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Executive Summary

We undertook a weight of evidence review of the research evidence of the pedagogical strategies that are most effective in supporting early language development and communication for children aged 2 to 5. The review process itself was iterative as we engaged with the Manor Park Talks team to both refine the review focus and ensure that the implications for practice could be translated in a clear and coherent manner.

We know from existing research that language development during the preschool years is associated with other domains of cognitive development and later educational attainment (Law et al, 2017). We also know from research that the development of communication skills is mediated by the environment that children are exposed to in and outside the home (Weigel et al., 2007). Understanding the quality of engagement and input that children receive during the early formative years is therefore vital in supporting positive language development.

For this review, 4,081 journal titles published between 2008 and 2018 were searched and retrieved, of which 348 were selected as possible studies for inclusion. After removing duplicate titles, 311 titles were kept and searched for the full articles for further review. Abstracts were then reviewed and 181 articles were retained for full review. A qualitative thematic analysis was used to synthesise and code the 181 articles according to three main themes: contextual and organizational supports, managing interactions and instructional focus. Taking a participatory approach to the review, the research and practice team jointly identified ‘managing interactions and conversational responsiveness’ as a priority area and further refined the review focus. From this, a final 72 items were coded and analysed according to the Weight of Evidence (WOE) protocol to address the question: *What strategies for managing interactions with young children are associated with positive outcomes in teacher practices and children’s early communication and language development?*

The findings showed variable but promising effects on children’s outcomes through the use of targeted pedagogical strategies for supporting language and communication development in early years settings. In sum, the findings revealed that:
• The extent of professional development is a crucial determinant of the overall impact on young children’s language and communication development.

• The evidence also shows the importance of maximising children’s potential by engaging them in rich and socially meaningful interactions, and with practitioners providing emotional support which can significantly enhance their linguistic productivity.

• The density, diversity, and duration of language experience matters. In other words, hearing many words of varying complexity over prolonged periods of time and repeated in many different contexts is of vital importance.

• Adults must carefully reflect on their roles as conversation partners. The adult has a vital role to play in:
  o Modelling language structures and conversational ‘norms’
  o Scaffolding the child’s attempts to communicate
  o Listening to the child’s attempts to engage in conversation and responding to their lead
  o And the creation of spaces in adult directed activities and child led activities (like play) to create a space for joint engagement.
Introduction

Aims of the Project

Manor Park Talks is a project based on the development of an educational intervention programme to improve the outcomes of disadvantaged two-year olds accessing free early education entitlement in Manor Park, Newham. The intervention is based on the Every Child a Talker (ECaT) programme and aims to ‘create pedagogical change in the settings through a set of core strategies that practitioners can be trained to deliver’ (Educational Endowment Foundation, 2019). The ECAT programme has been widely used since it was introduced in 2008 (Department for Children, Schools and Families, 2009). The research reported in this document will review the evidence base to inform the intervention in order to enhance the professional development of local teachers and practitioners. The purpose of this review, therefore, is to:

- Provide a synopsis of the documentary analysis of published literature which provides evidence based pedagogical strategies that can be used to support young children’s language and communication.

The specific aim of this review was to review the recent empirical evidence available since 2008 about effective strategies to support early language development and communication for children aged 2 – 5. The initial review question was:

- **What strategies are associated with positive outcomes in teacher practices and children’s early communication and language development?**

To provide our project partners with the opportunity to start to implement and trial some practices while we conducted the full review we first summarised key approaches with empirical evidence of efficacy from a recent review ‘Early Language Development: Needs, Provision, and Intervention for Preschool Children From Socio-Economically Disadvantaged Backgrounds’ (Law et al., 2017). From this summary, the Manor Park Talks team produced a poster for practitioners (see Appendix A) to support use of the approaches.

It should be noted that the search of the literature narrowed in scope as the project partners identified that they intended on focusing on the first strategy on the poster, conversational responsiveness and managing interactions, as the key focus of the project as a means to support young children’s language and communication. The refined review question then became:
- What strategies for managing interactions with young children are associated with positive outcomes in teacher practices and children’s early communication and language development?

A second poster was produced that supported this focus (see Appendix B).

