-.8 are acceptable.

3.9 Data Analysis

Primary data from the observation guide was collected and later arranged according to the aspects of literacy this study. Descriptive and statistical analyses were used to analyze data. In the case of descriptive analysis, qualitative information was first summarized thematically into tables with their frequencies and percentages.

For the objective one, qualitative data was collected. The data was categorized in themes and analyzed accordingly. Descriptive means of percentages of parents’”patterns were used in triangulation to get the answer for the research question. The commonly used patterns of storytelling were established and examined.

For objectives 2, 3 and 4, null hypotheses were tested using spear man correlation statistical tool. The hypotheses aimed at finding the relationship between specific parents’”storytelling patterns and children’s literacy components. These hypotheses were:

**Ho1:** There is no statistically significant relationship between parent story telling patterns and children’s vocabulary development at .05 level of significance.
**Ho2:** There is no statistically significant relationship between specific parents’ storytelling patterns reading comprehension at .05 level of significance.

**H3:** There is no statistically significant relationship between parents’ storytelling patterns and children’s fluency at .05 level of significance.

### 3.10 Ethical considerations

The researcher received an introductory letter from the University of Kyambogo which was presented to Education department at the district level in Sironko. He was also given another letter seeking the head-teachers of the selected primary schools to cooperate with the researcher during the study. Before carrying out the study, participants were given consent forms which they signed voluntarily to confirm that they were never forced to participate in the study. This could happen after explaining to the participants the academic intention of this study rather than any other purposes.

The researcher also respected the views of the participants and followed procedures that were given by the school administrators. For example, the researcher was requested to administer the treatment in the evenings for a maximum of two hours a day.

Confidentiality was maintained and none of the participants’ names or places was written against the questionnaires. Any information gathered was kept from any persons. The researcher also guarded against plagiarism during the study. In fact the information in this report is the first hand information and from literature that was properly reviewed by the researcher.

### 3.11 Limitations and delimitations of the study

This study was restricted to two hundred children of a P.2 class in five schools in one district in Uganda. One hundred parents were involved in the study. Findings from one district may not be generalized to communities that may have different conditions.
The study also focused on only storytelling patterns yet there other tales by parents that significantly influence children’s literacy development which have not been explored in this study. This study was also limited to three components of literacy yet there are more like phonemic awareness and alphabetic principle which were not part of this study.
CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION, INTERPRETATION AND ANALYSIS

4.0 Introduction
This chapter presents findings, analysis and interpretation. This study aimed at establishing the parents’ storytelling patterns that enhance children’s literacy outcomes in Sironko District; examine the current patterns that parents employ when telling tales to their children; assess the relationship between parents’ storytelling patterns and children’s vocabulary, comprehension and fluency outcomes.

The findings are presented in five sections according to research objectives. These include the demographic information of respondents, presentation of descriptive results by objectives, inferential analysis and then interpretation of findings for each objective. The computer Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) and Excel 2016 programs were used in the analysis.

4.1 Bio Data and Preliminary info analysis

The gender and bio-data and preliminary information are presented both in tabular and graphical analysis of most of the required. The preliminary section includes general information on the storytelling practice by the parents.

4.1.1 Gender of the Parents
The gender of the parents and learners involved in the study was established and is presented in the Figure 4.1 below:
Figure 4.1 Gender of the respondents

Figure 4.1 shows that there were more female parents than male parents who participated in the study. This was because the female parents were more available and willing to participate. Their male counterparts claimed to be busy. The female parents were also found to be the ones who spend most of the time with the children, in the morning before they go to school and in the afternoon when they return from school. However the learner respondents had equal numbers of boys and girls; the composition was 50:50 as illustrated in the figure 4.1 above.

4.1.2 Education Status of the parents

The education status of the parents was established as in the figure 4.2 below:

Source: Primary data

Figure 4.2 Education status of the parents
Figure 4.2 shows that there were more illiterate parents than the educated parents who participated in the study. This is in line with the assumption that the rural population in Uganda is composed more of illiterate parents who were the target of this study. In general however, (140) 70% respondents were illiterate and (60) 30% were literate. This means that there were more illiterate than literate parents in the study. The large illiterate parent population in rural setting has a huge negative influence on their children’s literacy unless the course is reversed through well-structured storytelling patterns.

4.1.3 Marital Status Analysis

The marital status of the parents selected is as presented in the figure 4.2 below:

![Bar chart showing marital status of respondents]

Source: Primary data

Figure 4.3: Marital status of the respondents

Figure 4.2 shows that most parents are married. The married constituted (134) 67 %. On the other hand, those who described themselves as single parents (56) 28% while (6) 3% widowed and (4) 2% described themselves as separated. The marriage status of the parents plays a big role in providing the necessary literacy environment to a child. It was revealed
through discussion that those who are married share roles and therefore some time is left for children’s attention. Most of the married couples had the mothers at home and these revealed to be telling stories to children. On the other hand the separated, single and widowed parents didn’t have enough time for their children for the obvious reason of fending for the home.

4.1.4 Family Background

The family backgrounds of the respondents were established as in the figure 4.3 below:

![Family Background Chart](chart.png)

Source: Primary data

**Figure 4.4 Family background of the respondents**

The figure 4.3 shows that most parents have a monogamous background. It means therefore that the findings on this study are from monogamous homes. Children from extended and polygamous family backgrounds have a richer literacy environment than their counterparts from the monogamous family backgrounds. This is because children from such backgrounds have more chances of being told a story by some of the members of the extended family.

4.1.5 Number of Children Under each parent’s Care

The number of children under each parents care was established as in the table below:
Table 4.1: Number of children under each parent’s care.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of Children Care</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>2.937</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table 4.1 shows that on average there are 4 children under the care of the Parents. The number of children under each parent’s care can determine how much attention the child gets from their parents. Well as one is likely to attract all the attention, many have the share it therefore less attention

4.1.6 Preliminary information

4.1.6.1 Frequency of story tale

How often stories are told to children by the parents or close members of the family was established as summarized in the table below:

Table 4.2 Frequency of storytelling sessions at home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very often</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>200</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table 4.2 shows that most parents sometimes tell stories to their children. These therefore are clear indicators that most parents are not regular in storytelling which in turn deprives children in reinforcement and mastery of the acquired skills, knowledge and values from the storytelling practice.

4.1.6.2 Length of storytelling sessions at home

Parents were asked to select the length of a story session. Their responses are summarized in table 4.3 below:
Table 4.3 Time length of story sessions between parents and their children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How long does a typical story session last</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Minutes</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Minutes</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Minutes</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20 Minutes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>200</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

According to the table above, the majority of the respondents suggested that their story sessions lasted an average of lasted 10 and 15 minutes. These responses hint at the fact that most parents spend a very short time in story telling sessions. Only twenty minutes may not be enough to have an interactive story that enhances literacy aspects.

4.1.6.3 Number of stories known

Parents were asked to select the range of stories they know. Their responses are summarized in table 4.4 below:

Table 4.4 Number of stories that the parents know

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-50</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>200</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data
The table 4.4 shows that the majority of the Respondents knew between 20-50 stories. This therefore means that most of the parents have a sufficient amount of stories. This proves the assumption that the parents know stories which they tell their children.

4.1.6.4 Number of stories shared per session.
Parents were asked the number stories shared at every story session. Their responses are summarized in table 4.5 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

The table 4.5 shows that most parents share only one story per session. This means that the score especially at pretest was based on one story by the parents. This is upon parents reasoning that telling more than one story is boring.

4.2.0 Parents storytelling patterns for children’s’ literacy development
This section sets out to examine the current patterns that parents follow when telling story tales to their children. This section mainly presents the data attained from the observations and discussions made.

By use of an observation tool, the researcher observed stories of the sixty parents. The observed patterns are summarized and recorded in the table 4.6 below.
Table 4.6: Parents’ storytelling patterns frequencies and percentages for children’s vocabulary development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No</th>
<th>Observed Patterns</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tells the title of the story</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tells the story fluently</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Makes story real to the child by relating to his life</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Asks child questions</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Accompanies the story with non-verbal actions</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Asks the child to retell the story</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Listens attentively while child retells the story</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Supports the child as he/she retells the story</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sings or dramatizes story parts</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lets child to identify new words</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Explains new words in the story</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Uses new words in the story</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Explores words (opposites, synonyms)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Encourages child to predict words</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Discusses story title</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Asks prediction questions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Asks in-text and in-my mind questions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Identifies characters</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Encourages fluency in story retells</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Story length is appropriate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** field data
Table 4.6 shows the most observed patterns included telling the title of the story, telling the story fluently, making story real to the child by relating to his life, asking child questions about the story and accompanying the telling with non-verbal actions. It is from the above stories that a list for each component was developed and applied on the experimental group learners. The children’s pretest mean scores on the study were as a contribution of these patterns. These were the patterns that most parents claimed to have learnt from their own parents and teachers. However, the table also shows a number of expected patterns were not included by the parents at all.

