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Abstract

This project tested the effects of cooperative learning, namely the students teams achievement approach (STAD) on students’ achievement in spelling as opposed to the traditional approach. The researcher attempts to establish the following: Teaching spelling through the STAD approach leads students to achieve higher scores on spelling assessments. To investigate this issue, the researcher used a pretest-posttest control group design. A study was conducted on two section of grade two in a private school in Lebanon. The sample of the study comprised 51 mixed-gender grade two students, selected from a private school in Beirut, Lebanon. The students were a middle class sample in terms of the socio-economic status. Their age was between seven and eight years old. The control group was one section out of four, and the number of students was 26. The experimental group was another section with a total number of 25 students. The results came contradictory to the hypothesis which stated that students’ achievements of spelling test improve considerably after being taught via the cooperative learning strategies, namely the Student Team Achievement Division (STAD) strategy.
Chapter I

Introduction

"I cdnuolt blveiee that cluoed uesdntnr wdhat I wad rdanieg. The phaonmneal pweor of
the human mind Aoccdmig to rsheearch taeam at Cmabrigde Uinervtisy, it deosn't mttier
in what order the ltteers in a word are, the only iprmoatnt thing is that the frist and lsat
ltter be in the rghit pclae." (received email)

After reading this above statement, one would wonder: Is it really necessary to
teach and learn spelling and go through all the pain that accompanies the process? Should
teachers really bother and try to find the best methods of teaching spelling, or they can
just let it go? Is it necessary to dwell on a spelling lesson or just go over it lightly? Is it
really worth it to even think about teaching spelling?

The reason people are able to read these simple anagrams (retain first and last
letter-scramble the remainder) is simple. They already have the basis of correct spelling
as well as correct grammar which enable them to decipher the meaning of the words
using context as the determining factor. For example, can people read these words,
'easeeneovvits' or 'eullooivatnly'? Since the context is not provided, people will not be
able to read those words although the first and last letters are intact. The two words are
'evocative' and 'evolutionally'.

Students should acquire the ability to spell correctly since correct spelling, as
Bollman (1991) argued, is very essential in communication for the person to be taken
seriously in today's society. Bolton and Snowball (1993) note that "accurate spelling is
highly valued by society" (p.2). Correct spelling is a required skill nowadays since its
worth is no more restricted to a school context but it can play a major role in future
employment. Office Angels conducted a survey over a sample of 1500 employers and employees which revealed that 84% of employers believe that sloppy spelling and poor grammar can debase the worth of even excellent work. It also showed that employers appreciate the high level of literacy skills in their employees.

Griffith and Leavell (1995) say, "Spellings provide a window into children's growing comprehension of written language's organizational principles" (p.8).

Thus, teachers have an obligation to teach their students to express themselves in writing. Spelling appropriately can help students express themselves in a strong and effective manner (Wilde, 1996).

No doubt that spelling is a very important skill, and, thus, it should be taught explicitly. However, rarely does any student or teacher enjoy a spelling lesson because its presentation is often rote and boring (Topping, 1995). Griffith and Leavell (1995) reported that when a group of teachers was asked to jot down three ideas related to the word 'spelling instruction' and 'spelling', the responses included 'drill', 'write words three times each', 'word lists', 'skills', 'memorization,' and 'relevancy/irrelevancy.' (p.1)

Spelling has not experienced the different instructional methods used with reading and writing (Adams, 1991). One of the most widely practiced spelling instruction strategy is that teachers provide students with a list of spelling words (10 to 20 words) to be learned over the week days and then administer a test at the end of the week to see if the words were learned. Then a new list of words is given and the process is repeated (see for instance, Gettinger, 1993; Lane, 1997; Pennington, 1995, Graham, 1983). What happens to the old list of words? They disappear forever. The students quickly forget what they have learned, and all that effort is wasted. Retention is left to happenstance. Maybe the
student will use the words in his/her writing before the spelling is forgotten. Maybe he/she won't. Maybe he/she will read the words in his/her reading and think about the spelling. Maybe he/she will not. According to Kwong and Varnhagen (2005), correct spelling of words will not be committed to memory unless continued experiences with spelling are insured.

Among the best methods in teaching is the cooperative learning method (Slavin, 1987). Cooperative learning has been extensively researched and has been established as one of the best methods that has great positive effects on several factors that include students' academic achievement along with students' motivation, students' liking of school and students' relation (Slavin, 1987).

The Student Teams Achievement Division, also known as STAD, has proved to be very effective across different grade levels and different subject matters. However, little research has been provided on the effectiveness of the STAD approach in an EFL (English as a Foreign Language) setting. Current research on second language learning argued that more learning is done in a student-centered classroom based on peer-to-peer interaction. It will be argued that the STAD approach can prove to be an effective approach in a context where there is a continuous need to balance student-centered learning with a test-centered curriculum.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to find out to what extent the cooperative learning methods namely the (STAD) could have an important function in improving students' spelling achievement.
The study was conducted over a one-week period – from May 4 to May 8 of 2009 – with two sections of grade 2 at a private medium school in Beirut, Lebanon. Students of one section served as the control group and the students of the second section served as the experimental group. A pretest was administered to both groups and then a posttest was also given so that the change in performance in spelling could be measured.

Significance of the Study

Curriculum designers, principals, coordinators and language teachers claim that they are working hard to improve the performance of the students in all aspects of the English language. However, many schools still face problems in understanding the reasons behind their students’ poor spelling achievements; what English as a Second Language (ESL) teachers really struggle with is how to teach spelling effectively.

Few experimental studies in a Lebanese setting explored the issue of cooperative learning and its effects on different subject matters (Ghaihth, 2002; Shaaban, 2006). However, almost none of those studies dealt with the issue of spelling and cooperative learning. In the Lebanese context and with the implementation of the new curriculum, and with all the changes it has caused in the quality of instruction, this kind of research may be of need. The results of this study would provide educators, especially English language teachers, in Lebanon with evidence concerning the best method of teaching spelling. Consequently, the result of this study can play a role in helping students become better spellers.

Definitions of Terms

Two terms must be defined in order to understand this research. Cooperative learning approach refers to students operating jointly to learn material or to complete a
project. In this research the Student Teams Achievement Division (STAD) approach is employed as a cooperative learning technique.

*Traditional instructional methods* refers to the practice of teaching spelling words by giving children a list of words on Mondays, providing little instruction, allowing the students to study on their own, and eventually testing them on Fridays.

*Hypothesis*

Based on the research question, it is hypothesized that students’ achievements of spelling test improve considerably after being taught via the cooperative learning strategies, namely the Student Team Achievement Division (STAD) strategy.

*Conclusion*

Students and teachers regard spelling as a tedious and pretty dull subject. Different techniques and strategies were devised in an attempt to create a more interesting and beneficial experience out of spelling instruction. However, the most widely used one is still the traditional method by which teachers provide students with a spelling word list at the onset of the week, give little or no instruction regarding the lesson, and eventually, at the end of the week, give a spelling test. This method, according to research, proved to be less than efficient. Although some students can still score high on the end of the week tests, some researchers are a bit skeptical as to the ability of students to store those spelling words in their long term memory and be able to write them correctly in future tasks. STAD, one of the widely researched cooperative methods, stood the test of time and proved to be highly efficient to teach different subject matters among which spelling. Accordingly, STAD is implemented in a Lebanese school context to test the validity of the researchers’ claim of the high efficiency of this method.
The following chapter deals with major literature that dealt with the issue of cooperative learning in general and STAD in specific. It also deals with the different strategies implemented throughout time to teach spelling and specifically the STAD approach to teaching spelling. Furthermore, it provides a brief historical overview as to the origin of some words which led to a contemporary mismatch between orthography and pronunciation in some words. Another issue tackled in the following chapter is the stages children go through for them to acquire the spelling skill.
Chapter II

Literature Review

Cooperative Learning

Cooperative learning was first developed to reduce the negative effect of competition among students which was identified as the “negative component” of the education system (Coleman, 1959, as cited in Devries and Edwards, 1973). After a two year study of students at nine high schools, Coleman (1959) (as cited in Devries and Edwards, 1973) concluded that competition in the academic setting hinders the learning process, and this approach should be substituted by a more collaborative teaching approach.

Slavin (1987) built on the work of Colman and defined cooperative learning as “a set of instructional methods in which students are encouraged or required to work together on academic tasks” (p. 1161).

This instructional method has been used for teaching almost all subject areas in all academic levels (preschool to graduate school). Five characteristics are detected in the different cooperative learning methods (Slavin, 1994): (1) students work in small groups (2-5), (2) students work on common tasks, (3) students work cooperatively to successfully complete a task, (4) activities should be well structured to provoke students to interact, and (5) students are responsible for the learning of their team members as well as their own.

According to Blosser (1992), successful cooperative learning implementation encompasses many factors (a) having precise instructional objectives, (b) appropriately
assigning students to different teams, (c) explaining thoroughly the cooperative method, (d) monitoring the groups’ progress, and (e) evaluating students individually.

In the majority of studies, different cooperative learning strategies proved to be more efficient than traditional individual reward methods in raising motivation and achievement and also in generating positive social outcomes (McManus & Gettinger, 1996; Slavin, 1987; Kambiss, 1990).

According to research, cooperative learning is an essential approach to insure more motivation to learning, more learning, and stronger interpersonal relationships than other approaches to learning.