**Method**

**Search of the Literature**

We conducted a systematic literature review, using rapid evidence assessment (REA) techniques and a weight of evidence review suggested by Cordingley in Basma and Savage (2017). A wide search of the literature documenting search number, date of search, database, source selected and restrictions, and key search terms was conducted. We used EBSCOHOST UK, SCOPUS, and Web of Science to search ERIC, British Education Index, Child Development and Adolescent Studies, and Teacher Reference Centre. On EBSCOHOST UK we restricted our search to abstract only. With Scopus we restricted our search to title, abstract, and key word. Using Web of Science, we searched topics only. Our key search terms were: early language intervention, language and communication, and early language development.

The search was restricted to articles published between 2008 and 2018, published in peer-reviewed journals only, and written in English. When using the search terms ‘language and communication’ the search was restricted to ‘early childhood education’ given the broad scope of the term. When searching the Teacher Reference Centre, we restricted the search to; articles, written in English, social science index, educational research, and to children and preschool. In total we scanned 4,081 titles (see Figure 1). After scanning titles, we had 348 possible studies for inclusion and after removing duplicate titles we kept 311 titles to search for the full articles for further review. We then reviewed abstracts we kept 181 articles for full review, rejected articles that were not relevant, that did not report empirical studies (for example practitioner articles), and could not find 3 manuscripts

**Phase 1: Initial Review**

Articles were coded thematically in line with project focus. 7 papers were coded independently and checked for inter-rater agreement.
Contextual and Organisational Supports

The research focused on:

- Combination of child managed and adult directed activities.
- Focus on combinations of free play and free choice versus teacher directed and managed.
- Opportunities created to engage children in language rich opportunities through organisation.
- Using grouping to facilitate language opportunities (small groups)
- Professional development opportunities.

Managing Interactions/ Conversational Responsiveness

The research focuses on:

- Emotional and instructional support - focus on providing warm supportive support.
- Inferential Questioning - using this type of questioning to support children to infer or evaluate.
- Dialogically organized talk
- Conversational responsiveness by facilitating communication (commenting, questioning, facilitating peer to peer conversation, pace, pausing)
- Conversational responsiveness by taking turns or using turn taking strategies.

Instructional Focus

The research focused on

- Dialogic Reading
- Phonological Awareness activities
- Interactive shared reading
- Story props
- Practices targeting literacy skills (concepts about print and print referencing).

Studies could have multiple foci, in other words a paper could have been double coded as focusing on context or organization and managing interaction. 60 studies were coded as focusing on context or organization. 130 were coded having an instructional focus, and 72 were coded as having a focus on managing interactions and conversational responsiveness. At this point in the review process the project partners requested that we
focus on managing interactions and conversational responsiveness and we refined our review question to:

- **What strategies for managing interactions with young children are associated with positive outcomes in teacher practices and children’s early communication and language development?**

**Stage 2: Refined Review**

**Weight of Evidence**

After coding, studies were categorised according to the following weight of evidence (WOE) protocol used by Savage and Basma (2018) and Moss et al. (2018). Studies were rated on three criteria and assigned a rating of High/ Medium/ Low for each category

**WOE A: Fidelity**

Did the report findings in the study answer the study question and was it internally consistent?

If the rating was low for this then B and C were also rated LOW. Gough (2007) advised that this is a generic non-review specific judgement about the evidence presented. Cordingley et al. (2007) suggested that the study had to report triangulated evidence and, normally, a benchmark for comparison (a comparison group and/ or pre-test post-test results). The authors also had to report explicitly on the implementation of the intervention and on attempts to establish validity and reliability.

**WOE B: Rigour**

Is the research design appropriate for the review question? Gough (2007) stated that this is a:

> ‘review specific judgement about the appropriateness of that form of evidence for answering the review question and the fitness for purpose of that form of evidence. For example, the relevance of certain research designs such as experimental studies for answering questions about process’ (p. 223).

**WOE C: Focus**

Was the evidence relevant to the review question?

Gough (2007) described how this judgement related to the focus of the evidence collected. For example, the reviewer must consider if the sample or the context aligned with the
review focus. Gough also suggested that these criteria also related to the extent to which the research conducted aligned with ethical guidelines.

**WOE D: Overall Rating**

What is the overall quality of the paper in terms of how it provides evidence to answer the review question (Gough, 2007)?

Based on the judgements of WOE A, B, and C the studies were then assigned an overall rating of high, medium, or low. The decision to assign an overall rating was based on the combination of results from all three areas. The different permutations are contained in Table 1 and were used to allocate the WOE D rating.