4.2.1 Parents’ Story Telling patterns for Vocabulary Development.
Through interview, one parent revealed how he learnt patterns of storytelling in the following words “I do it the way we used to learn new words using the Nile English books with our teacher of primary, (parent from Sironko).” This particular parent began by explaining the words he perceived to be new to his child. He went ahead to use the new words in sentences and asking the child to do likewise.

Those who described themselves as illiterate asserted that they did whatever patterns as an emulation of their parents and grandparents story sessions. Representative of most in this category, one parent noted:

“When I tell a story to my child I very well remember how our grandfather, a renowned village storyteller used to do it and would like to emulate him.”

Surprisingly some would ask the children to retell the story they had heard or previously heard. The rationale for asking a child to retell stories included: ensuring attention, ensuring the child learns to retell stories, checking on pronunciation of words, learning words by most parents.
Most parents strongly asserted that they included whatever patterns deliberately. The major reason advanced for telling stories being to enrich their children’s vocabulary. They strongly believed that story telling helps to enrich children’s vocabulary. This was strongly reiterated during the after observation discussion – parents’ preparation discussions for those who were to take part in the treatment. From the observations some of the pre-storytelling patterns were general clichés; statements that a parent makes to call the attention of the listener and also to start the story. Such included statements like, “Can I tell you my Story?” To which the child would respond “yes please thank you…” then the parent would continue…”Long time ago/...once upon a time....”

Most parents would first tell the title or what the story would be about before beginning to tell the stories. The above beginning already shows how a child is being immersed into vocabulary development and the general language dynamics. A question is posed to which the child responds. One of the parents interviewed noted:

“Stories deal with different areas, themes and topics. When you tell the title, it helps to point out the particular topic that the story will focus on. This is better enforced by having a discussion around the topic of the story,” respondent. source: three parents of Sironko.

Indeed, those parents who told titles of their stories drew closer attention from the listener. Some parents who engaged children in discussions coming from the topic had their discussions having a particular focus.

Some parents asked guiding questions before the actual beginning of the story. The most common questions aimed at listening for particular information, calling for judgment or listening attentively so as to answer the questions that would be asked after. One interviewed parent noted:
“Questions before telling the story help the child to listen out for the information that you purposed them to pick from the story. It captures their attention, enforces comprehension and memory of statements and words.”

The above voice shows that asking guiding questions before telling the story is done purposely by those parents who do it. It was also observed that this particular pattern has more benefits. Above all, it gives the child opportunity to actively participate in the story.

During the storytelling phase, it was also observed that some parents would allow children to interrupt when a new word is mentioned. Some parents would explain the new word there and then. Other parents asked the children to hold their peace and ask when the story ends.

One parent had a different approach. She would pick out the new word herself and ask the children if they knew it, if they did they would be asked to explain it.

Different patterns were used by different parents to explain the new words in the stories. These included defining the word, giving a similar word, providing the opposite or even synonymous words differentiated by sound lengths. Some parents would help the child pronounce the word and even use the word in sentences. One of the parents intimated as below:

“Stories if told rightly help to introduce new words to children. They however need to be introduced in ways that help a child to understand, retain and use them in their day today lives.”

Some parents would ask children to provide the next word or words in a sentence. Parents who employed prediction patterns had their stories appear participative. However these were few.

A few parents used the new words in sentences and asked their children to do the same to show that they understand their meaning.
4.3.1 Current parents’ story telling patterns for children’s Comprehension development

Through observation of storytelling sessions, a number of patterns that enhance comprehension development were noted. From observations a number of patterns were identified as leading towards the development of children’s comprehension. These included making the story more real to the child by relating the story to his / her life, asking children questions about the Story, asking child to retell stories, telling the title of the story before telling the story and accompanying the story with non-verbal actions. The children’s pretest mean scores on the study were as a contribution of these patterns. These were patterns that most parents were able to exhibit in their storytelling practices. All the parents who included the patterns observed justified their inclusion for purposes of enhancing comprehension.

Through interview, one parent noted:

“telling the title of the story helps the child’s prior understanding of what the story will be about,” one parent on the study in Sironko.

As earlier indicated in the summary of the observed patterns, some parents ask questions about the story. One parent who told a moral story asked the children to listen and at the end of the story, tell who was wrong in the story and why. This therefore helps train the children to listen for information which is critical to comprehension and also use their own reasoning to derive moral lessons from the stories. Asked whether she simply targeted moral lessons when she posed those guiding questions, the parent reaffirmed that she targeted comprehension as well. In her own words, the parent intimated thus:

“Guiding questions help to focus the child’s attention to the lesson in the story and the general comprehension of the story,” one parent in Sironko.

She reiterated that every story has a lesson that a listener gets from it.

Similarly some parents asked questions to check children’s comprehension. Most of those who asked questions had their answers in the story. Most of the questions asked were wh-
questions. Two parents attempted to ask in-my mind questions. In-my-mind questions are those questions that require implied knowledge from the story. Such questions require the listener to read between the lines to make inferences. This pattern though, was not included by many parents when telling their stories. However one parent who attempted at in-my – mind question gave the justification below:

“Stories, sentences or even words carry other meaning and messages besides the conveyed literary ones. It is therefore necessary that children are trained to think beyond the said words or sentences so that they probe at the implied meanings,” parent in Sironko.

It was also observed that a good number of parents attempted to make the stories real to the children’s life situation. Story retellings emphasized by some parents also were found to be enriching to the child’s comprehension of the story. Examples were either paralleled with those from the environment or similarities were drawn. For example, nearby mountain, river, forest or mountain would be used to reference the physical features in the stories. On why it is important to make stories real to the child’s life situation, one parent put it thus:

“Some stories are real life in nature; they are informative. They are told to inform and educate the child. Unless they are made real, the message won’t sink into the child,” parent.

4.3.4 Parents’ current Story telling patterns for Reading fluency development

Through the direct observation of the parents” storytelling sessions, a number of patterns that enhance fluency in speech and later reading were noted.

These included saying all words in a sentence or story, telling the story fluently, encouraging the child to retell the story. This means that the children’s pretest fluency scores were based on these patterns and singing songs within the story fluently. The parents exhibited such patterns since they were the only ones they could observe.
Asked to justify the need for fluency when telling stories, most parents affirmed that telling the stories fluently enables comprehension and helps to rule out boredom. It was also noted that such parents in turn expected their children to retell the stories fluently. In the words of one parent who insisted on fluent story retelling she said;

“It’s through fluent retells that the story is understood. If a child can tell a story fluently then even when they are creating their story or even writing them. The speed of thought has to be in agreement with the hand,” parent respondents.

Many parents would also ensure eloquence and the children would be guided to say all the words in the story and pronounce them correctly. To achieve eloquence some parents would demand that the stories are told fast; without repetition of certain words. One parent noted thus,

“Stories are better understood if they are told at the right speed and without unnecessary repetition,” parent.

All the observed parents were clear in their communication that is synonymous words were separated by sound length. The parents eloquently pointed out pairs of such words and insisted that sound length can change meaning completely.

A few of the parents listened to the children attentively as they retold the stories. The biggest number though did not extend their fluency attempts to actual reading.

4.4.1 Parents’ storytelling patterns and children’s vocabulary development.

This objective was set to establish the relationship between parents’ storytelling patterns and children’s vocabulary development in Sironko District. The story telling sessions were observed before the treatment. It was observed that the parents’ story narrations included a maximum of two patterns. These were however raised to include most of the collected patterns for the experimental group. The storytelling patterns included categories like
questioning, predicting, and word exploration. Before telling the story, parents would tell the title and ask children to predict what the story would be about. The predictions would trigger a discussion between the child and a parent.

During the storytelling phase, new words would be identified. The parent and the children would explore family words, tell the opposites of the words, explain the meanings of the new words and use the new words in sentences. This would be done either during the telling or after the story has been told.