According to Slavin (1995), a leading advocate of cooperative learning, cooperative learning has proven to be an efficient instructional strategy. Slavin (1995) reported that out of 67 studies on the effects of cooperative learning on students’ academic achievement, 41 showed a considerable increase in achievement of students concerned with cooperative learning over those in control groups (Slavin, 1993). A study by Mulryan (1992) indicated that in a cooperative learning environment students were more engaged and spent more time on task than in a conventional environment. In another study students who were exposed to cooperative training were more cooperative and supportive to each other (Ashman & Gillies, 1997). Kambiss (1990) states that, "research has shown that cooperation among adults promotes achievement, social support, and self-esteem... Cooperative learning can influence peer pressure, encourage classmates to succeed, and provide an increase in self-esteem” (p. 1).

Johnson, Johnson and Scott (1978) studied the effects of cooperative instruction versus individualized instruction on the achievements and attitudes of fifth and sixth
grade students. The results showed that students were more accurate and worked faster when involved in cooperative training. It was also argued that the advantages of cooperative learning increased as the material became more advanced and as the students acquired more experience with cooperative learning.

Humphreys, Johnson and Johnson (1982) (as cited in Abu & Flowers, 1997) conducted a study that compared cooperative learning, individualistic and competitive learning strategies in Science classes. The researchers deduced that students who were taught through the cooperative learning methods retained and learned more. In another study conducted in math classes by Sherman and Thomas (1986) (as cited in Abu & Flowers; 1997) similar results were found.

A meta-analysis of 122 studies on cooperative learning showed that cooperative learning is more effective in promoting achievement than individualistic and competitive approaches (Johnson, Maruyama, Johnson, Nelson & Skon; 1981).

Johnson, Johnson and Smith (1995) reported that in achievement tests, students in cooperative learning groups scored 25% higher than students in individualistic or competitive classrooms in achievement tests (as cited in Biehler & Snowman, 1997).

**Key Elements of Effective Cooperative Learning:**

There are five essential elements for effective cooperative learning as outlined by Johnson and Johnson (1994): positive interdependence, small group skills, individual accountability, group processing, and promotive face to face interaction. Those factors, once available, guarantee a successful cooperative learning implementation. Those factors are further explained below.
Positive Interdependence:

It is essential for the students to feel as parts of a group and see themselves as mutually dependent, sharing the same fate. This feeling of belonging to a group boosts student’s self-esteem and their motivation to achieve higher (Johnson & Johnson, 1994).

Individual Accountability:

One of the disadvantages of cooperative learning, as discussed by Slavin (1995) is that high achievers in a certain group would do most of the work required. Consequently, the learning would be transmitted to this student and not the others. To rectify this, teachers have to create individual accountability. Individual accountability insures the learning of every single member in the group. Group goals and individual accountability are essential to motivate students to help and support each other to put forth utmost effort.

Johnson and Johnson (1994) argued that individual accountability can be achieved through the use of individual assessment and by regularly reinforcing the contributions of every member, figuring out who needs more assistant, and assessing single contributions of every member in the group.

Teachers have to make sure that all members receive equal load of work, and they have to assess this load of work performed by every student. They have also to ensure that all members are evenly accountable for the final product.

Johnson and Johnson (1994) outlined essential factors for building individual accountability:

• Keeping the size of the group small
• Administering individual tests where students cannot ask for help form others
• Randomly choosing students to answer questions
• Observing the group and recording the frequency of every member’s contribution
• Assigning a “checker” who asks the members of the group to justify the groups answer
• asking students to teach what they learned to other group members

Promotive Face-to-Face Interaction:

In small heterogeneous groups, students work closely together. They are expected to assist, share, and maintain each other’s learning.

Interpersonal and Small Group Skills:

According to Johnson and Johnson (1994), one of the fundamental factors for the success of the work of a group is the level of social skills students have. Students achieve higher when they are aware of the social skills and when teachers reinforce the use of those social skills. Students have to be taught interpersonal skills such as sticking to the task, asking questions, active listening, problem resolution and so on.

Group Processing:

Johnson and Roger (1994) argued that group processing can happen on two levels: in small groups and entire class. For the group processing to take place on the group level, teachers should dedicate some time at the end of every class to have students process how efficiently the members cooperated together. By doing this, groups would be more able to focus on maintaining high-quality working relationship among themselves; furthermore, this processing can help students to acquire the learning of cooperative skills and guarantee that members get feedback on the quality of work they have provided the group with; it also ensures that students are working on both levels, the cognitive and the metacognitive; and allows the group to celebrate their achievement and to reinforce positive behavior (Johnson & Roger, 1994).
For the group processing to happen at the class level, teachers can irregularly examine groups, investigate problems and then offer feedback to the class as a whole.

Different Cooperative Methods

Kagan (1989) lists well-known and successfully used cooperative structures in different grade levels and subject areas:

**Jigsaw**

Developed by Elliot Aronson, Jigsaw involves a certain number of steps for its implementation in the classroom.

First, teachers create small heterogeneous groups. Then, the teacher appoints a group leader. Next, the teacher assigns the group a number of tasks. Each student has to carry on a separate task. Then, students from different groups with similar tasks work with each other to become very knowledgeable with the material they have. Again, students join their groups and start teaching the other members the topics they had to become “experts” on. Finally, the teacher assesses the material they have all learned through their cooperative learning.

**Think-Pair-Share**

In this strategy, students have to think individually about a certain topic, and then they have to pair with another student to discuss their thoughts. At the end, the pair shares their thoughts with the whole class.

**Numbered Heads Together**

This cooperative learning strategy holds every student accountable for learning the material. In this strategy, the teacher puts students in groups and then numbers them...
off. She/he asks a question, and then asks the students to “put their heads together” to come up with a complete answer to the question.

*Three Steps Interview*

In this strategy, students are put in heterogeneous groups. They first interact in pairs, interviewing each other about a topic. Then, they take turns sharing what they have learned from their partners with the rest of their groups.

*Co-op*

It’s a ten-step process that engages in the development of a product. It starts on the individual level where students work alone to contribute later on to their teams. Then the teams prepare a product to supplement the class lesson.

*Round Robin*

In this strategy each student gets the opportunity to share something new with the other members of the cooperative group.

*Inside-Outside Circle*

In this structure, students within the same group sit or stand facing each other and they take turns answering questions provided by the teacher.

*Roundtable*

This structure is most effective with brainstorming activities and creative writing. Each member has to write one answer on a piece of paper and then circulate it around the table.

**Student Teams Achievement Division (STAD)**

STAD is the most extensively researched of all cooperative learning methods and was first developed by Robert Slavin and his colleagues at John Hopkins University. It proved to be the most flexible and the simplest of all cooperative methods. It was
developed mainly to address the essential components of successful cooperative learning. STAD is adaptable to a wide range of subject matters and grade levels.

Slavin (1994) pointed out that STAD is not meant to be used as a comprehensive teaching method. According to Slavin (1994), STAD is more intended to be used as a way to organize classes, which eventually leads to an improved performance of all students.

The principle that governs this approach is that students work together to learn and are also responsible for the learning of their team members as well as their own learning.

The most important thing according to Slavin (1994) is that all group members learn sufficiently and understand that the work won’t be considered done unless all members understand the content. Slavin (1994, 1995) emphasized three major concepts of STAD; team rewards, individual accountability and equal opportunities for success.

*Team Rewards:*

The team can be rewarded for meeting designated criteria by getting certificates or other rewards. There is no competition among teams. All teams can be rewarded based on how much they score (Slavin, 1995).

*Individual Accountability:*

When all group members learn, then the group succeeds. Students of the same group have to ensure the acquisition of the knowledge in question among all group members. Consequently, they need to tutor each other and make sure that each member of the group is adequately prepared for the individual assessment (Slavin, 1995).
*Equal Opportunities for Success:*

Individual improvement from a previous success is what students contribute to the team. This ensures equal contributions of students of high, average and low academic levels. This also ensures that students are equally challenged to do their best (Slavin, 1995).

*Implementing STAD in the Classroom:*

Slavin (1995) highlighted four major factors in the implementation of the STAD approach in the classroom; teams, class presentations, team recognition and quizzes. These elements are intermingled and repeated over three to five days or class hours.

*Class Presentations:*

Teachers should dedicate 1 to 2 periods for instruction while continuously linking the lesson to the group assignments and individual quizzes. The major steps that instructors should emphasize during the instruction involve (Slavin, 1995): informing students of the content of the lesson and explaining the lesson's importance; reminding students of presentation skills; sticking to the objectives; dealing with the meaning of the content and avoiding rote learning; assessing students' comprehension; calling on students to answer questions; explaining why a response is acceptable or not; switching fast from concept to concept; using short tasks for students to perform; maintaining momentum.

*Teams:*

The STAD teams are heterogeneous teams (level, gender, and ethnicity) consisting of four to five members. It is of the utmost importance that the teacher makes sure that students understood the importance of working collaboratively as one team.
Students need to know that their group work is not done until all group members fully understand the material (Slavin, 1994). Individual accountability is guaranteed since the achievement of the team is determined by the learning of all members.

Each group is given two worksheets with two answer sheets to work on with each other. That can be achieved by having the group work collectively or each two together. It is the responsibility of the students to tutor each other until each individual in the group is capable of scoring high on their quizzes (Slavin, 1994).