Table 1. Weight of Evidence Rating Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOE A</th>
<th>WOE B</th>
<th>WOE C</th>
<th>WOE D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In applying the weight of evidence ratings, we used the following criteria:

- Those practices which are explicitly documented with clear outcome measures by which efficacy is established
- Those which show promise – lack a clear outcome measure but articulate why this approach might work and contribute to theory building or improving practice in this way
- Those which do neither of the above.
- Those which provided information and data from a primary study not from a literature review.

At the end of the analysis, we rated 26 studies as low overall, 25 medium, and 21 high. Figure 1 provides a synopsis of the search process.
Figure 1. Review Flow Diagram

Stage 1: Initial Search
- **Databases**: ERIC, British Education Index, Child Development and Adolescent Studies, Teacher Reference Centre.
- **Search Terms**: Early Language Intervention, Language and Communication, Early Language Development

4081 Titles Scanned, Duplicates Removed, 311 for Abstract Review

Stage 2: Abstract Review
- Abstracts reviewed for relevance and empirical study

181 articles kept for full review

Stage 3: Full Review and Coding
Coded according to content review

- Context or Organisation (60)
- Managing interactions and conversational responsiveness (72)
- Instructional Focus (130)

Stage 4:
Weight of Evidence Review
72 Studies

- Low (28)
- Medium (25)
- High (21)
Findings
The findings were derived from the 21 studies that received the overall (WOE D) rating of high using the weight of evidence assessment framework. In the next section, we present an analysis of the findings and highlight the features of effective practice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme 1: Attend to social and emotional development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attention to children’s social and emotional wellbeing and development in interactions contributes positively to language development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An overarching finding from the studies analysis is that attending to children’s social and emotional well-being has positive effects in promoting language and communication. As Bierman et al. (2008) suggested; language skills and social and emotional skills are intertwined and ‘language skills enhance the child’s capacity to regulate emotions’ (p. 1812).

Evidence
Goble and Pianta (2017) found that quality of teacher emotional support predicts gains in language learning. Similarly, Piasta et al. (2012) found that use of communication facilitating strategies such as looking expectantly at children and being warm and receptive and opportunities to talk about feelings was related to greater linguistic productivity and complexity in talk. In a randomized control trial, Bierman et al. (2008) examined the effects of the Head Start REDI programme on the language development, emergent literacy, and social emotional skills of 4-year olds. This programme was described as an ‘enrichment intervention’ (p. 1805) for existing preschool curricula (in this case Head Start). This programme had measurable effects on both language and social development. The authors argued that a dual focus (cognition and social domain) is possible and can simultaneously promote gains in both areas. Similarly, Castro et al. (2017), in an experimental study examining the efficacy of the Nuestros Ninos School Readiness Professional Development Programme, found that children’s language and communication could be improved by combining professional development of teachers with an intervention targeting language, literacy, social-emotional development, and mathematics learning of bilingual preschoolers. The intervention involved read alouds, targeted small group activities for vocabulary and phonological awareness and promotion of positive teacher-child relationships. Jung et al. (2016) did find that if instructional quality is low that high ratings of social and emotional support in caregiving did not predict positive language outcomes. So, it seems that, as
Bierman et al. (2008) stated, there is an inter-relationship between providing quality instruction and emotional support.

Table 2. Examples of Practice: Social and Emotional Development

| Maintain eye contact | Look expectantly at children as you engage in conversation with them (Piasta et al., 2012)  
Example: As you are talking with children maintain eye contact with them. |
|----------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Promote friendships  | Promote friendship skills, emotional understanding, emotional expression, and self-control through targeted lessons (Bierman et al., 2008).  
For example: Targeted lessons could involve modeling stories and discussions about friendship using puppets, photos, and role-play (Bierman et al., 2008). |
| Promote cooperation  | Provide targeted opportunities for children to practice target skills in supported settings (Bierman et al., 2008).  
Example: Provide opportunities for children to ‘practice’ friendship skills like sharing by supporting cooperative games and praising positive behaviours |
| Be warm and receptive | Be warm and receptive to children’s attempts to communicate (Piasta et al., 2012).  
Example: Welcome any child initiated attempts to communicate with a warm and positive demeanor. |
A large proportion of the studies reviewed examined how adult caregivers can effectively shape conversations to promote language development. We suggest that, collectively, the studies describe the active conscious role adults must play in shaping conversations.