The parents told the stories following these patterns before the posttest. The mean obtained from pretest and posttest scores were then used to draw a comparison. The result is summarized in Table 4.7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of patterns</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>Std deviation</th>
<th>No of patterns</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>Std deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P ≤ 2</td>
<td>23.73</td>
<td>6.890</td>
<td>P ≥ 4</td>
<td>28.28</td>
<td>6.74212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7 shows that the children’s mean scores improved with more storytelling patterns included. This finding suggests a difference of +4.55%. This increment is attributed to the treatment. This difference is in line with the parent’s reasoning that they tell stories to enrich children’s vocabulary.

Table 4.7 also shows that the parents observed two or less patterns in their stories. It also shows that parents observed more than four patterns during the treatment period. The parents could not state any patterns that they hold important when telling stories. Many of them are not yet well versed with the various patterns.
The mean scores for the two groups, i.e. the control and experimental groups are represented in figure below:

Source: Primary data

**Figure 4.5 showing average vocabulary scores for the control and experimental groups**

According to figure 4.5 above the mean scores of the pretest were nearly the same. The figure also shows the mean scores for the experimental group is higher than that of control group. It indicates a difference of +4.88% in favor of the experimental group. This incremental difference is attributable to the treatment given to the Experimental Group.

It also shows the post Test mean scores after the treatment is higher than pretest; indicating an impact point of 4.55%. On the other hand, the posttest means score of (23.4) is lower than the pretest Mean score of (23.56); indicating a reduction of 0.16%.

**Comparative analysis of vocabulary pretest and posttest mean scores of the control and experimental groups**
The table indicates a higher posttest comprehension mean (23.7900) than the Pretest vocabulary scores. It also shows a standard deviation of 6.83644 and 4.80716 for the posttest and posttest scores respectively.

The mean difference of the two scores is -4.6900. The probability outcome (t) is -19.222; the degree of statistics (df) is 99 and significance level of .000. Given that the P value is less than the level of significance .05, the null hypothesis is rejected.

4.4.2 Relationship between parents’ storytelling patterns and children’s vocabulary development.

In order to establish if there is a relationship between parents’ storytelling patterns and children’s vocabulary development in Sironko District, the following hypothesis was tested.

Ho1: There is no relationship between parent story telling patterns and children’s vocabulary development at .05 level of significance.

This hypothesis was set to test whether a significant relationship existed between parents” story telling patterns and children’s vocabulary development. The data used in the analysis
include the pretest and posttest scores of the experimental group where stories were told following the patterns identified. From this pair of data, a Pearson Correlation Coefficients was used to test this particular null hypothesis. The result is summarized in Table 4.8 below.

Table 4.8. Correlation between parents’ story patterns and vocabulary Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>patterns</th>
<th>vocabulary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.798**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sig. (2-tailed)</strong></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Correlations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

From Table 4.8 above, Pearson correlation coefficient (r=0.798; p<0.05). This correlation therefore shows a very strong positive correlation between Parents Story Patterns and Vocabulary Scores and the relationship is statistically significant. This means that the relationship between the two variables is not just by chance. The null hypothesis which proposed that there was no statistically significant relationship between parents” storytelling patterns and children’s vocabulary scores was therefore rejected. It was therefore concluded that a statistically significant relationship exists between parents” storytelling patterns and children’s” vocabulary development.

The impact of parents storytelling patterns was determined by \( r^2 \times 100 = (0.798 \times 0.798 \times 100 = 64) \). The impact of parents storytelling patterns on children”s vocabulary was 64%

### 4.5.1 The relationship between parents’ storytelling patterns and children’s comprehension development.

This objective was set to establish the relationship between parents” storytelling patterns and children’s comprehension development in Sironko District. The story telling sessions were
observed before the treatment. It was observed that the parents’ story narrations did not exceed one pattern in one particular story that is aimed at developing children’s comprehension. However, several patterns were recorded among parents. The collected patterns were implemented in the treatment for the experimental group. The storytelling patterns included categories like questioning, predicting, and word exploration. The parents told the stories following these patterns before the posttest. The mean obtained from pretest and posttest scores were obtained. The result is summarized in Table 4.6 as below.

Table 4.9: Number of patterns and mean scores of the pre and post test scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control group Pretest</td>
<td>18.57</td>
<td>5.970</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control group Posttest</td>
<td>19.17</td>
<td>5.394</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental group pretest</td>
<td>18.60</td>
<td>6.574</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental group posttest</td>
<td>24.12</td>
<td>6.344</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9 shows the difference of the between pretest mean scores for the control group and experimental groups as 0.003 which is negligible. This means that that the two groups were at the same level of performance before the treatment. This was so because the learners were assigned to the two groups using a random sampling method.

Table 4.9 also shows the posttest mean score difference between the control and the experimental group and the control group of 4.95 in favor of the experimental group. This means that the experimental group had better comprehension outcomes than the control group. Internally the difference between the pretest and post mean scores of the experimental group was 5.52. This means that the treatment had an impact to children’s comprehension outcome. The positive impact Difference in Scores could be attributed to the Story telling Treatment Patterns imposed on the Experimental Group.

The mean scores for the two groups, i.e. the control and experimental groups are represented in figure 4.6 below:
Figure 4.6 shows average comprehension scores for the control and control group

The figure 4.6 above shows that the bar for the experimental group is higher than that of the control group. Well as the control group had an improvement of 0.6, the experimental group had an improvement of 5.52 percentage points. This means that children who were in the treatment group had a higher improvement than their counterparts in the control group.

Comparative analysis of pretest and posttest mean scores (experimental groups)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest-comp</td>
<td>19.360</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.68507</td>
<td>.46851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest-comp</td>
<td>23.820</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5.06997</td>
<td>.50700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table indicates a higher posttest comprehension mean (23.8200) than the Pretest comprehension scores. It also shows a standard deviation of 5.06997 and 4.68507 for the posttest and posttest scores respectively.
Paired Samples Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest – posttest comp</td>
<td>-4.6900</td>
<td>5.309537</td>
<td>.53046</td>
<td>-19.53353 -17.42647 -34.805</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean difference of the two scores is -4.6900. The probability outcome (t) is -34.42647; the degree of statistics (df) is 99 and significance level of .000. Given that the P value is less than the level of significance .05, the null hypothesis is rejected.

4.5.2 The relationship between parents’ storytelling patterns and children’s comprehension development.

In order to establish if a statistically significant relationship existed between parents’ storytelling patterns and children’s comprehension development in Sironko District, the following hypothesis was tested.

Ho1: There is no significant relationship between parent storytelling patterns and children’s comprehension development at 0.05 level of significance.

This hypothesis was set to test whether a significant relationship existed between parents’ story telling patterns and children’s Comprehension development. The data used in the analysis include the pretest and posttest Comprehension scores of the experimental group where stories were told following the patterns identified. The patterns followed by parents were directly matched to the post scores for each learner in the experimental group. From this pair of data, a Pearson Correlation Coefficients was used to test this particular null hypothesis. The result is summarized in Table 4. 10 below.
Table 4.10. Correlation between parents’ story patterns and comprehension Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>patterns</th>
<th>correlation</th>
<th>comprehension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.842 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.10 above shows a Pearson correlation coefficient of $r = .842$; sig (p=0.000 < (0.05).

This correlation shows a very strong positive Correlation between parents’ story patterns and comprehension Scores and the relationship is statistically significant. This means that the relationship between the two variables is not just by chance. The null hypothesis which proposed that there was no statistically significant relationship between parents’ storytelling patterns and children’s comprehension scores was therefore rejected. It was therefore concluded that a statistically significant relationship exists between parents’ storytelling patterns and children’s comprehension development. The impact of parents storytelling patterns was determined by $r^2 \times 100 = (0.842 \times 0.842 \times 100 = 71)$. The impact of parents’ storytelling patterns on the experimental group was at 71%.

4.6.1: The relationship between parents’ storytelling patterns and children’s reading fluency in Sironko District.

This objective was set to establish the relationship between parents’ storytelling patterns and children’s reading fluency in Sironko District. Observation of storytelling sessions before the treatment revealed that the parents’ story narrations did not exceed one pattern in one particular story that aimed at developing children’s reading for fluency. However, the different patterns were gathered from the different parents. These included: a) retelling of stories according to expected speed, b) Some stories would be punctuated with songs, for
example, a character would sing for the river to give way, sing for a rock to open or even sing for its young ones. The parents would sing eloquently. The collected patterns were implemented in the treatment for the experimental group. This treatment was conducted regularly for a month. Meanwhile the children in the control group had the status quo of story sessions with their parents as usual. Both groups were given a post test. The mean obtained from pretest and posttest scores were obtained. The result is summarized in Table 4.11.