One major responsibility of the teachers is to teach the students how and when to ask for assistance from each other and how to provide efficient explanations (Tomei & Dembo, 1998). This process is very important for students to learn to have an effective implementation of the STAD approach, and it can be facilitated when teachers circulate around the class asking students some questions and encouraging them to explain their answers. By doing so, students acquire deeper comprehension of the content in question (Hassard, 2000).

Slavin (1994) argued that teams can be left together for five to six weeks. Teams are then shuffled giving the opportunity for those teams with a modest performance to have a new beginning.

Assigning Teams:

Students must first be tested, and then, accordingly, teachers have to come up with a summary sheet that ranks students from highest to lowest.

By going down the ranking list in order, teachers assign each student a different letter taking into consideration the number of teams (five teams would be A-E). When the
teachers reach the last used letter, they start over again but in a reverse order (E-A) (Slavin, 1994).

*Quizzes:*

Teachers allow the teams to work for one to two periods to master the content. Afterwards, each member is tested individually and is no more allowed to seek the help of his or her group members. Students are then evaluated according to the improvement they have achieved from one test to another. According to Slavin (1994), this makes sure that equal chance for achievement is provided for students of all levels, high, average and low and that all students are similarly challenged to achieve their best where the input of every single member is valued.

Any individual in the group, away from his or her level of achievement can add equally to the score of the team. Every student starts with an initial score considered from an average of previous grades, and is given points based on how much he or she can progress from these scores. The points of the groups are calculated in the following way:

- more than ten points below the initial score – five points
- between one to ten points below the initial score – 10 points
- initial score to ten points above – 20 points
- more than ten points above or a perfect score – 30 points.

To calculate a team score, teachers add up the scores of the improvement of every group member and then divide those scores by the number of members in the group to come up with a team score. The reward of the group is based on how well the members performed as a team. Rewards are given as follows:

(Slavin, 1994, 1995).
• Super Team for 25-30 points
• Great Team for 20-24 points
• Good Team for Less than 20 points

Spelling

What is spelling?

“Spelling is a highly complex task that is gradually mastered over a period of time as an individual becomes acquainted with the properties and purposes of written language. It is not merely the memorization of words. Spelling involves the use of strategies which may vary according to the words being attempted and the knowledge that the writer has acquired through experiences with words” (Bolton & Snowball, 1993, p. 2).

“Spelling is a subject that allows for no creativity or differences of opinion. Only one spelling of a word is correct. It is a precise skill which is important yet difficult to master at any level of development” (Bollman, 1991, p. 10).

Spelling is a puzzling subject for most educators. On one hand, it is considered by society as an essential social value and an indicator of literacy; and on the other hand, it is perceived by many educators as a subject demanding humble concern in the curriculum (Graham, 1983; Hodges, 1982; Ediger, 1995).

Traditional Perspective on Spelling

Venezky (1980) observed that spelling was perceived as an unimportant subject by many cognitive psychologists, and it was only in the last ten years that a few started to regard it as a topic worthy of investigation.

In the past, and because of this mismatch between the sounds and the spelling of some words, spelling instructional strategies were based on mere rote learning and
memorization (Horn, 1969). Rules were taught at times when they were applicable; however, the rules were many, and they included a lot of exceptions which made educators put less emphasis on them. The emphasis was on the following: finding out the right words for teaching (Horn, 1926; Thorndike, 1921), analyzing students’ errors mostly in terms of letter and sound correspondence (Gates, 1937), and trying to come up with effective strategies for instruction (words presented in lists rather than in contexts, administering a pretest, providing instruction, and then administering a posttest (Horn (1946)).

Contemporary Perspective on Spelling

The ways spelling has been perceived have changed drastically over the years. The comprehensive understanding of the English spelling paved the way for more efficient strategies for instruction. More educators now consider that when memorization plays a major role in learning how to spell, it cannot be the sole agent in the spelling learning process (Henderson, 1990).

Learning to spell involves the ability to realize how words function—the rules that govern their structure and how this structure affects meaning and sound (Brown & Ellis, 1994; Read & Hodges, 1982; Templeton & Bear, 1992). Consequently, teaching and learning spelling involve a wider theoretical and practical domain than in previous years (Templeton, 1991). The examination of patterns that can be found in the sound, structure, and meaning of words is now emphasized in spelling instruction versus the obsolete stress on learning the spelling of the 5,000-plus most frequently taking place words in writing or having students study the spelling of specific words that they have problems with their spelling, as suggested by Horn (1926) and Thorndike (1921).
In part, this conclusion resulted from the common understanding among researchers that word knowledge is the most important issue in the process of reading words and writing words (Ehri, 1993; Gill, 1992; Perfetti, 1992). When students become well-informed about the structure of words, they become more fluent readers (Perfetti, 1992). Thus, orthographic knowledge is the key for adequate reading and writing. However, many educators still lack this skill of teaching spelling and even are not fully aware of the nature of the spelling system (Gill & Scharer, 1996; Henry, 1996; Moats, 1995; Morris, Blanton, Blanton, Nowacek, & Perney, 1995).

**Spelling and Letter-Sound Correspondence**

Among the most important factors that made the spelling of English words tedious is the mismatch between sound and letters in a wide range of words. The ceaseless question of why not we just write words the way they are pronounced has been asked by teachers as well as students throughout the years. T.S. Watt's poem “Brush Up Your English” (as cited in Taylor & Taylor, 1983) has become a classic of a kind, highlighting the various ways in which the same sounds can be written in the English language. It begins:

"I take it you already know

Of tough and bough and cough and dough.

Others may stumble but not you,

On hiccough, thorough, tough and through... (p. 99)"

According to Cummings (1988), there should be a balance between the phonetic and the alphabetical requirements in spelling. Consequently, "sounds [must] be spelled
consistently from word to word" with a respect to the meaning that requires that "units of semantic content be spelled consistently from word to word (p. 461)."

*Characteristics of English Spelling*

Linguists identified the characteristics of spelling in English as: alphabetic, orthographic, syllabic, and morphemic. From an educational point of view, Henderson and Templeton (1986) identified the different levels of information of the English spelling as alphabetic, pattern, and meaning.

*Alphabetic*

The English language started out as a phonemic writing system (grapheme to phoneme correspondence). Sounds were presented from left to right and matched the letters. Those phonemic roots are still obvious in words such as *mat* and *stop*. Nevertheless, throughout centuries, a myriad of new words that have different origins—Scandinavian, Germanic, Greek, French, Latin, Spanish, and Greek—were coined to the English language. The spelling of those words in the original language was generally brought in too. This had the unavoidable effect of taking spelling away from its straightforward letter-sound correspondence (Venezky, 1999).

*Pattern*

Patterns govern the English spelling. The role of those patterns is to provide a certain level of consistency that works between and within syllables, and they also support the alphabetic level in offering information about how sounds are spelled. Those patterns provide valid explanations as to the reason behind the presence of letters that do not have a sound by themselves in specific words: those letters have the role of signaling the pronunciation of other sounds in the word. For example, in the word *scrap*, each letter
matches a sound in English. However, to distinguish between the pronunciations of the word *scrap* and the word *scrape* with the long *a* sound, the letter *e* was added. The VCe pattern allows us to differentiate what would otherwise be confusing spellings—like using the word *scrap* for the spelling of both words *scrap* and *scrape*.

**Meaning**

Another reason for not having words spelled the same way they sound is that we would drop the consistent spelling of meaning that is conserved among words having the same base and their derivations. To illustrate this preservation, words such as *critic*, *criticism*, *criticize* and *please*, *pleasant* and *pleasure* can be considered. This consistent spelling of morphemic elements serves as a helpful strategy for writers as well as a useful method to decode unfamiliar words encountered by students during their reading (Aronoff, 1994; Derwing & Baker, 1986).

**The Way Students Learn to Spell**

As with any other type of learning, learning how to spell words starts from a more tangible (understanding of letters and sound) to a more theoretical level of analysis and understanding (pattern and meaning). Students, consequently, start off with the comprehension of the alphabetical level in the spelling system, and then move to the pattern layer to reach eventually the meaning one. The understanding of those layers is done gradually and depends on ample experiences with meaningful reading and writing (Ehri, 1993; Frith, 1985; Henderson, 1990; Templeton & Bear, 1992).

According to other researchers, this progression is not merely the application of different levels of analysis at each level, but also involves intricate processes where a
number of different strategies are involved all through the learning process (Read, 1994; Snowling, 1994; Treiman, 1993).

Emergent literacy is the period in which spelling starts (Morris, 1993). This period is characterized by the learning of the form and functions of print. At this stage, inventing spelling starts to find its way where consonants emerge first (Morris, 1993).

According to Morris (1993), this stage is very important and serves as the foundation for moving to the next stage, the alphabetical layer of spelling.

In the pattern layer, students start to realize that spelling does not only function in a left-to-right way, but also groups of letters work together to distinguish a sound. The understanding of the letter pattern comes before the understanding of the syllable pattern. (Cummings, 1988; Invernizzi, Abouzeid, & Gill, 1994; Templeton, 1979).

Throughout years, students progress from learning how spelling represents sound to learning how spelling represents meaning. As learners’ literacy skills develop through writing, learners understand words that comprise the meaning and spelling patterns that characterized words that were later introduced into English. Most of this section of English vocabulary, including literally thousands of words, represents a more conceptual realm. However, from a developmental point of view, the cognitive ability of the learners becomes more advanced which allows them to understand those concepts along with the different layers of information presented in spelling (Fowler & Liberman, 1995; Templeton, 1989).