Evidence

Adults should try to follow children’s lead in conversations in child-initiated conversations. Cabell et al. (2015) found that the quality of teacher conversations, including following children’s leads, predicted improved outcomes for children in terms of language and communication. Chang et al. (2016) had similar results with children with autistic spectrum disorder. Landry et al. (2017) found that following the child’s lead and then maintaining a focus on the child’s interest versus redirecting the conversation to a topic of the adult’s choice was an important feature of adult participation in the conversation process. Interestingly, Landry et al. (2017) found that this strategy when used by parents had larger effects than with teachers.

Researchers described how specific types of adult contributions could facilitate communication (Piasta et al., 2012). Some of these strategies were key features of the Hanen Learning Language and Loving It Programme (see Piasta et al., 2012) for a full description) and including making comments to cue turn taking, using questions to stimulate conversation, and facilitating peer to peer communication. In terms of questions, Zucker et al. (2013) found a large effect size ($d = .81$) in terms of children’s receptive vocabulary for a relatively short intervention (4 weeks) which focused on attention to questioning. In this intervention, adults were encouraged to use guiding questions before shared book reading to set a purpose for listening and a variety of inferential questions. A subtler type of questioning, elicitation, or simply asking the child to talk more on a topic was found to be related to gains in vocabulary (Cabell et al., 2015).

Other strategies which demonstrated efficacy in terms of language development (Piasta et al., 20120) were use of repetition, recasting, expansion, and providing additional information. Cabell et al. (2015) described this as extension (e.g. if a child provides a one-
word response (like flower) the adult should extend the utterance ‘you are making a flower with leaves’ (p.83)) and found this strategy was related to gains in vocabulary.

Ottley et al. (2017) and Piasta et al. (2012) found that pace of conversation was important – conversations needed to be slow and include wait time. Landry et al. (2012) did, however, suggest that responses to children’s attempts to communicate needed to be prompt. In Cabell et al.’s (2015) study, participation in multi-turn taking conversations that included elicitations, following the child’s lead and extensions predicted growth in child vocabulary.
**Table 3. Examples of Practice: Adult as Active Partner**

*The adult needs to be an active partner in the conversation process – modelling, scaffolding, listening, creating spaces for joint engagement*

| Expand and extend language | Actively coach language by expansions or extensions (expanding on what the child says) and grammatical recasts (recasting what the child says in grammatically correct manner) (Bierman et al., 2008; Cabell et al., 2015; Chang et al. 2016; Landry et al., 2017; Piasta et al., 2012)  
Example:  
- Teacher: What are you making?  
- Child: Flower  
- Teacher: You’re making a flower.. it’s a very pretty flower! |
|---|---|
| Model | Modelling is an effective strategy (Ottley et al., 2018)  
Example:  
- Engage in parallel talk – saying what they child sees or is doing as they engage in activity (Abel et al., 2015). |
| Elicit more talk | Elicit more talk in the context of conversation (Cabell et al., 2015).  
Example:  
- Child: I made a dinosaur.  
- Teacher: It’s a big dinosaur, I wonder what he likes to eat? |
| Wait | Provide wait time and engage in conversation at a slow pace (Ottley et al., 2017; Piasta et al., 2012; Pinto et al., 2013).  
Example:  
- Pause expectantly as the child talks. Use a deliberately slower pace while talking with children (Piasta et al., 2012). |
| Ask open ended questions | Restrict use of closed questions (Pinto et al., 2013) and provide a variety of guiding question and questions that target both literal and inferential understanding of topics (Zucker et al., 2013).  
Example:  
- Literal: What was the little girl’s name?  
- Inferential: I wonder why baby bear was so sad?  
- Guiding: Before a story ask a question that might focus the child’s attention – e.g.: After I finish reading we will talk about it and I want you to think about why the bear was following the family in the story. |
Follow the child’s lead and stick with it (Landry et al., 2017).

Example:
- As the child play’s follow what they are talking about and allow the focus of their interest to shape conversation.

### Theme 3: Valuing complexity, diversity, and duration of language experience

**Density and diversity of language, including but not limited to vocabulary, for prolonged periods matters**

We found that a proportion of studies described the complexity of language (in terms of vocabulary and conversation), the diversity of language (in terms of context) and the duration or time spent involved in language lessons or intervention.

**Evidence**

The amount or length of time children spent in multi-turn conversation matters. According to Cabell et al. (2015) high levels of multi-turn conversations (greater than four turns between participating adults and children) predicted better language outcomes. Interestingly, they hypothesized that these conversations would allow children to engage in more ‘semantically contingent related talk’ (p.89). In other words, they were more likely to hear more words related to the same topic.