Table 4.11: Mean scores of the pretest and posttests fluency Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive Statistics (experimental and control group)</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control group Pretest</td>
<td>14.06</td>
<td>4.311</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control group Posttest</td>
<td>14.23</td>
<td>4.275</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental group pretest</td>
<td>14.08</td>
<td>5.763</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental group posttest</td>
<td>15.78</td>
<td>5.016</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.11 shows a minimal pretest mean score difference of 0.02 percentage points between the control and experimental groups. This means that both groups had an equal level of performance before the treatment was administered to the experimental group. It also shows a difference of 0.17 percentage points in gain for the posttest score of the control group. Table 4.11 also shows an improvement of 1.7 percentage mean score in favor of the post test result for the experimental group. The improvement is attributable to the treatment.

The mean scores for the two groups, i.e. the control and experimental groups are represented in figure 4.7 below:
Figure 4.7: Illustrating the fluency scores for the control and experimental groups.

The figure above shows the mean scores of the control and experimental groups at nearly an equal level of performance. This validated the sampling technique that produced nearly homogenous groups before the treatment was applied to the experimental group. It helped to compare the post test scores for the two groups. The figure also helps to compare the posttest mean scores or the control and experimental groups. It indicates a higher score for the experimental group. This means that the treatment had a difference of 1.55 percentage points for the experimental when compared to the control group.

T test comparison of the pretest ant posttest Fluency means scores (experimental group)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Samples Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre fluency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post fluency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The T-test means score table indicates a higher mean for the post test (10.1500) as compared to the Pretest test fluency scores (8.1400). it also shows a higher standard deviation of 2.61068 and 2.54265 for posttest and pretest scores respectively.
The comparison of the mean scores for the two test scores was further analysed and findings are presented in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Samples Test</th>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1 Pretest Flue – Posttest Flue</td>
<td>-2.0100</td>
<td>1.21850</td>
<td>.12185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean difference of the two scores is -2.0100. The probability outcome (t) is -16.496; the degree of statistics (df) is 99 and significance level of .000. Given that the P value is less than the level of significance .05, the null hypothesis is rejected.

4.6.2: The relationship between parents’ storytelling patterns and children’s reading fluency development.

In establishing if a statistically significant relationship existed between parents’ storytelling patterns and children’s reading fluency development in Sironko District, the following hypothesis was tested.

Ho1: There is no significant relationship between parent story telling patterns and children’s reading fluency development at .05 level of significance.

This hypothesis was set to test whether a significant relationship existed between parents’ story telling patterns and children’s reading fluency. The data used in the analysis include the pretest and posttest scores of the experimental group where stories were told following the patterns identified. The patterns followed by parents were directly matched to the post scores for each learner in the experimental group. From this pair of data, a Pearson Correlation Coefficients was used to test this particular null hypothesis. The result is summarized in Table 4.12 below.
Table 4.12. Correlation between parents’ story patterns and fluency Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>patterns</th>
<th>fluency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.758**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 4.12 above shows a Pearson correlation coefficient of $r = .758^*$, sig (0.00 < (0.00) $p = .005$. This correlation shows a very strong positive Correlation between children’s reading fluency and parents’ storytelling patterns indicating the relationship is statistically significant. This means that the relationship between the two variables is not just by chance. The null hypothesis which proposed that there was no statistically significant relationship between parents’ storytelling patterns and children’s fluency scores was therefore rejected. It was therefore concluded that a statistically significant relationship exists between parents’ storytelling patterns and children’s reading fluency. Using the established correlation above, the impact was determined as $r^2 \times 100 = (0.758 \times 0.758 \times 100 = 57.5)$. The impact of the parents’ storytelling patterns was 57.5%.
CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 Introduction
This chapter presents the discussion of the study findings and conclusions drawn from them. The chapter also presents recommendations that different stakeholders can adopt to improve parents’ storytelling patterns so that they influence literacy positively. Finally, the chapter has suggestions for further research that other scholars can utilize to improve literacy outcomes among children in Uganda.

5.1.1 Discussion
This objective was set to examine the patterns that parents follow when sharing storytelling patterns with children. The preliminary findings indeed established that all parents have time to engage their children in oral storytelling patterns. The revelation by parents that they engage children in storytelling patterns however is not supported by the performance levels as seen in the various subsequent findings of Uwezo(2005;2007;2010,) EGRA(2015) NAPE(2016; 2017 ) and the pretest scores of learners engaged in this study. That is why it was necessary that the storytelling patterns be examined to see whether they are appropriate or not. By understanding how the storytelling patterns are conducted, the researcher would examine whether such patterns are appropriate to the development of literacy components or not. The discussion is presented for objective one is presented below:

5.1.2 Objective 1: To examine the current patterns that parents follow when sharing storytelling patterns with children
The findings reveal that most parents tell stories. It was also found out that parents in Sironko observe different patterns in their storytelling practice. Some parents observed certain patterns deliberately to attain certain aspects in the children while others simply told stories as a cultural practice. It was found that most parents who identified themselves as illiterate
told stories naturally; didn’t considering context let alone the nature of the stories. Harris et al (2011) observed that words and other aspects of language are best learned in meaningful contexts and in sentences that are typical of children’s everyday language. However the study findings reveal that most parents do not use the new words in sentences (context). If words are not used in meaningful sentences then children can hardly understand them let alone increase on their vocabulary. Harris et al (2011) further asserts that embalming words in sentences are crucial to illustrate word meaning and influence the learning of grammar. Storytelling patterns provide this opportunity but yet parents need to identify the new words and use them in sentences for comprehension and vocabulary enhancement.

The findings also reveal that some parents do not allow children to ask questions from the story. This does not only deprive the child from clarifying his/her own perceived ideas but also denies the child further comprehension and word building. Hariss et al (2011) illustrated that …when young children ask ,What is that?”, they are more interested in what kind of thing it is—that is what its intended function is—than what it is called … vocabulary learning is not about learning words in isolation but about acquiring the concepts for which the words stand.

On vocabulary development, patterns like: (a) using word families, (b) giving opposites, (c) using morpheme to differentiate between words, or (d) asking children to predict the next words while telling stories were observed by some parents. Indeed parents who were observed including these patterns in their storytelling patterns rightly state they help to enrich children’s vocabulary. “One parent respond stated, by exploring word families, giving opposites, using predictions and bringing up word differences in itself exposes a child to meaningful word acquisition,” parent respondent. This assertion rightly carries the guidance by DES(2011) on patterns for enhancing children’s vocabulary. Findings though indicate that most parents did not include these patterns when telling stories to their children. By not using the above appropriate practices in the story, the storytelling patterns then miss the
opportunity to enhance children’s vocabulary. This is in line with Sylva et al., (2011) who asserted that three quarters of the educational settings had not made any difference in growth in vocabulary. Juel (2006) urges educators to carefully analyze word meanings in text with children yet the research findings on this study indicate a missed opportunity by parents to do so.

The findings reveal that parents either deliberately or by chance include one or two patterns that enhance children’s comprehension. The patterns observed included questioning, unraveling of the plot, making the story more real to the learner and encouraging story retelling. Parents most especially those who described themselves as literate were seen asking questions before and after the storytelling sessions. These intimated that they did it for comprehension purposes. One parent observed, “There is no way you can tell whether your story has been understood unless you ask questions.” Afflerbach (2009) asserts recommends that questions should be asked of the text to assess comprehension. By asking questions regularly, the listener is trained in self-questioning as they listen to stories Baker & Carter B., (2009). The process of generating questions heightens children’s awareness of reading comprehension in a number of ways. Children who generate questions are more involved in the reading process, Singer & Donlon, (1982).

Another pattern that parents exhibited was encouraging children to retell the stories heard. Although some parents said they did it to train their children in the storytelling practice, the pattern actually has a lot of benefits to literacy development generally. Glazer and Burke (1994) stress the importance of a young child retelling a story (after listening to it), stating that it enhances the child’s sensitivity to story structure; and he or she can remember and comprehend more effectively, which in turn guides the child in creating his or her own stories. In fact, these authors claim that story retellings can signal acceleration towards literacy. The study findings reveal 58.3% of the parents including asking a child to retell
stories. It also showed a big percentage didn’t ask their children to retell the stories. Such findings show that although parents tell stories, they miss out the practices that would otherwise enhance children’s literacy.

EGR model currently being implemented in Ugandan primary schools stipulates patterns for the teacher that parents can integrate in their story telling activity. Indeed some parents observed them in their storytelling sessions. Some of these were included in the treatment. These include predictions, asking questions, identifying characters, setting and the conflict in the story. Such help to enhance comprehension among children.