Strategies for Teaching Spelling

There is a great inconsistency in teaching spelling in today’s classrooms, and, in addition to that, spelling is still a controversial issue in education (Schlagel, 2002;
Boynton & Walker, 2004). Some believe that the conventional spelling books have outlived their usefulness and should be dropped from the curriculum. They argued that the teaching of spelling should be incorporated with other subject areas and only taught as need arises (Bean & Bouffler, 1987; Wilde, 1990). This position maintains that a definite curriculum for the instruction of spelling is not required. In this view, accurate spelling is picked up while dealing with reading and writing. Teaching a specific spelling lesson should only be done when the teacher feels the need for it and through mini-lessons and editing workshops. Students may further be asked to have all the words they have trouble with compiled into individual notebooks for study and reference. Consequently, students will learn better the spelling of words when those words are relevant to them and needed to be able to communicate effectively (Bean & Bouffler, 1987; Wilde, 1990).

Another method suggested to teaching spelling is through "word study" sequences created to fit students' varying developmental levels (Bear, Invernizzi, Templeton, & Johnston, 2000; Ganske, 2000).

Still others argue that conventional spelling books are functional tools that, if used correctly, are a competent and reliable way to instruct the spelling system (Templeton, 1991).

According to Graham (1983), teachers should allot 60 to 75 minutes per week for spelling instruction. However, if children are not given enough time for spelling practice, they do not learn (Pennington, 1995). Also a pretest should be administered for students to know which words they are already familiar with their spelling and which words need to be studied (Graham, 1983).
Gettinger, (1993); Mallette, Harper, Maheady & Dempsey, (1991) and Lane, (1997) note that immediate correction of errors proved to be a very effective technique in promoting correct spelling. When students’ spelling mistakes are directly corrected, then students won’t spent time practicing the incorrect spelling. According to Bollman (1991), allowing students to express their creativity in writing overshadows the need of correct spelling and consequently students’ spelling mistakes are not corrected. "Due to the emphasis on composition and the factors that are involved in composing, spelling has been left alone and poor spellers have been left to face their own deficiencies and deal with them in any way they can" (Bollman, 1991, p. 9).

Teaching Spelling through STAD

There is little research in the area of cooperative learning and spelling. According to Graham (1983), 60 to 75 minutes per week should be allocated for teaching spelling. However, rarely does any classroom instruction provide students with this time, let alone practice time. With no time for practice, it is very hard for learning to take place (Pennington, 1995). Pennington, in her 1995 study, found that when students were given the opportunity to study with a partner for 20 minutes a day and guided on how to study together, they scored significantly higher on the end of the week spelling tests than those students who were deprived from this opportunity (Pennington, 1995).

According to Fowler (1989) peer tutoring and cooperative groups are effective techniques in spelling achievement. In her 1989 study, Fowler found that students who played the role of tutors scored above the class median and those who scored below were tutees. The tutors would say the word, use it in a sentence and repeat the word again as the tutee wrote the word. After all words were written, the tutor spelled each word for the
tutec. The tutee corrected each word and the process was repeated. The research has shown that after this process both the tutor and tutee spelled more words correctly than before; moreover, attitudes toward spelling became more positive (Fowler, 1989).

In a study conducted by Fowler (1989), students were divided into heterogeneous groups of five and asked to complete exercises as a group. They were instructed that they need to assist each other, and were told that every group member has to score at least 80% on the test that must be taken individually. The results showed that low-spelling achievers improved by an average 15.2 points and the number of full grades increased by four times (Fowler, 1989).

In a study on cooperative learning and students' achievement, Kambiss (1990) found out that students achieved higher in spelling tests after 12-week treatment by which students were instructed using the STAD cooperative learning techniques than students who were taught using traditional techniques (Kambiss, 1990). Augustine, Gruber and Hanson, (1989) utilized cooperative techniques for over 10 years to teach grade three spelling and reported that spelling scores improved consistently (Augustine, Gruber & Hanson, 1989).

Conclusion

Extensive literature has researched the cooperative learning approach and its effects on different subject matters. The STAD approach was even the most heavily researched. This literature supported the fact that cooperative learning methods can prove to be one of the most effective teaching techniques since it has very positive effects on achievement tests, attitudes, and motivation in different subject areas. However, little research was found that investigates the reliability of the STAD approach on the teaching
of spelling. To test the researchers' claim as to the effectiveness of the cooperative learning approach, namely the STAD approach, and as an attempt to provide a study that deals with the implementation of the STAD approach in teaching spelling, a study was conducted on two classes of grade two in a private medium school in Lebanon.
Chapter III
Methodology

Introduction

This paper explores the implementation of the cooperative learning approach, namely the STAD approach to teaching spelling in two sections of grade two. This study took place at a private English medium school in Lebanon. Two different teachers were responsible for the spelling instructions. Teacher A (the researcher) taught one section through the STAD approach, and teacher B implemented the traditional approach in the second section.

The researcher attempts to establish the following: Teaching spelling through the STAD approach leads students to achieve higher scores on spelling assessments. To investigate this issue, the researcher used a pretest-posttest control group design.

Research Design

The researcher employed a pretest-posttest control group design to conduct the study. This design allows for precise control of variables (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003). The purpose of the control group is to enable the researcher to conclude that it is the independent variable, and nothing else, which is influencing the results of the study (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003).

In addition to the previously mentioned advantages, this design was chosen because it allowed the researcher to examine the differences between the scores of spelling achievement tests of students exposed to the STAD approach with those of students who were not. Furthermore, this design can control threats on internal validity better than other designs (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2000).
Sample

The sample of the study comprised 51 mixed-gender grade two students, chosen from a Lebanese private school in Beirut. The students were a middle class sample in terms of the socio-economic status. Their age was between seven and eight years old. The control group was one section out of four, and the number of students was 26. The experimental group was another section with a total number of 25 students.

Procedures

The design was a pretest-posttest control group. The experimental sample was assigned to the following conditions: pretest, intervention, and posttest. The intervention took place in one section of a regular grade two class over a period of one week. The control group was given the same pretest as the experimental group, received traditional spelling instruction and then given a posttest.

Cooperative learning spelling instruction: students were divided into heterogeneous groups. Having 25 students, five groups of four, and one group of six were established. The groups were created by the researcher and they were based on the spelling ability of students. Their ability was determined by assessing the students’ scores on previous spelling tests. Students’ scores were sorted out under low, middle and high ability, and at least one student from each category was included in each group.

Every team was given a letter from A to F and asked to come up with a name for their team that corresponds with the letter and to make a team song. The purpose behind this was to create bonding among team members and have them think of their group as having a unified identity. Photos of each team were taken to be used later as rewards
where they will be hanged on the corridor bulletin board whenever any team achieve “Super Team” rank (a team score of 25-30 points).

The teacher started out by stressing the importance of working cooperatively and how students were supposed to assist each other to learn the material (see appendix A). The teacher gave the students instructions for studying together as well as the way for receiving group points (see appendix B). She informed them that they would get individual grades as well as group points depending on how much improvement each group member displayed on the posttest. For example, if X had an average of 70% on the past weeks spelling tests, she would add two points for her group if her score on this spelling test increases to a 75% (see appendix C). This is done for motivational purposes; as Dornyei (2001) notes, “teacher skills in motivating learners should be seen as central to teaching effectiveness” (p. 116).

After receiving the instructions on how to work cooperatively, the students sat for the pretest (see appendix D) and afterwards received the spelling words for the week. Three forty-minute periods were dedicated to the spelling instruction and practice (see appendix E). Students studied the words with one or more members of their group while working on the exercises in their spelling book (see appendix F). While working on the exercises in the practice book, students were asked to work with a partner of a different level to teach and quiz each other. What was stressed by the teacher was that students should make sure that all members in their group know how to answer all the questions.

To find out the students’ achievement after receiving the cooperative learning instruction treatment, students were given a quiz. At the end of the week, students were
tested on the spelling words (see appendix G). The scores of the quizzes were summed at the end of the treatment for a total score.

**Traditional instruction:** students were first given a pretest (see appendix H). They were then given a list of spelling words. The teacher taught the spelling lesson. Then students were asked to study assignments individually. These study assignments comprised; alphabetizing the words, quizzing themselves, using the words in sentences, writing letters using the words, and completing the pages in the spelling workbook (see appendix I). At the end of the week students again receive another quiz (posttest) (see appendix J) which is the same as the pretest.

**Instruments**

A weekly spelling test was the instrument used to measure spelling achievement. The spelling words were from the literature anthology text that was used in the second grade curriculum for this school. This text was the Harcourt, Trophies. Spelling word lists were based mainly on particular spelling patterns and were supplemented by vocabulary words from the reading selections.

**Ethical Issues**

Ethics in research should be dealt with carefully. In this study, participants were sheltered from any psychological or physical harm or danger since educational research involves activities that are within the habitual procedures of schools (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2001). However, for this particular study, parents were not notified that their children were to be part of a research study as the coordinator of the English department had the whole activity preplanned and included in the curriculum. To guarantee confidentiality, the students’ names and the name of the school are not enclosed.
Conclusion

A pretest-posttest control group design was implemented to study the effects of the STAD approach on spelling improvement as opposed to the traditional approach. This study was conducted over a one week period of time, where students of one section of grade two received spelling instruction through the traditional method, and students from another section of grade two were instructed spelling through the STAD approach. The STAD instructions abided by the rules suggested for implementing cooperative methods specifically the STAD method. The same pretest and posttest were given to students in both the experimental and control groups.

