



## Talking, Listening and Questioning 2016-17

Settings which had had TLQ training were invited in the summer term of 2017 to submit their data and comments on the intervention.

### Results

#### Nursery

The settings reported spending 15 to 20 weeks on the programme. The number of children was 53. More than half of the children had baseline scores too low for age equivalents. This meant that the progress in months was an underestimation of the progress achieved. The effect sizes were remarkably good (see table 1 below). An Effect Size  $\geq 0.8$  = Large; 0.4 is the effect of one year's schooling. Effect size of 0.8 = the difference in height between a 13 and an 18 yr old female.

Table 1: Nursery Programme, Progress in Months and Effect Sizes.

<b>Nursery 15-20 Week Programme</b>	<b>Information</b>	<b>Grammar</b>
<b>Average Progress in Months</b>	21.72	12.36
<b>Effect Size</b>	1.56	1.54

#### Primary 1/2

The primary settings generally reported spending 20 weeks on the programme, as recommended. The number of children was 36. Around a third had baseline scores too low for age equivalents, so again this is likely to be an underestimation of progress. The effect sizes seen at primary were remarkable. Grammar improvements were particularly notable, both in months and in terms of the effect size (see table 2 below).

Table 2: Primary P1/P2 Programme, Progress in Months and Effect Sizes.

<b>Primary 20 week Programme</b>	<b>Information</b>	<b>Grammar</b>
<b>Average Progress in Months</b>	23.78	24.17
<b>Effect Size</b>	1.66	2.26

## Qualitative Data

The settings were also asked if there were any further benefits. These were collated by theme (see table 3 below).

Table 3: Respondent Settings' Reported Additional Benefits of the Programme Collated by Theme.

<b>Theme</b>	<b>Number of Settings</b>
Increased Confidence	7
Social Skills	2
Improved Writing Skills	1
Relations Between School and Parents Improved	1

The most notable additional benefit was that upon children's confidence but there were benefits reported in other areas one might expect from a language intervention. An unforeseen additional benefit was that of improved relations between home and the setting.

The settings were also invited to comment on challenges. These were collated by theme (see table 4 below).

Table 4: Respondent Settings' Reported Challenges of the Programme Collated by Theme.

<b>Theme</b>	<b>Number of Settings</b>
Time	6
Staffing	3
Resources	3

Finding the time in a busy calendar was a common theme. The challenges of securing staffing and finding/preparing resources were also problematic.

The respondents were also invited to make any comments they wished. These were collated by theme (see table 5 below).

Table 5: Respondent Settings' Additional Comments Collated by Theme.

<b>Theme</b>	<b>Number of Settings</b>
Progress Made/Benefits of TLQ	4
Staffing	2
Resources	1
Start Earlier in Year	1

One nursery said TLQ was “valuable and worth doing” while a school noted they were “very pleased at the progress the children have made”. The issues of staffing and resources came up again as a barrier. One respondent said they would start earlier in the year next time.

## Conclusions

TLQ is an effective intervention for improving the expressive language of children with vulnerable language skills in Nursery, P1 or P2. This has been evidenced both in terms of the assessed progress and the comments of the settings. The overall gains of around two years in information (vocabulary) and grammar have been consistent throughout the four years of the project so far. Additional benefits in terms of confidence, social skills and academic progress have also been evident.

TLQ is an effective way to raise attainment and close the gap, in line with NIF priorities. Barriers to its use have been staffing and resources. Pupil Equity Funding at Primary level provides an opportunity to extend the use of this remarkably effective intervention.

Dr Kelton Green  
Educational Psychologist  
Dumfries and Galloway Psychological Service