The findings also reveal a number of patterns are included in parents’ storytelling practice that if consistently implemented, help develop the children’s oral fluency and consequently reading fluency. These included parents own fluency in storytelling, using sound length to differentiate synonymous words as well as saying all the words in the story. Much as these are oral and may seem detached from the reading fluency itself, it should be noted that these practices enrich the child’s orthography and general features of language such as pitch, tone and intonation that are crucial in reading fluency. Ransinki (2011) asserts that reading fluency is heavily influenced by the orthography of the language the reader is learning to read. Differentiating synonymous words, fluency in oral storytelling and ability to say all the words in sentences and story enhance orthography immensely. Nichols et al., (2009) write that beginning readers learn to read orally with the features of spoken language such as expression, stress, pitch and suitable phrasing.

5.2.0 Discussion
To determine the relationship between parents’ storytelling patterns and children’s vocabulary development, children were selected and assigned to two groups; the experimental and control group. Both groups were given a pretest to establish their level in
vocabulary. The experimental group was subjected to a treatment were parents told stories including the collected patterns. Both groups were then given a posttest to assess if there was any influence of the storytelling patterns by parents on the experimental group. The scores were analyzed descriptively and statistically. The discussion is presented in the section 5.2.1 below:

5.2.1 Objective 2: To assess the relationship between Parents’ storytelling patterns and children’s vocabulary development.

The findings on this study showed statistically that the parents’ tales had a significant influence on children’s vocabulary at a correlation coefficient ($r=0.935; p<0.01$). This finding is in line with the studies of Tong X.L et al., 2011; Zhang et al., 2012; that found that parents’ storytelling practice had a significant influence on children’s vocabulary development. This is also in line with the parents’ reasons for telling stories to their children. Most of them intimated to telling stories so as to enrich children’s vocabulary.

It should however be noted that the influence of parents’ storytelling patterns on children’s literacy outcomes is dependent on the quality of interactions between the child and the parent. The storytelling patterns should provide a conversation that is meaningful and substantive, Burns et al. (1999). It explains why children on the control group whose parents simply narrated stories did not register any positive achievement in the post test. The few patterns observed in the first phase of the study explain the low pretest mean scores for both groups.

5.3.0 Discussion

To determine the influence of storytelling patterns by parents, children were selected and assigned to two groups; the experimental and control group. Both groups were given a pretest to establish their level in reading comprehension. The experimental group was subjected to a treatment were parents told stories following prescribed patterns. Both groups were then given a posttest to assess if there was any influence of the storytelling patterns by parents on
the experimental group. The scores were analyzed descriptively and statistically. The discussion presented in section 5.3.1 below:

5.3.1 Objective 3: To find the relationship between parents’ storytelling patterns and children’s comprehension.

The findings on this study found statistically that the parents’ storytelling patterns had a significant influence on children’s vocabulary (correlation coefficient of $r = .894$; sig (p=0.000 < (0.01).

This finding is in line with the studies of Ljalba 2014; Mullis R.L., 2004, that intimate that storytelling enhances comprehension. This finding also confirms one of the reasons for telling stories to children by the parents. Most of the parents whose story sessions were observed asserted that they tell stories to boost their children’s comprehension.

It was found that parents included patterns like questioning, story retelling and story plot unraveling. These formed the treatment that resulted into an impact in the performance of the experimental group.

Despite the fact that the findings indicate positive impact points on comprehension by particular comprehension patterns, most parents do not observe them according to the findings through the observations. This explains the low pretest scores for both groups. Most parents did not deliberately observe many patterns to ensure comprehension. They were simply telling stories for entertainment and as a pass on culture. Most parents in the discussions could not relate stories with formal school business. One parent stated thus, “there is no way our stories contribute to schooling in the formal schools.” She could not believe that teachers tell stories in the schools. This shows a disconnection between the school and family setting yet if the two institutions collaborated the benefits would be immense, Bromfeiner (1986).
Where deliberate patterns are missing in the storytelling practice by parents, the stories do not benefit children’s comprehension significantly. This is confirmed by the pretest results of both the control and experimental groups in all the study sites on this study. For storytelling to have a positive impact on children’s comprehension, more patterns need to be observed by the parents. Crystal C. (2013) stresses the importance of questioning before, during and after the story has been told. Glazer and Burke (1994) also emphasize story retell being beneficial to children’s comprehension. The type of questions stipulated by research triangle international (RTI) in Uganda primary schools can be easily adapted by the parents.

5.4.0 Discussion
To determine the influence of storytelling patterns by parents, children were selected and assigned to two groups; the experimental and control group. Both groups were given a test to establish their level in reading fluency. The experimental group was subjected to a treatment were parents told stories following prescribed patterns. Both groups were then given a posttest to assess if there was any influence of the storytelling patterns by parents on the experimental group. The scores were analyzed descriptively and statistically.

5.4.1 Objective 4: To establish the relationship between parents’ storytelling patterns and children’s reading fluency development.

The pretest and posttest mean scores of the experimental group on this study indicated zero impact points attributed to the treatment. However the impact can be seen if a comparison is drawn between the control group pretest and posttest score difference. Well as the control group score remained constant, the posttest score for the control group actually dropped. This trend could be explained by other factors that dug into the post test scores of both groups.

It was found statistically that the parents’ tales had a significant influence on children’s vocabulary. This finding is in line with the studies of Tong X.L et al., 2011; Ljalba 2014; Mullis R.L., 2004 who assert that parents’ storytelling patterns positively influence children’s
literacy development. Their findings, just like this study do not show how exactly the story patterns contribute directly to reading fluency. It can only be well explained by Tong X.L et al., (2011) who attributes stories to metalinguistic awareness that is critical to literacy components like fluency. Researchers (Miller & Mehler, 1994; Phillips, 1999; Ryan, 2000) indeed regard storytelling as an effective bridge into early literacy.

5.5 Conclusion
Parents in Uganda engage their children in storytelling patterns nearly on a daily basis. However the current patterns followed do not contribute significantly to children’s literacy. The storytelling patterns however if enhanced with appropriately relevant patterns can contribute significantly to children’s literacy outcomes.

According to Burns et al. (1999), “As adults, we sometimes view conversation as a luxury – an extra in our busy lives for young children whose developing minds are striving to become literate, talk is essential – the more meaningful and substantive, the better” (p. 36). Although episodes of oral storytelling between young children and their parents or other adult caregivers may begin as nonverbal, journey through cooing and babbling, they slowly find linguistic structure. Glazer and Burke (1994) stress the importance of a young child retelling a story (after listening to it), in that it enhances the child’s sensitivity to story structure; and he or she can remember and comprehend more effectively, which in turn guides the child in creating his or her own stories. The same researchers assert that story retellings can signal acceleration towards literacy. This study finding in fact shows that parents irrespective of their education status have the potential to significantly contribute to their children’s formal literacy outcomes through storytelling patterns. Encouraging parents to read with their children will always remain a powerful tool in the development of literacy. However, as this study illustrates, there are other, perhaps equally as powerful means through which children can be helped to better their literacy outcomes.
5.5 Recommendations to parents and other caregivers

Based on the findings in this research summary, there are a number of recommendations for parents and other caregivers to consider regarding oral storytelling interactions between parents and young children.

Parents can use storytelling as a pathway to emergent literacy in many different ways. The most important thing to remember perhaps is the importance of avoiding behaviors that may encourage the development of illiteracy or a lack of interest in reading. In an effort to do this, parents and other caregivers should help their children develop a foundation of motivation on which to build early literacy development. Following a child’s interests and making shared talk interactions fun and enjoyable is an excellent start. Parents can also take advantage of everyday situations and offer opportunities for “conversation” as many times as possible each day, being careful to monitor a child for boredom or saturation with the activity. Finally, parents should remain aware of the impact that their beliefs, attitudes, and expectations for their child can have on oral storytelling events. A belief that the child will succeed and demonstrating an attitude of involvement, interest, and enjoyment can extend each oral storytelling event or episode.

Additionally, parents can develop an awareness of how powerful the home environment is for sharing stories with their children. The safety and support found in this environment is paramount and provides a perfect opportunity for young children to ask questions, develop stories, act out stories, and seek additional experiences outside the home. Parents also serve as their child’s primary role models for literate behavior. Just as a child who observes a parent reading is more likely to emulate the behavior, a child who listens to his or her parents sharing stories, responding to one another, and using verbal and nonverbal messages that match is more likely to learn to do the same. Parents should take on the roles of directors and monitors during oral storytelling so that children are not pushed to levels of boredom or
overexcitement. Finally, parents should remain aware of how the way in which they express belief in their child and act on that belief can positively impact each and every oral storytelling interaction.