Analysis of the results as well as a discussion are presented in the following chapter.
Chapter IV

Analysis and Discussion

Introduction

The aim of this study was to compare the effects of both the STAD cooperative learning approach and the traditional approach as strategies for teaching spelling.

Two sections of grade two were chosen as a sample for this study. A pretest-posttest control group design was utilized. A pretest was administered to both the control group and the experimental group. The STAD approach was used as a means of instruction in the experimental group; whereas the traditional approach was used with the control group. Finally, a posttest (same as the pretest) was administered in both groups. The study stretched over a period of one week, from Monday till Friday.

Results

The results are divided into two main sections: section one reports the results of the pretest and post test control and experimental groups, and section two reports the observations conducted by the researcher.

Section 1:

Pretest and Posttest Control Group

The control group sat for the pretest on May 4, 2009, and for the posttest on May eighth. The results of both tests are indicated in table one.
### Table One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students’ Name</th>
<th>pretest scores / 15</th>
<th>posttest scores / 15</th>
<th>posttest – pretest =</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student B</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student D</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student E</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student F</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student G</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student H</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student I</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student J</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student K</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student L</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student M</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student N</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student O</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student P</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Q</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student R</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student S</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student T</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student U</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student V</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student W</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student X</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The numbers in bold indicate a grade below the acceptable passing average)

*Analysis of the Results of the Control Group*

Out of 24 students, 16 students scored below the acceptable average in the pretest (below 7.5 over 15). After the instruction, only five students scored below the average. Four out of those five students who got a below-average grade still showed an increase in the grade of the posttest. Only one student scored less in the posttest than the pretest. As for the remaining students, all showed a considerable improvement in their grades except for one student who got the same grade as the pretest and another whose grade deteriorated.

*Pretest and Posttest Experimental Group*

The experimental group sat for the pretest on May 4, 2009, and for the posttest on May 8, 2009. The results are recorded in table two.

*Table Two*

| Students’ Name | pretest Score / 15 | posttest score / 15 | posttest-pretest=
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student 1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The numbers in bold indicate a score below the accepted passing average.)

Analysis of the Results of the Experimental Group

Out of 25 students, 23 students failed the pretest (below 7.5 over 15). After the instruction via the STAD approach, out of the 23 failing students only 11 scored above the average in the posttest. However, eight students deteriorated in the posttest and scored below the pretest score, and only one student retained the same score. As for the remaining students a noticeable improvement was detected.

Section Two:

Observation

More accurate data about particular variables can be provided by direct observation (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2005). Consequently the researcher took careful notes while conducting the study. Those notes helped the researcher figure out some of the weak points in the study such as the inability of the students to work cooperatively.

The researcher in the experimental group found some difficulties in having the students understand the new method implemented. After the explanation of the lesson, and after dividing the students into groups, hardly did any member of the groups follow the instructions of the researcher (teaching each other the spelling words). The researcher had to reinforce the fact that eventually all individual grades will be contributing to the final grade of the group. In general, high achievers were reluctant to help the others to
study the spelling words and kept on working by themselves. After repetitive reminders as to the importance of teaching each other, cooperation improved gradually.

On the other hand, things went smoother in the control group as reported by teacher B. Since students were already used to the traditional method, the teacher faced no difficulty in giving the lesson.

Discussion

The results came shocking to the researcher. At the onset of the study it was hypothesized that students' achievements of spelling test improve considerably after being taught via the cooperative learning strategies, namely the Student Teams Achievement Division (STAD) strategy. However, the results came to show the opposite.

The majority of the students taught via the traditional approach scored higher on their spelling pretests than those taught via the STAD approach.

All students in the control group showed a significant improvement in their scores except for one student whose score decreased by three grades in the posttest. This result showed that the traditional approach is still standing the test of time and proved to be very effective in teaching spelling.

However, the experimental group's scores were so poor. Many students showed a decrease in their score instead of even keeping the same score. This result was unexpected, especially in a time when most of the research calls for the implementation of the cooperative approach as a useful and effective technique to teaching the different subjects including spelling.

Although a statistical analysis was not done on the low, medium, and high achievers in the study, the researcher made some general observations as to the
differences in each. The largest difference was seen with the lowest achieving students. One student had a pretest average of 2 over 15 and a cooperative learning average of 13 over 15. Average students showed deterioration in their grades. Nine students had seven over 15 in their pretest and a cooperative learning average of four, three, three, one, four, three, four, four, and four respectively.

Though students were used to work cooperatively, they were not used to the rules that govern the cooperative work. In addition, students were not used to make sure that all members of the group acquire the knowledge in question. Furthermore, the study took place only over a one week period of time, which makes the duration of the study relatively short.

Another important factor that played a major role in this study is the parents’ involvement. Students in the control group were asked to study the spelling words at home; whereas the studying of the spelling words in the experimental group was restricted to the classroom. Thus, one can conclude that the acquirement of the spelling words was due to this home preparation rather than to the effectiveness of the traditional approach used with those students.

Although the hypothesis stated at the beginning was not supported in this study, there were unanticipated positive effects on students’ motivation and peer support for academic performance in the experimental group. Because these effects are difficult to explain efficiently, it seems prudent to wait for further study to clarify them.

Conclusion

This study didn’t really serve the purpose it was meant to serve and that is due to various factors- students being not used to work cooperatively, the short period of time
dedicated for the study, parents’ involvement, and the less than efficient application of the STAD approach. Instead of proving that the cooperative approach serves, as a teaching medium, better than the traditional approach, the opposite was proven. A conclusion will be provided in the following chapter along with an extensive discussion of the limitations of the study and suggestions for future research.
Chapter V

Conclusion

In the previous chapter results were discussed. In this final chapter, the discussion focuses on the main conclusions, limitations of the study, as well as suggestions for additional research.

The study addressed the question of whether the STAD approach can be found more effective as a strategy to teach spelling than the traditional rote learning approach. This study was led in a school in Lebanon, and the sample comprised two sections of grade two students. The study took place over a one week period of time, and the design used was the pretest-posttest control group.

Given that a relatively small sample was used for the research it would be difficult to make any broad reaching conclusions. However, some general observations warrant discussion. Almost all of the students in the control group did much better on the achievement test. Whereas very few did as well as or better on the achievement test in the experimental group.

Limitations of the Study

Critically evaluating the results and the whole study is crucial. This study has certain limitations that need to be considered when taking into account the study and its contributions. However, some of these restrictions can be viewed as useful paths for future research on the same topic.

The first limitation concerns the selection of the sample. Though the study included an experimental and a control group, the subjects were not randomly selected and the size of the sample is relatively limited.
The second limitation of this study includes external validity, or the generalizability of the study. There were only 49 participants who participated in this study which makes it a small number for generalizing the results.

The third limitation is that different teachers were to teach different classes. Consequently, the results may be subject to the teachers' capacity and their ability to convey information rather than the efficiency of the teaching approaches.

The fourth limitation has to do with the correct implementation of cooperative learning. The divisions of the groups met the requirement of group division such as dividing students into small heterogeneous groups. However, some key components of effective cooperative learning were not stressed adequately by the researcher. Since students were not used to work cooperatively, more time should have been dedicated to prepare the students to be able to work efficiently in groups. Students were not able to understand the concept of being part of a group, and, consequently, they were not able to understand the concept of sharing the same fate. The spirit of competition immerged among the same group members. Individual accountability was not accomplished although the researcher frequently stressed the importance of the contribution of each member. This, again, is due to the lack of the cooperative skills among students. Johnson and Johnson (1994) argued that one of the basic factors for the success of a group work is the level of social skills students have. Students achieve higher when they are aware of the social skills and when teachers reinforce the use of those social skills. Students have to learn interpersonal skills such as staying on task, active listening, asking questions, conflict resolution and so forth.
A fifth limitation is the discrepancy between the academic levels of the experimental group and the control group. Out of 24 students in the control group, only 16 students got a below average grade on the pretest, as opposed to 23 students out of 25 in the experimental group who got below the average on the pretest.

Suggestions for Further Studies

The conclusions as well as the limitations of this study bring forth some fruitful and remarkable possible ways for future research that might be needed in relation to the premise of the study. Since through the years spelling has always received little attention from educators and has not experienced the variety of instructional methods that have characterized the teaching of reading and writing (Adams, 1991), and since this study was not able to provide accurate results, the most important avenue for future research obviously lies in continuing the elaboration of the STAD approach and its effect on spelling achievement with a sample that is already trained to work cooperatively.

Furthermore, more empirical evaluations are needed to replicate the findings in different contexts and surroundings, and with a bigger sample.

Reflexivity

If the researcher is to repeat this study, the researcher has to make sure that students are already acquainted with the new method implemented before starting with the study. Furthermore, the researcher has to reconsider the time dedicated for the study. At least a period of one month should be dedicated for the study for valid results. In addition, the researcher should consider the same sample of students to be exposed to the different approaches (STAD and traditional) rather than two samples since different spelling abilities can be one of the causes of the unexpected results. Once this is
achieved, the issue of different academic abilities between the control group and experimental group would be ruled out.
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Cooperative Learning Instructions to Students

For the next few weeks you will be studying your spelling words a little bit differently than in the past. You have all been assigned a new group to study your spelling words with. These students will be your team members for the next three weeks. You will be learning to spell the words together. It is going to be important for you to help each other learn the words. For the next few weeks you will be receiving your individual grade on your spelling test at the end of the week, but your team will also receive a group score which will be determined by how much your whole group improves from one week to the next. The teams that show the most improvement will receive prizes.