In terms of vocabulary, many of the interventions we reviewed included explicit teaching of vocabulary. For example, Castro et al. (2017) described direct teaching and consideration of core vocabulary using Tier 1 words (words that are used frequently like big/ small) and tier 2 words (general academic words or words with multiple meanings) (see Beck and McKeown, 2013). They suggested that this type of teaching of vocabulary is essential for bilingual or EAL learners and suggested strategic use of the primary language to support understanding in the second or additional language. Both Hindman et al. (2012), Bowne (2017) and Zucker et al. (2013) described interventions with positive outcomes in terms of vocabulary where attention was paid to the thematic units. Hindman et al suggested that teaching using thematic units and using books, materials, and activities related to the one theme permits a conceptual connectedness in terms of how words are presented to children. Zucker et al. (2013) found that use of child friendly definitions of words and vocabulary related questions predicted better language outcomes.
In terms of context, the interventions or practices described all occurred in a variety of settings, from small groups (e.g. Castro et al., 2017; Goble & Pianta, 2017; Hindman et al. 2012), one-to-one (e.g. Hindman et al., 2012) to free play (Goble & Pianta, 2017). It seems that teacher involvement or direction matters. Goble and Pianta (2017), in a large scale RCT, found that engagement in higher levels of teacher directed activity versus child initiated free play predicted language outcomes. However, higher engagement in free play resulted in higher levels of inhibitory control or self-regulation of behavior. The length of time of interventions varied from yearlong (e.g. Abel et al., 2015) to four weeks (Zucker, 2013).
Table 4. Examples of Practice: Language Density, Diversity, and Duration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Density and diversity of language, including but not limited to vocabulary, for prolonged periods matters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target vocabulary</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple opportunities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provide input</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Limitations**

There are practical and methodological limitations with the review. From a practical perspective, a limitation is the focus only a defined age group and period of review. Although the results reported are promising, most studies involved children aged 3 to 5 years of age with a majority being conducted in state funded pre-kindergarten settings in the United States. There are, no doubt, empirical studies conducted pre-2008 that would have contributed to our findings but that was not within the scope of the project focus.
Methodologically, the design of different studies limits the extrapolation of comparative data to measure the impact of different interventions on children’s outcomes across studies. In addition to this, there were many studies which offered promising practices but these practices were not linked to child outcomes and, as such, these studies did not receive a high rating.

**Summary**

In summing up the evidence reviewed, there are a range of promising practices which should ideally inform the Manor Park Talks intervention. These include attending to:

- Children’s social and emotional development.
- The density and diversity of language, including but not limited to vocabulary, for prolonged periods of time.
- The role the adult plays as an active partner in the conversation process – modelling, scaffolding, listening, creating spaces for joint engagement.

In addition to this, it is worth noting that

- Many studies used targeted observation scales like the ELLCO (Early Language and Literacy Classroom Observation) (Smith & Dickinson, 2002) or CLASS (Classroom Assessment Scoring System) (Pianta et al., 2008).
- The fact that the same measure was used across studies is promising in terms of the similarity of the constructs measured.
- Some studies suggest that family involvement in early language intervention provides a promising boost to classroom intervention alone (see Castro et al., 2016; Jung et al., 2017).
- A large proportion of the studies we examined are examining the effect of professional development models (coaching, online, mentoring, bug in ear) on children’s outcomes in terms of language and, indeed, in terms of adults’ practices. There were some studies which potentially could have been rated as high quality but did not report a child outcome
- One over-arching theme is the fidelity of practitioners to the intervention and the variability of results in terms of degrees of fidelity.
Future Research:

In examining the 72 studies for further review, we noted many studies that offered promising practices that are worthy of further research to examine the efficacy of these approaches. These include:

- Working with parents as partners to share the practices used in the classroom.
- The exploration of use of practices in children’s home languages.
- The replication of studies reviewed in different contexts and, particularly, outside the research setting.
- The replication of studies reviewed with children aged 2 – 3 years of age.
- Working with early years practitioners with varying levels of qualifications to explore how the practices can be implemented and what types of supports practitioners need to implement these practices.
- Researching how leadership can be distributed to encourage black and ethnic minority early years educators to assume leadership roles in projects such as Manor Park Talks.
### Manor Park Talks

**Effective ways to help children’s early language development.**

We are learning all the time in this project: this poster will change and get better as a result of the work we do together.