Storytelling with young children has significant potential for fostering the type of language development that is linked to literacy. Dickinson and Tabors (2001) show how joint attention of children and adult on the picture/text provides opportunities for the adult to extend the child’s language and to encourage the use of complex language. This includes explanations, definitions, and descriptions. It also includes talk about past experiences, predicting and making inferences.

Interactive, reflective conversation patterns during storytelling can impact on the ways in which children think and the ways in which they use language. A major purpose of discussion between parents and children about a story is to develop children’s ability to make sense of and respond to decontextualized language (McKeown & Beck, 2006, p. 287). Supporting children to make meaning from the story is to focus them on important story ideas and encourage them to reflect on these. Engaging children in interactive discussion about the text should be the key goal for the parent educator. However, the talk must engage children in talking about their understandings and ideas about the story that they are constructing and co-constructing „as the story is being told” (McKeown & Beck, 2006).

In engaging with an adult in co-constructive storytelling, children are linguistically challenged as well as being intellectually challenged. The study recommends the following key patterns when telling stories: The key patterns involved should include:

• having an extended discussion before beginning to tell the story

• using dramatic techniques as appropriate
• modeling good language use, recasting children’s contributions as appropriate

• showing the pictures and discussing them

• encouraging the child to use new vocabulary and new words

• expanding on the child’s contributions as appropriate

• encouraging the child to extend their contributions

The study recommends that in order to co-construct meaning with children the parent should:

• Direct the child’s attention to aspects of the story.

• Stop several times to help the child to understand the plot and the characters.

• Pick up on cues indicating a lack of understanding of the plot or other aspects of the story.

• Encourage the child to connect the story to their own experiences.

• Encourage the child to make predictions that require him/her to link understanding to personal experiences.

• Encourage the child to project his/her feelings onto the characters in the story.

• Encourage the child to explore and explain motives and behaviors of the characters in the text.

• Elicit emotional reactions from the child.

• Use questions to check understandings and to assist the child to begin to understand the meaning.

• Use follow-up questions. Respond to the child’s questions, especially when related to the story.
• Elaborate on the topic and give interesting information as appropriate.

• Aiming to stay with a particular point for several conversational turns i.e. establishing an extended discourse.

Harris et al. (2011) offer six principles of vocabulary learning which according to them can fill the gap which has been observed in relation to pedagogical principles for teaching vocabulary to young children. The principles of word learning are:

• Children learn the words that they hear the most.

• Children learn words for things and events that interest them.

• Interactive and responsive contexts, rather than passive contexts, favor vocabulary learning.

• Children learn words best in meaningful contexts.

• Children need clear information about word meaning.

• Vocabulary learning and grammatical development are reciprocal processes.

The study also recommends that the school head teachers and teachers need to appreciate the potential of parents to enhance children’s literacy. They need to guide them on the appropriate patterns. There is also need for working together for instance teachers could communicate the themes of the week so that parents tell related stories.

Additionally, teachers could provide children with opportunity and time to retell the stories heard from their homes. This will encourage children to listen attentively, ensure they get all clarifications from the parents since they will know that they have to retell stories with authority.
5.6 Suggestions for Further Research

This study established some research gaps that can be filled by other researchers. First and foremost, this study targeted three of the five aspects of literacy. This therefore means that there are other important aspects that must be assessed in order to enhance literacy development in totality. This presents a gap for other interested researchers to start from.

This study was conducted in one district of Uganda and the findings generalized to other parts of the country. There is need for another study to be carried out in other districts to establish the how parents can contribute to enhancing children’s literacy outcomes nationally.

This study was based parents’ storytelling patterns as an entry point to improving the children’s literacy outcomes. Stories are just one of the many ways that parents communicate with children on everyday life. This study did not look at parents’ use other tales and children’s literacy. It is therefore important for another study to be carried out focusing on the use of other tales by parents and their relationship with literacy outcomes.
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Appendix 1: Parent data sheet

A: BIO-DATA

1. Which of the following best describes your education?
   • Literate b) Illiterate

2. If literate, state the level of education
   • Primary level b) Secondary level d) Tertiary

3. State your marital status
   • Single b) Married c) Single mother / Father e) Separated

4. State the nature of the family background
   • Monogamous family b) Polygamous family c) Extended family

5. State the number of children upon your care ......................................................

6. State the position of birth of the pupil under this study (e.g., first born, second born, etc.)
   ........................................................................................................................................

7. Do you find difficulties in providing the scholastic materials to the pupil?
   • Yes b) No

9. Do you normally check pupils” book whenever he/she returns from school?
   • Yes b) No

B: Preliminary information

During a typical week, how often do you engage in the following activities?

Never (1) Sometimes (2) Often (3) Very Often 4 Daily (5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I teach my child how to print words</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I teach my child how to read words</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please circle the response that best describes you and your child’s experiences.

3. How often do you or another family member tell your child a story?

Never (1) Seldom (2) Sometimes (3) Often (4) Very often (5)
4. If you have already begun regularly telling stories to your child, at what age did you start?

5. How many minutes did you or another family member tell a story to your child yesterday?
   Zero minutes (1) 5 minutes (2) 10 minutes (3) 15 minutes (4) 20 minutes (5) More than 20 minutes (6)

6. Approximately how many stories do you know?
   0-20 (1) 20-50 (2) 50-100 (3) 100-200 (4) over 200 (5)

7. Approximately how many story picture books do you have in your home for your child’s use?
   0-20 (1) 20-50 (2) 50-100 (3) 100-200 (4) Over 200 (5)

8. How often do you go to the library with your child?
   Never (1) Seldom (2) Sometimes (3) Often (4) Very often (5)

9. How long does a typical story session last?
   Zero minutes (1) 5 minutes (2) 10 minutes (3) 15 minutes (4) 20 minutes (5) More than 20 minutes (6)

10. How many stories do you usually share at each time you and your child tell stories?
Appendix 2: Story observation Guide

Aim:........................................................................................................................................

Observation venue:................................................................................................................

Date:.........................Time started......................Time ended......................

Story teller.................................Child...........................

Story title..............................................................................................................................

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>s.no</th>
<th>Pattern observed</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Justification for the observed patterns (ask accordingly)........................................................................................................................
.........................................................................................................................................................
## APPENDIX 3: Validity and Reliability of the research Instruments

### Item-Total Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Squared Multiple Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Touch the picture which matches the „word“</td>
<td>41.3000</td>
<td>571.274</td>
<td>.450</td>
<td></td>
<td>.848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>give another word or group of words with the same meaning</td>
<td>39.8000</td>
<td>494.274</td>
<td>.770</td>
<td></td>
<td>.828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>give a word which is opposite</td>
<td>38.9000</td>
<td>431.989</td>
<td>.625</td>
<td></td>
<td>.845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>give a single word for the underlined group of words</td>
<td>41.5000</td>
<td>553.316</td>
<td>.721</td>
<td></td>
<td>.842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use the given word in a sentence to show that you know its meaning.</td>
<td>41.4000</td>
<td>590.358</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td></td>
<td>.858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word comprehension</td>
<td>41.5500</td>
<td>567.103</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td></td>
<td>.848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence comprehension oral task</td>
<td>40.0500</td>
<td>601.418</td>
<td>-.053</td>
<td></td>
<td>.860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture comprehension</td>
<td>40.4500</td>
<td>613.629</td>
<td>-.269</td>
<td></td>
<td>.863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forty words to read</td>
<td>41.3000</td>
<td>571.274</td>
<td>.450</td>
<td></td>
<td>.848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentences to read (right speed(1), all words in the sentence read well(1) with tone and intonation</td>
<td>39.8000</td>
<td>494.274</td>
<td>.770</td>
<td></td>
<td>.828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture naming</td>
<td>38.9000</td>
<td>431.989</td>
<td>.625</td>
<td></td>
<td>.845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>give another word or group of words with the same meaning:</td>
<td>41.5000</td>
<td>553.316</td>
<td>.721</td>
<td></td>
<td>.842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>give the plural form</td>
<td>41.4000</td>
<td>590.358</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td></td>
<td>.858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For each of the words/ phrases in 1 to 10, explain the meaning:</td>
<td>41.5500</td>
<td>567.103</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td></td>
<td>.848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence comprehension</td>
<td>39.8000</td>
<td>494.274</td>
<td>.770</td>
<td></td>
<td>.828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word reading fluency</td>
<td>39.8000</td>
<td>494.274</td>
<td>.770</td>
<td></td>
<td>.828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence reading fluency</td>
<td>39.8000</td>
<td>494.274</td>
<td>.770</td>
<td></td>
<td>.828</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4: pilot tests results vocabulary, comprehension and fluency results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nos.</th>
<th>Comprehension</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Fluency</th>
<th>Re-test results (%)</th>
<th>Frequency =15 (post-test)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test scores (Frequency =15) pre-test
## Appendix 5: Score Data Sheets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respond</th>
<th>Vocab_Pre</th>
<th>Comp_Pre</th>
<th>Fluency_Pre</th>
<th>Vocab_Pos</th>
<th>Comp_Pos</th>
<th>Fluency_Pos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 6 Pre-test

VOCABULARY

[This is NOT a timed task]

Here is a sheet of paper with pictures. I will read the 'words' matching the pictures. Touch the picture which matches the 'word' I am going to read to you.