In a few minutes I will explain how each group will receive points. Your groups are not in competition with each other. Every group has an equal opportunity to receive points. If one group receives points that will not effect another group's points so every group has the opportunity to win prizes.

The first thing that your team needs to do is choose a name. This will be your team name for the next three weeks. After you have chosen a name your team needs to decide on the rules that will help you work the best together. I will pass out a list of some suggested rules. Your group may pick the ones that you think will help you the most.
Appendix B
Partner Study Instructions

You will be given the new list of spelling words each Monday. On Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, you will study the words with one other member in your group. If you have an odd number of members in your group three of you will study together. You will study the words with a different member of your group each day.

You will follow this procedure to study the spelling words.

**Student A**
1. Read the first word to student B.

**Student B**
2. Write the word on a piece of paper.

**Student A**
3. If the word is correct tell student B, "That is correct!" Then go on to the next word.

4. If the word is spelled incorrectly tell student B the correct spelling of the word. Student B immediately writes the correct spelling. Then go on to the next word.

5. Follow this procedure for the rest of the words. Then repeat the procedure using only the words that were spelled incorrectly the first time. Continue until the teacher instructs you to switch.

6. Now student A will become student B and student B will become student A.

*Repeat the entire procedure.*
Appendix C
### IMPROVEMENT POINTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quiz Score</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 or more below base</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&quot;You can do better!&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 below to 4 above base</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;About average for you -- but you can do better!&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9 above base or 90% to 99%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&quot;Better than your average -- Great work!&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or more above base or 100%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&quot;Super! Much better than your average!&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TEAM REWARDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Rewards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average of 1 point</td>
<td>• Sticker or piece of candy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average of 2 points</td>
<td>• Choice of pencil or piece of candy for each member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Certificate of achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each member receives:</td>
<td>• Sticker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Piece of candy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average of 3 points</td>
<td>• Pencil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Certificate of achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Name on Super Spellers Wall of Fame</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Any individual student who adds 3 points to their team score will have their name on the Super Spellers Wall of Fame.**
Appendix D
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. preAaf x Paragraph
2. reAaf x petroglyphs
3. for x Photo
4. rInEn x Telephone
5. graf x Graph
6. aAft x Laugh
7. cAf x Cough
8. rAaf x Rough
9. InAaf x Enough
10. toAaf x Tough
11. prAaat x pursuit
12. seAaat x Recruit
13. brAant x Birthday
14. bre x Buy
15. pAass x Dance
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. prog
2. sprayed
3. Fort a photo
4. TIF on a Telephone
5. graph a Graph
6. Left a Laugh
7. Ga F a Cough
8. RF a Rough
9. ENO F a Enough
10. for a Tough
11. POST a pursuit
12. recruit a Recruit
13. birthday a Birthday
14. Buy a Buy
15. Dans a Dance

7/15
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. paragraph
2. petroglyphs
3. photo
4. telephone
5. graph
6. laugh
7. cough
8. rough
9. enough
10. tough
11. pursuit
12. recruit
13. birthday
14. buy
15. dance

Grade: 2 A
Name: ____________ 3
May 5, 2009

15/15
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. Paragraph □
2. Petroglifi & petroglyphs □
3. Photo □
4. Telephone □
5. Graph □
6. Tough □
7. Cough □
8. Rough □
9. Enough □
10. Tought □
11. Pursuit & pursuit □
12. Recruist & Recruist □
13. Birthday □
14. Buy □
15. Dance □
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. paragraph  of  paragraph
2. pictographs  of  petroglyphs
3. sofa  of  photo
4. Talat "Telephone"
5. graf  of  Graph
6. lat  of  Laugh
7. ghaf  of  Cough
8. raft  of  Rough
9. qanaf  of  Enough
10. taf  of  Tough
11. phrot  of  pursuit
12. Recur  of  Recruit
13. Birthday  of  Birthday
14. Buy  of  Buy
15. dans  of  Dance
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. pag g epargraph
2. pet ro gh l ph s epetroglyphs
3. fot o a photo
4. tal fo a Telephane
5. gra Fa Graph
6. lo gh a Laugh
7. CUF a Cough
8. ku r a Rough
9. enUF a Enough
10. tUF a Tough
11. pr sy t a pursuing
12. reciput a Recruit
13. birth da y a Birthday
14. buy a Buy
15. dans a Dance
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. paragraph
2. petroglyphs
3. photo
4. telephone
5. graph
6. laugh
7. cough
8. rough
9. enough
10. tough
11. pursuit
12. recruit
13. birthday
14. cry
15. dance
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. paragraph
2. petroglyphs
3. phone
4. telephone
5. graph
6. laugh
7. cough
8. rough
9. enough
10. tough
11. pursuit
12. recruit
13. birthday
14. boy
15. dance
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. paragraph & Paragraph
2. petroglyph & petroglyphs
3. photo & photo
4. telephone & Telephone
5. graph &
6. laugh & Laugh
7. cough & Cough
8. rough & Rough
9. enough & Enough
10. tough & Tough
11. pursuit & pursuit
12. recruit & Recruit
13. birthday & Birthday
14. buy & Buy
15. dance &

9/15
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. Pergfe a paragraph
2. Petroglyf a petroglyphs
3. foto a photo
4. thicon a Telephone
5. graf a Graph
6. lode a Laugh
7. cof a cough cough
8. rof a Rough
9. engaf a Enough
10. tof a Tough
11. procot a pursuit
12. recrot a Recruit
13. Birthdac
14. bay a Buy
15. dace
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. paragraph
2. glyphs
3. photo
4. telephone
5. graph
6. laugh
7. cough
8. rough
9. enough
10. tough
11. recruit
12. recruit
13. birthday
14. buy
15. dance

Score: 12/15
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. pigraf
2. ring
3. foto
4. telephone
5. graf
6. Late
7. Cote
8. rope
9. Anote
10. Toke
11. piste
12. secret
13. Birthday
14. Bay
15. Dans

I Love Miss Getty
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. Paragraph
2. Paragraphs
3. photo
4. telephone
5. graph
6. Lough
7. cough
8. rough
9. enough
10. tough
11. pursuit
12. recruit
13. birthday
14. by
15. dance
1. Paragraph
2. Petroglyphs & petroglyphs
3. Photo
4. Telephone
5. Graph
6. Laugh & Laugh
7. Cough & Cough
8. Rough
9. Enough
10. Rough
11. Person & pursuit
12. Recruited & Recruit
13. Birthday
14. By & Buy
15. Dance
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. paragraph
2. petroglyphs
3. photo
4. telephone
5. graph
6. cough
7. cough
8. tough
9. enough
10. tough
11. pursuit
12. recruit
13. birthday
14. buy
15. dance

May 5, 2009

4/15
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. __peregrine__ paragraph
2. __petroglyphs__
3. __feta__ photo
4. __telephone__
5. __graph__
6. __lase__ laugh
7. __cause__ laugh
8. __rufe__ rough
9. __enuff__ enough
10. __tace__ tough
11. __purt__ pursuit
12. __recruit__
13. __birthday__ Birthday
14. __by__ buy
15. __Daws__ Dance
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. paragraph
2. petroglyphs
3. photo
4. telephone
5. graph
6. laugh
7. cough
8. rough
9. enough
10. tough
11. pursuit
12. recruit
13. birthday
14. buy
15. dance
Dictation

Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. paragraph
2. pteranodons petroglyphs
3. photo
4. telephone
5. graph
6. laugh
7. cough
8. rough
9. enough
10. tough
11. pursuit
12. recruit
13. birthday
14. buy
15. dance
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. path /r/ paragraph
2. patch /k/ petroglyphs
3. photo /fo/ photo
4. tall /f/ Telephone
5. Garf /f/ Graph
6. safe /l/ Laugh
7. cafe /k/ Cough
8. cafe /k/ Rough
9. four /f/ Enough
10. face /k/ Tough
11. ZO /for/ pursuit
12. p/fe /k/ Recruit
13. Birthday /B/ Birthday
14. stay /k/ Buy
15. / Dance
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs.
/f/ gh, ph

1. Parrafo / paragraph
2. pet / petroglyphs
3. Foto / photo
4. teletfone / Telephone
5. Grafo / Graph
6. lagg / laugh
7. cuof / cough
8. roof / rough
9. enopf / Enough
10. taurf / tough
11. personf / pursuit
12. recruf / Recruit
13. Perhday / Birthday
14. biay / Buy
15. dancl /
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. Paragraph
2. Petroglyphs
3. Photo
4. Telephone
5. Graph
6. Laugh
7. Cough
8. Rough
9. Enough
10. Tough
11. Pursuit
12. Recruit
13. Birthday
14. Buy
15. Dance

2/15
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/ff/ gh, ph

1. paragraph  V
2. petroglyphs  
3. photo  
4. telephone  
5. graph  
6. laugh  
7. cough  
8. rough  V
9. enough  
10. taught  V
11. pursuit  
12. recruit  
13. Birthday V
14. Buy V
15. Dancer V
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. Paragraph
   - paragraph
2. Petroglyphs
   - petroglyphs
3. Photo
4. Telephone
   - Telephone
5. Graph
   - Graph
6. Laos
   - Laugh
7. Cape
   - Cough
8. Golf
   - Rough
9. Night
   - Enough
10. Tag
    - Tough
11. Sport
    - pursuit
12. Foot
    - Recruit
13. Birthday
14. Bug
15. Dance
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. paragraph
2. petroglyphs
3. photo
4. telephone
5. graph
6. laugh
7. laugh
8. rough
9. enough
10. Tough
11. pursuit
12. recruit
13. birthday
14. buy
15. dance
Cooperative Learning Spelling Instruction
Lesson Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduce the spelling words for the week.</td>
<td>Students will study words with a partner from their group using the study instructions provided.</td>
<td>Students will complete with a different partner the Spelling Practice Book pages 87, 88, and 89.</td>
<td>Students will study words with partner from their group using the study instruction provided.</td>
<td>Students will sit for the posttest.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F
Words with *gh* and *ph*

- Finish the sentences. Write a Spelling Word from the box on each line.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>telephone</th>
<th>rough</th>
<th>tough</th>
<th>enough</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>graph</td>
<td>photo</td>
<td>paragraph</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. We made a bar _______ in math class.
2. It contains a few sentences. It is a _______.
3. It is hard to do. It is _______.
4. The road has holes in it. It is a _______ road.
5. I ate a lot of food. I had more than _______.
6. We took a picture. Here is the _______.
7. I called my friend. We talked on the _______.