We want to help children with their early language development. That means we need to do more than just giving them appropriate environments and activities. The best way we can help children is by having high-quality conversations and interactions with them every day.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies associated with positive outcomes</th>
<th>What we will notice children doing</th>
<th>What adults could do</th>
<th>What adults could provide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conversational responsiveness</strong></td>
<td>• Increasing the amount they say</td>
<td>• Focus our attention where the child’s attention is</td>
<td>• Time to talk – not always being busy doing other things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increasing the number of turns they can maintain a conversation for</td>
<td>• Notice the child’s communication (verbal and non-verbal)</td>
<td>• Spaces which promote conversation – not noisy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increase the complexity of their conversation</td>
<td>• Comment/remark/describe</td>
<td>• Comfortable places to sit and talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Avoid giving children more time to process and respond when we say something to them</td>
<td>• Engage children in expressive language in daily routines and naturally occurring situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Add a word or two words, recast or expand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Personalise using our knowledge of the individual child</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Limit questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Display active listening by maintaining eye contact, nodding, or smiling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interactive book-reading</strong></td>
<td>• Talking and engaging actively with the book, not just sitting quietly and listening</td>
<td>• Comment - modelling literal and inferential responses</td>
<td>• Creating spaces for individual curling up with a book and for sharing books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Making individual comments about the book</td>
<td>• Use questions sparingly with type and focus dependent on child’s development</td>
<td>• Small groups and 1:1 reading time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Making links between the book and their own ideas and experiences</td>
<td>• Give children time and opportunities to shape their own ideas about the book</td>
<td>• A wide range of books which match the many different interests of the children in the setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Embedding prompts for children to talk at both literal and inferential level about vocabulary in the story</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Using songs, rhymes and stories to support expressive language</strong></td>
<td>• Singing or talking to themselves using the rhythms and some of the words of familiar songs and rhymes</td>
<td>• Use songs and rhymes throughout the day and during everyday activities</td>
<td>• A shared repertoire of songs, rhymes and stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Acting out familiar stories on their own or with others</td>
<td>• Model how you can change the words and still rhyme</td>
<td>• Small world play, puppets, dressing up, clothes, trips, and other resources linked to popular songs and books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Singing and acting out rhymes and stories using props</td>
<td>• Make songs, rhymes and stories personal to individual children</td>
<td>• Provide props that will help to support understanding of key concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Model the use of props in songs, rhymes and stories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Support children to ‘replay’ the story using props at story times and throughout the session</td>
<td>• Engaging environmental print</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Musical instruments and other resources which promote careful listening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Print referencing to support emergent literacy</strong></td>
<td>• Talking about their interpretation of a picture, the illustrations in a book</td>
<td>• Talk about book illustrations and words</td>
<td>• Displays of print in the environment through songs, rhymes and stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Talking about the features of print e.g. brand they recognize, a letter from their name</td>
<td>• Point out familiar print when out in the neighbourhood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Use activities to develop phonological awareness through rhymes, music etc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Listening for sounds</strong></td>
<td>• Displaying beginnings of sound awareness</td>
<td>• Encourage children to listen for sounds in the environment and letter sounds</td>
<td>• Games and play that encourage listening for sounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Associating sounds with familiar objects</td>
<td>• Engage children in activities that associate a variety of objects and toys with letter sounds</td>
<td>• Everyday activities that help support sound association and differentiation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Manor Park Talks Poster 2

Manor Park Talks

We are learning all the time with this project. This poster will change and get better as a result.

Home Learning
- Set aside 10 minutes everyday to play with and listen to your child, avoid distractions, share books, music and TV for quality time together.

Remember it is important to stop and build your child's interest in books.

Shared Book Reading
- Read together, not reading to children you can use books as a way of starting conversations.

PEER Framework
1. Prompt the child to say something about the book.
2. Evaluate their response.
3. Expand their response by paraphrasing or adding information to it and;
4. Repeat the prompt to help them learn from the experience.

Prompts you might use:
-― What do you notice?
-― Can you say that again?
-― Can you say that in a different way?
-― I wonder what the caterpillar is doing now?

Listening to Children and Having a Conversation with Them
- Play with children, following their interests and drawing their attention to interesting things (developing joint attention)

Four finger rules:
Aim for four comments to every question.
Ten second rule:
Give children time to process what you’ve said and reply.

Develop deeper conversations, serve, wait and talk in turn.

Make time for conversation, make sure you aren’t always busy and talking about one thing to the next.

Talking and sharing a story together
Talking and playing together
Talking and doing things together
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