Scoring guide

Pupil touches a correct picture [1 mark], Pupil touches a wrong picture[0 mark] No response [0 mark] Pupil does self correction 0.5 mark

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Hornet" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.2</td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Bowl" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.3</td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Glass" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.4</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Car" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.5</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Monkey" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.6</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Elderly Person" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.7</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Man with a Stick" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.8</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Man with a Stick" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.9</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Man Running" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.6</td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/150" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.7</td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/150" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.8</td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/150" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.9</td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/150" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.0</td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/150" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For each of the words 4.3.1- 4.4.0 give another word or group of words with the same meaning

- ingubo
- libokye
- chikopo
- bulili

- yakamisa
- niina
- likekele
- muungo

- kamitye
- iwafubo

For each of the words in 4.5 to 4.6 give a word which is opposite

- Umuseza
- Ingaki
- Kyibofu
- Kyibaalayi

- Yeza
- Umukana
- Umuleyi
- Kyilo

- imali
- umulayi
- yingila
- yikala

- yinyuka
- umukelema
- umunyangu

- alikuuseka
- umusilu
- bbaabba

- umusakulu
- idwaya
- inzowu
For each of sentences 4.8.1 to 4.9.0 give a single word for the underlined group of words:

4.0.1 Kwozile **mukyifo hesi batundila era bagula bibiitu.**
4.0.2 Imuduyile **hesi zikafu zigona.**
4.0.3 Baabana **babasalikha lunaku lwonyene** beezele.
4.0.4 Baamudiyile ngali **kutusa moya** kungoko inzibe.
4.0.5 Umukaana wa Masaaba **aboneka bulayi naabi.**
4.0.6 inzowu yawe **bajifunilemo** mitwalo kyinaana.
4.0.7 Naduyile ngabazile **kudimisa zisolo mukyigona.**
4.0.8 Imbusi yeffe **yeletele** bumeme budatu
4.0.9 Atulile butulingo **ngakawo umufujilile da.**
1.9.0 Babaana basubilwa kuba **bawuliliza nikukola**
**byesibabalomela kukola.**

For each of the words 4.9.1 – 5.0.0 use the given word in a sentence to show that you know its meaning:

4.9.1 aagaana
4.9.2 wonkyisilike
4.9.3 yeeda
4.9.4 agobola
4.9.5 kumezi

4.9.6 kwimba
4.9.7 kudaha
4.9.8 wanakayima
4.9.9 sonyiha
5.0.0 enyene
Appendix 7
Pre test: Comprehension test

a) Word comprehension (explain each of the following words = each correctly explained word is 2mark)

1. Ligujje
2. Wonasilike
3. Ligombolola
4. Zingano
5. Lulwanda
6. Liifuluma
7. Kuulota
8. Ingoma
9. Isebeele
10. Nakalondo

b) Sentence comprehension oral task (for each of the sentences answer the questions about it)

1. Ingoko yimikile mukyisisa.
   a) Kyina kyimikile mukyisisa?
   b) Wambasa lwakyina ingoko yimikile mukyisisa?

2. Basomi bosi chalelo baliingo
   a) Basomi benga baalingo chalelo?
   b) Chiina chijila basomi baleka kuza kusomelo da?

   a) Nanu ulikuza kukanisa?
   b) Wambasa kyiina kyilikumuyila kukanisa?
4. **Guga akuganikizagila zingano bulilunaku.**
   a) Guga akukolizagila kyiina bulilunaku?
   b) Wambasa lwokyiina bamulanga bati guga?

5. **Masolo alikweya lulwanyi.**
   a) Nanu ulikweya lulwanyi?
   b) Lwokyiina eya lulwanyi?
   c) **Passage comprehension**

   Here is a short story in Lumasaaba. I want you to read it aloud, quickly but carefully. When you have finished, I will ask you some questions about what you have read. When I say ‘start’ read the story as best as you can. I will keep quiet and listen to you. Have you understood?

   **Basaale balaayi**


   Namunyu wabugula inyama wadima nayo Mukasaaka kakaba kupiho.

   Adyaaga inyama mangu manu ajimalaawo. Kakodyo kewe kabakukolele nenga waaswa waanyiga naabi.

   Busaale bwawe bwaafe lunakuulwo.

   Kwama lwo bulimudwele azakumenya kulwewe.
Questions:
1. Mutwe gwelugano luno guli gutye?
2. Baasale babili mulugano luno babalango batyena?
3. Kyiina kyikubulila chiti bano babezaga baasale?
4. Baaza hena kuyiga?
5. Waaswa ita kyiina?
6. Lwakyiina namunyu agobola ngaluyile?
7. Namunyu akolela waaswa kakodyo kyiina?
8. Lwakyiina waaswa inyama yamugwako?
9. Naanu wesi unenya lwekufwa kwebusaale ate lwokyiina?
10. Magesi kyiina gesi wamdibele ngowa babili bano?

d) **Reading comprehension**

**INSTRUCTIONS TO A LEARNER**

Here is a short story in Lumasaba. I want you to read it aloud and carefully. When you have finished, you will answer the questions below it in full sentences. You will be allowed to read twice or three times for you to understand.

**Lugoosi mukyiisinza kyefwe**

Gumwesi gubitile, habawo kampeyini mukyiisinza kyefwe. Babatu babili bimika ku kyifwo kya nakyizolongo we kyiisinza (L.C 1). Nga khutobola khukyili kubawo da, RDC wategekha ipate. Walanga bulimutu mukyiisinza. Wagabila bulimutu itisyaati nga baronakho bati, “ingana lugoosi”.

Bulimutu wagigwata wasuubiza khulinda lugoosi mukyisela kye khulonda.

**Biitebo**

1. Kampeyini yaba li?
2. Benga bemika kukyifwo kya nakyizolongo?
3. Lwakyina RDC arona bilomo “ingaana Lugoosi” kutosyaati?
4. Kyiina kyesi kuyiga mu lugaano luno?
5. Wambasa lwacina cili cilayi babatu kulinda lugoosi?
6. Lwokyina babatu ngabagobole ingo babuliko balilwana bawe?
7. Bulimutu akolezaga kyina ngamalile kuduma kagoka kewe?
8. Babasigla hebadumila kalulu baaba batyena?
9. Beesi balonda bebitisa batyeena?
10. Bino byabezagako mukyisinza kyowo?
e) Picture comprehension

Look at the picture below and answer questions about it:

a) Lugano luno luli kunaanu? [identifies all the characters = 2 marks]

b) Lugano luno luli mukyifo kyiina? [identifies the setting = 2 marks]

c) Lugano luno luli munganga kyiina? [identifies the time/season = 2 marks]

d) Kyiina kyiili kukolekana mulugano luno? [gives a logical and consistent narration = 4 marks]
Appendix Reading fluency

Pre-test (Timed tasks)

[This is a timed task] This section is about fluency.

a) Forty words to read (expected time 120 seconds+ 40 marks per word correctly read)

- isawu
- gusaala
- ligidini
- kukwinyaha
- kudima
- lugaano
- kyikapo
- wonanzofu
- lihasi
- umulosi
- lusisi
- lusiisi
- zinyende
- zisusisi
- wonkyisilike
- naamunyu
- liyombo
- kyeyelo
- dima
- kukwaga
- akyina
- adaha
- kwaseka
- basilabusili
b) **Sentences to read (right speed (1), all words in the sentence read well(1) with tone and intonation(1) = 3marks)**

1. Namataka, yezahano mangu!
2. Za undetele hano: isepikyi, kyijiko, mugango nikiyibiiti.
3. Mayi akutumile kyiina?
4. Sawa ngazolele zibili ukezaano da.
5. Bbabba weewe amulomelati, “kengana busilusilu bwe-sukola bwo da!”
6. Lwokyiina kogana bakutumako?
8. Masaaba alikuza kwayisa gamakyese gewe imubimbi.
9. Imbadwile nga balikwinyaha bwinyahi.
c) **Passages to read (at the elapse of 60 seconds, stop the reader and mark where they are at. Every word read is 1 mark)**

Appendix.... post test

VOCABULARY

a) Picture naming

[This is NOT a timed task]

Here is a sheet of paper with pictures. I will read the ‘words’ matching the pictures. Touch the picture which matches the ‘word’ I am going to read to you.