Handwriting Tip: When you write the letter *g*, make the tail curve to the left.

_ g _
Name ____________________________

- Proofread the sentences. Circle the words that are misspelled. Write the Spelling Words correctly on the lines.

1. Don’t make me laff. _____
2. Hang up the telephone. ______
3. We played in a tuff game today. _____
4. I had a bad cough last week. _____
5. Look at the beautiful petroglyphs.

- Dictionary Write these Spelling Words in ABC order.

buy dance graph rough enough

6. ______ 7. ______
8. ______ 9. ______
10. ______

SPelling STRATEGY
Guess and Check
If you are unsure of a spelling, take a guess. Then check your spelling with a dictionary.
**Word Scramble**  Unscramble each Spelling Word. Write the words.

1. agarpahrp
2. psirutu
3. topoh
4. sportypeghl
5. hbryaitd
6. uticerr

**Use the code to make Spelling Words.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Letter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. 7-9-12-7-2-6-13
8. 8-6-7-13-4-14-1-15
9. 11-1-7-1-3-7-1-11-4
10. 9-10-5-2-3-4
Appendix G
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. fargseph x
2. Pf+segphy Ph x
3. Phra x
4. Tol Phonc x
5. Gsegh x
6. Lyaph x
7. La ph x
8. ra gh x
9. renegh x
10. taxgh x
11. Pacite x
12. Scite x
13. Briday x
14. Boy x
15. Dans x
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. paragraph
2. petroglyphs
3. photo
4. telephone
5. graph
6. laugh
7. rough
8. rough
9. enough
10. tough
11. present
12. recent
13. birthday
14. buy
15. dance

Score: 14/15
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. paragraph ✓
2. petroglyphs ✓
3. phone ✓
4. telephone ✓
5. graph ✓
6. laugh ✓
7. cough ✓
8. rough ✓
9. enough ✓
10. tough ✓
11. person ✓
12. recruit ✓
13. birthday ✓
14. boy ✓
15. tan ✓

14/15
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. paragraph ✓
2. Paragrapgh x
3. phaph x
4. tetaph x
5. ghaf x
6. task x
7. cough ✓
8. lough ✓
9. anaph x
10. tahph x
11. parapath x
12. secret x
13. Birthday x
14. Boys ✓
15. dogs x

Score: 3/15

May 7, 2009
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. paragraph
2. petroglyph
3. route
4. tellbox
5. graph
6. laph
7. cephal
8. reph
9. equen
10. tough
11. persist
12. rektrod
13. birthday
14. befly
15. dons

1/15
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. Paragraph ✔
2. Petroglyphs ✔
3. Photo ✔
4. telephone ✔
5. graph ✔
6. laugh ✔
7. cough ✔
8. rough ✔
9. enough ✔
10. tough ✔
11. pursuit ✔
12. recruit ✔
13. birthday ✔
14. buy ✔
15. dance ✔
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. paragraph
2. petroglyphs
3. photo
4. telephone
5. graph
6. laugh
7. cough
8. rough
9. enough
10. laugh
11. pursuit
12. recruit
13. Birthday
14. Buy
15. Darcy
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. paragraph ✓
2. petroglyphs ✓
3. photo ✓
4. telephone ✓
5. graph ✓
6. laugh ✓
7. cough ✓
8.ough ✓
9. enough ✓
10. tough ✓
11. pursuit ✓
12. secret ✓
13. Birthday ✓
14. bye ✓
15. Dance ✓

May 7, 2009
Grade: 2A
13/15
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. paragraph
2. pergola
3. photo
4. telephone
5. grand
6. log
7. case
8. rope
9. cross
10. tof
11. desert
12. record
13. birthday
14. bay
15. domain

Total: 2/15
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. forglyph
2. petroglyph
3. bats
4. telegraph
5. graph
6. lamp
7. caf
8. tap
9. af
10. tap
11. paseyt
12. fiction
13. birthday
14. big
15. blame

4/15
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. paragraph
2. petroglyph
3. pete
4. telephone
5. graph
6. laugh
7. cog
8. rough
9. cought
10. thought
11. present
12. correct
13. Birthday
14. Bay
15. Dance
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. paragraph
2. petroglyphs
3. photo
4. telephone
5. graph
6. laugh
7. cough
8. rough
9. enough
10. tough
11. pursuit
12. recruit
13. birthday
14. buy
15. dance

14/15
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
\(/f/\) gh, ph

1. paragraph
2. petroglyphs
3. photo
4. telephone
5. graph
6. laugh
7. tough
8. rough
9. enough
10. tough
11. persistent\& pursuit
12. recruit
13. birthday
14. buy
15. dance

\[13/15\]
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/ф/ gh, ph

1. paragraph
2. physically
3. photo
4. telephone
5. graph
6. laugh
7. cough
8. rough
9. enough
10. tough
11. pursuit
12. recruit
13. birthday
14. bug
15. dance
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. Paragraph
2. petroglyph
3. photo
4. telephone
5. graph
6. leg
7. cough
8. enough
9. enough
10. enough
11. great
12. eaten
13. birthday
14. buy
15. dance
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/ʃ/ gh, ph

1. paragraph
2. petroglyph
3. false
4. telephone
5. George
6. leaf
7. cat
8. run
9. length
10. eat
11. percent
12. report
13. birthday
14. boy
15. dinner
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs.
/f/ gh, ph

1. paragraph
2. paragraph
3. photo
4. telephone
5. grief
6. lath
7. case
8. soft
9. enof
10. tahoe
11. person
12. Beaver
13. Birthday
14. buy
15. Dance

4/15
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. paragraph
2. parent
3. paint
4. telephone
5. group
6. jeep
7. race
8. race
9. tense
10. Tahoe
11. present
12. rice
13. birthday
14. buy
15. dance

Total: 4/15
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. paragraph ✓
2. petroglyphs ✓
3. photo ✓
4. telephone ✓
5. graph ✓
6. long ✓
7. cough ✓
8. rough ✓
9. enough ✓
10. tough ✓
11. persuade ✓
12. retrace ✓
13. birthday ✓
14. buy ✓
15. dance ✓

May 7, 2009
Grade: 2A
Name: __________________

Total: 10/15
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. Paragraph  
2. petroglyphs  
3. phone  
4. telephone  
5. graph  
6. laugh  
7. cough  
8. rough  
9. enough  
10. tough  
11. pursuit  
12. recruit  
13. birthday  
14. buy  
15. dance  

Total: 14/15
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs

1. paragraph
2. petroglyph
3. photo
4. telephyon
5. graph
6. laugh
7. cough
8. rough
9. enough
10. tough
11. persuade
12.mcrota
13. Birthday
14. Buy
15. Dance
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. Paragraph
2. petroglyphs
3. phone
4. telephone
5. Garaph
6. techph
7. cough
8. raf
9. enough
10. laugh
11. beergut
12. recruit
13. Birthday
14. Baby
15. Donk

8/15
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. paragraph
2. petroglyphs
3. photo
4. telephone
5. ghraf
6. laugh
7. cough
8. rough
9. enough
10. tough
11. pursuit
12. recruit
13. birthday
14. buy
15. dance

Score: 13/15

May 7, 2009
Appendix H
Name: ________________  May 5, 2009

Grade: 2-D

Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. paragh X
2. phetogh highs X
3. photov
4. ph/ ph ghon X
5. ghraph X
6. laugh
7. coup h X
8. rauph X
9. enauph X
10. phough X
11. phrusat X
12. reghroure X
13. Birghday X
14. Buys X
15. Dance X

(3/15)
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
\(/f/\) \(gh, \text{ ph}\)

1. paragraph
2. petrographs \(\times\)
3. photo \(\checkmark\)
4. telephone
5. graph
6. laugh \(\checkmark\)
7. cough \(\checkmark\)
8. rough \(\checkmark\)
9. enough
10. tough
11. pursuit
12. recruit \(\times\)
13. birthday
14. buy
15. dance
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. Paragraph
2. Petroglyphs x
3. Photo x
4. Telephone ✓
5. Graph
6. laf x
7. rough x
8. rough x
9. enough x
10. tough x
11. pursue x
12. rick roat x
13. birth day
14. bay ✓
15. dance
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. Paragraph
2. Patroglifes
3. Photo
4. Telephone
5. Graph
6. Laugh
7. Kough
8. Rough
9. Enough
10. Tough
11. Pirscout
12. Sircrot
13. Birthday
14. Bay
15. Dans