Scoring guide

Pupil touches a correct picture [1 mark], Pupil touches a wrong picture [0 mark] No response [0 mark] Pupil does self correction 0.5 mark

pictures

(Hut, Bunch of bananas, Local knife, tree, tortoise, dancing, fire, river, sleeping, cutting, climbing, Hen brooding, hiding, carrying firewood, Elephant, Witch doctor, digging, bird, family, village, sweep, latrine, fat, pig, walking, duckling, mosquito, lamp, mortar, bananas, riding, path, rat, fish, plates, plate, goats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1</td>
<td>![Image of Hut]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.2</td>
<td>![Image of Bunch of Bananas]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b) **Word families**

For each of the words 4.3.1- 4.4.0 give another word or group of words with the same meaning: [each correct word = 1mark]

Kyifo, umwana, zisolo, ligesa, itebe, umunefu, kyambaso, kwikoya, isambo, asinga

c) **Word plurals**

For each of the words in 4.5 to 4.6 give the plural form: [each correct word = 1mk]

Umwana, libbondi, imoni, kyiigele, kyitabo, umukaana, inzu, iwunwa, mugunda, kyikyaalo

d) I have ten Lumasaaba words here with me on these cards. I will show them to you, one by one as you:

- Read the word.
- Use the word in a sentence to show that you know its meaning.

wakyelewele, kusangaala, lugoosi, wiikisa, bazowa liigumba umukaana, muguunda, kulwaanyi, luusuku

**Assessment guidelines:**

**M2:** Successfully uses the vocabulary correctly

**M1:** uses the vocabulary but not eloquently
APPENDIX 8
POST-TEST – Reading comprehension

a) Word/phrase comprehension

For each of the words/phrases in 1 to 10, explain the meaning:

1. Kuzowazowana
2. Liibimba
3. Kuheza heza
4. Kwilisa lisa
5. Kusanyalala
6. Kukwimba
7. Lihaasi
8. Imubimbi
9. Guusolo
10. lubaale
a) Sentence comprehension

Read each of sentences 1 – 5 and answer the questions:

1. Ikyiminiyo igona mumadote.
   i) Kyina chigona mumadote?  
   ii) Wambasa lwakina ichiminiyo igona mumadote?

2. Wanangwe aadya imbusi ya Guga.
   i) Kyina kyikyadya imbusi ya guga?  
   ii) Wambasa lwakyina ngwe yadya imbusi?

3. Umwana umulayi ayeda bakyatu.

   i) Binanu bibabilayi muungo?  
   ii) Lwakyina bisaala bibabilayi mungo?

5. Naduya Nambozo ngalikwisagilila zinyinyi mezi.
   i) Naanu webwduya ngalikwisagilala zinyilila mezi?  
   ii) Wambaasa lwakyina zinyinyi bazisagilila mezi?
b) Picture comprehension

Look at the picture below and answer questions about it:

1. Lugano luno luli kunaanu? [identifies all the characters = 2 marks]
2. Lugano luno luli mukyifo kyiina? [identifies the setting = 2 marks]
3. Lugano luno luli munganga kyiina? [identifies the time/season = 2 marks]
4. Kyiina kyiili kukolekana mulugano luno? [gives a logical and consistent narration = 4 marks]
c) LISTENING PASSAGE READING

Listening comprehension Assessment (administered individually)

This section is about listening comprehension. The child will be asked comprehension questions after listening to the short story. The learner will write (or draw) their answers on a piece of paper. The paper will be collected for assessment.

INSTRUCTIONS TO THE LEARNER

Here is a short story in Lumasaaba. I want you to listen attentively as I read. When I finish, I will ask you some questions about what you have heard. Have you understood?


Bireebo.

1. Naanu uli kuganika mulugaano?
2. Maayi wewe bamulanga batinanu?
3. Nanu ulima madoote ni nabudama?
4. Mayi akulisila nabukubo wahe?
5. Katale kaba zinaku kyina?
6. Lwakyiina mayi akulisa nabuukobo?
7. Wambasa lwakyiina papa alima wa’ya ni tsingafu?

8. Kaatale kaba zinaku kyina?

9. Kaatale niyo kyiina?

10. Wambasa lwakyina maayi asobolesa kugulisa nabukubo wewe paka amalawo yesi buli lunaku?

d) READING COMPREHENSION

This section is about reading comprehension. The learner is expected to read and answer the questions correctly.

INSTRUCTIONS TO A LEARNER

Here is a short story in Lumasaba. I want you to read it aloud and carefully. When you have finished, you will answer the questions below it in full sentences. You will be allowed to read twice or three times for you to understand.

Lunaku ludwela naduya umulekeeli wekyibina kye kabili nga likuganika hesibekyibina kyinyowa nga bakyili kuze’ngo kudya kyegumusi da.

Abalomela ti, "nga muze’ngo oba mweza kusomelo, mujenda delo adwena ob bablyi babili hajila babatu babi batye kabakola bugosi. Alomata nga habelehe kyibi kyosi kyikukolekele ko oba kumusale wowo, bulila basali bowo oba umulekeli wowo mangu.

Babaana baza ingo babula babulila basali bawebyesi umulekeeli abalomeele. Baasali basangala nabi lwekuba balekeeli bafayo kubana bawe.
Biteebbo

1. Umulegeeli niyo naanu?
2. Umulegeeli haba’li kuganika nibananu?
3. Umulegeeli abawa magesi kyina?
4. Abalomela ati bakole batyena ngahabelewo kyihangafu kumusaale oba banyene?
5. Lwokyina basaali baasangaala?
6. Lwokyina ubulila umusaali oba umulegeeli nga habelewo kyigosi?
7. Wambasa batu babi bakola babaana bibi kyina?
8. Waambasa lwokyiina baatu baabi batya babaana ngabali babili babili?
9. Baatu baabi bafaana batyena?
10. Lugano luno luli kukiyiina?
Appendex 9:  
Post Test; reading fluency; 

Post-test (Timed tasks)

[This is a timed task] This section is about fluency. 

a) Word reading fluency; 
here are words for you to read; i will expect you to read them in two minutes. At the elapse of two minutes i will stop you and mark where you have stopped.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>wakyelewele</th>
<th>kusangaala</th>
<th>lugoosi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wiikisa</td>
<td>bazowa</td>
<td>babili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khunaba</td>
<td>bakeka</td>
<td>tsisolo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>umulimi</td>
<td>umulai</td>
<td>nabukubo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mabondi</td>
<td>nabudama</td>
<td>bigaali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunakhu</td>
<td>ludwela</td>
<td>zikobe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>muguunda</td>
<td>Zadya</td>
<td>mapondi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b) **Sentence reading fluency**

**Sentences to read (right speed (1), all words in the-sentence read well(1) with tone and intonation(1) = 3marks)**

1. Maayi alikuninanina ingaaji hegumugunda.
2. Inziile kwiduuka naagula : maayido, buto, buufu, mugaanda, sukaali, majaani ni gumugaati.
4. Iwe bukulanga bati naanu?
5. Yeeza kuze fesi kusomelo.
6. Bagulisila hena zimwanyi?
7. Yeza wikale hasi mangu!
8. Induyile Nabuzaale ni Nambozo nga balikuyomba.
9. Lwokubili ikaze mukatele inguleyo kyiteteyi.
10. Maayi ni bbabba baazile kuulima

c) Text reading

[This is a timed task]. This section is about reading correctly with tone and intonation in a timely manner. The time given for this exercise is 5 minutes. Upon elapse of 5 minutes the child is stopped and where he/she has reached marked off for assessment.

Wamono ni Gidudu baama Inalondo. Babaana be zi’ngo zino zombi bali ni zisambo zindayi lwekhuba basaali baabwe be bufunisi.


Batangirisi be diini nabo banywesa khukambilila khu bye kimisilo. Bino nga byakukoleka lugoosi lwelawo. Babaatu bilinda, limenya lyaka.