Grade: 2 D

May 5, 2009

7/15
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. paragraph  
2. patroglephs  X  
3. photo    
4. talagh  X  
5. graph    
6. laph  X  
7. craph  X  
8. rough  X  
9. aonaph  X  
10. tauph  X  
11. parSot  X  
12. rerot  X  
13. Birthday  
14. by  
15. dance
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs

1. paragraph
2. pet
3. photo
4. telephone
5. graph
6. laugh
7. cough
8. through
9. enough
10. tough
11. persons
12. researcher
13. birthday
14. bay
15. cancer

Total: 8/15
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. paragraph
2. petroglyphs
3. photo
4. telephone
5. graph
6. laugh
7. cough
8. ramp
9. enough
10. tough
11. pursuit
12. rack
13. birthday
14. buy
15. through
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. paragraph  
2. paragraph  
3. sheep  
4. laugh  
5. quick  
6. laugh  
7. cough  
8. rough  
9. enough  
10. tough  
11. quick  
12. regraph  
13. birthday  
14. Bush  
15. Diph  

Total: 15
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. Paragraph ✓
2. Petroglyphs X
3. Photo ✓
4. Telephone ✓
5. Gragh ✓
6. Laugh ✓
7. Cough ✓
8. Rough ✓
9. Enough ✓
10. Tough ✓
11. Pursuit X
12. Recreate X
13. Birthday ✓
14. Buy ✓
15. Loose ✓
dance

Grade: 2 D
Name: [Redacted]
May 5, 2009
ID: 10
15
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. paragarp X
2. potrogripes X
3. pou X
4. flopen X
5. ghrapex
6. laupe X
7. caupo X
8. rapupe X
9. inuc X
10. tojz X
11. prsot X
12. pauf X
13. Brisday X
14. Baye X
15. Bes X
Name: ____________________________
Grade: 2 D

May 5, 2009

Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. Paragraph
2. photo
3. telephone
4. graph
5. cough
6. rough
7. rough
8. inugh
9. tough
10. pursuant
11. re-route
12. birthday
13. eye
14. dance

12/15
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. Paragraph
2. Petroglyphs
3. Photo
4. Telephone
5. Graph
6. Laugh
7. Cough
8. Rough
9. Enough
10. Tough
11. Pursuit
12. Recruit
13. Birthday
14. Buy
15. Dancer

Grade: 2D

May 5, 2009
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. paragraph
2. paragraph
3. photo
4. telephone
5. graph
6. laugh
7. cough
8. cough
9. enough
10. tough
11. pursue
12. incorrect
13. birthday
14. diy
15. dance

Grade: 2 D
Name: 
May 5, 2009
Score: $\frac{8}{15}$
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. paragraph
2. patrol light
3. photo
4. telephone
5. grugh
6. laugh
7. cough
8. cough
9. inugh
10. laugh
11. pursuit
12. recott
13. birthday
14. busy
15. times

Grade: 2 D
Name: 
May 5, 2009

6/15
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. paragraph ✓
2. petrograph ✗
3. photo ✓
4. telephone ✓
5. graph ✓
6. laugh ✓
7. cough ✗
8. rough ✓
9. enough ✓
10. tough ✓
11. puncture ✗
12. recruit ✗
13. birthday ✓
14. bye ✓
15. dance ✓
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. paragraph ✓
2. petroliums ✗
3. photo ✓
4. telephone ✓
5. graph ✓
6. laugh ✓
7. cough ✓
8. rough ✓
9. enaph ✗
10. tough ✓
11. pursuit ✓
12. riñut ✗
13. birthday ✓
14. buy ✓
15. dance
Name: ____________________________  Grade: 2 D  

May 5, 2009

Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. path x
2. row x
3. lepher x
4. photo v
5. full phon x
6. graph v
7. laugh x
8. cough x
9. cough x
10. enough x
11. touch ph x
12. piqued x
13. recreate x
14. birthday x
15. buy x
dance v
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. Paragraph
2. potro-ghs
3. photo
4. tghan
5. graph
6. lagh
7. cough
8. cough
9. diphgh
10. taught
11. par sent
12. casegh
13. birth dog
14. boy
15. dance

Score: 4/15
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. paragraph
2. pat rog fright
3. ph too
4. tiphon
5. graph
6. la gh
7. couph
8. rough
9. enough
10. tough
11. press
12. pfft
13. progh
14. by
15. dan5
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. paragraph x
2. patro|ple|hs x
3. photo x
4. tele|phon x
5. graph x
6. lag x
7. cough x
8. rough x
9. enough x
10. tough x
11. person x
12. recruit x
13. birthday x
14. bay x
15. dans x

6/15
May 5, 2009
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. paragraph  
2. paragraphs X  
3. photo X  
4. tallghn X  
5. graph ✓  
6. lagh X  
7. graph X  
8. rath X  
9. ogh X  
10. rath X  
11. pursuant X  
12. retreat X  
13. bring which X  
14. By ✓  
15. this X
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. Paragraph
2. Patrowchfs X
3. Photo
4. Telephone X
5. Drew X
6. Leat X
7. Cot X
8. Scott X
9. Squat X
10. Search X
11. Person X
12. Search X
13. Bear, ver X
14. ver X
15. dense X

Total: 2/15
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. frank - graph x
2. part - light x
3. photo x
4. telephone x
5. graph x
6. lough x
7. cough x
8. laugh x
9. energy x
10. laugh x
11. peanut x
12. seakoute x
13. Birthday x
14. Bay x
15. donic x
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/\f/ gh, ph

1. paragraph x
2. petroglyph x
3. photo x
4. telephone x
5. graph x
6. laugh x
7. cough x
8. cough x
9. enough x
10. tough x
11. phracts x
12. backpack x
13. birthday x
14. bayou x
15. balance x

2/15
Appendix I
# Traditional Spelling Instruction

## Lesson Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduce the spelling words for the week. Give students a pretest. Then have students write the correct spelling of each word on their own copybook.</td>
<td>Teacher will go over the words and explain their meanings. Students will individually write the spelling words in alphabetical order.</td>
<td>Students will complete the Spelling Practice Book pages 87, 88, and 89.</td>
<td>Students will write sentences using each spelling word once. Students will quiz themselves using the Look, Say, Touch and Spell, Look Away and Write” method.</td>
<td>Students will sit for the posttest.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diary: study the spelling words for dictation
Appendix J
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/fe/ gh, ph

1. paragraph ✓
2. petroglyphs X
3. photo ✓
4. telephone ✓
5. graph
6. laugh ✓
7. rough ✓
8. rough ✓
9. enough ✓
10. tough ✓
11. pursuit ✓
12. recruit X
13. birthday ✓
14. bay ✓
15. dance ✓
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. paragraph ✓
2. petroglyphs ✓
3. photo ✓
4. telephone ✓
5. graph ✓
6. laugh ✓
7. cough ✓
8. rough ✓
9. enough ✓
10. tough ✓
11. pursuit ✓
12. recruit ✓
13. birthday ✓
14. buy ✓
15. dance
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. Paragraph √
2. Petroglyphs √
3. Photo √
4. Telephone √
5. Graph √
6. laugh ? x
7. cough √
8. rough √
9. enough √
10. tough √
11. pursuit √
12. recruit √
13. birthday √
14. buy √
15. dance

14/15
Dictation

Consonant Digraphs

/gh, ph/

1. paragraph ✓
2. petroglyphs ✓
3. photo ✓
4. telephone ✓
5. graph ✓
6. tough ✗
7. cough ✓
8. rough ✓
9. enough ✓
10. tough ✓
11. pursuit ✗
12. rukrot ✗
13. birthday ✗
14. buy ✓
15. dance ✓
1. paragraph
2. petrol pump
3. phone
4. telephone
5. graph
6. laugh
7. cough
8. rough
9. enough
10. tough
11. pursuit
12. course
13. birthday
14. buy
15. done
Dictation

Consonant Digraphs

/gh/ gh, ph

1. paragraph X
2.C nervous X
3. gh X
4. telephone 
5. groan X 
6. round X 
7. cough
8. rough 
9. enough 
10. tough 
11. peerswitch 
12. react X 
13. birthday X
14. bay X
15. dance 

5/15
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. paragraph
2. petroglyph
3. photo
4. telephone
5. graphic
6. laugh
7. cough
8. rough
9. enough
10. tough
11. pursuit
12. wash
13. birthday
14. bug
15. dance

Score: 14/15
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. paragraph
2.regonlydchs
3. photo
4. telephonr
5. graph
6. laugh
7. cough
8. rough
9. enough
10. tough
11. pmursuit
12. ricernt
13. birthday
14. buy
15. dance
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. Paragraph
2. Petroglyphs
3. Photo
4. Telephone
5. Graph
6. Laugh
7. Cough
8. Rough
9. Enough
10. Tough
11. Pursuit
12. Recruit
13. Birthday
14. Buy
15. Dance

May 7, 2009
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. paragraph x
2. petroglyph x
3. pot x
4. teliph x
5. garpe x
6. gher l x
7. cough u
8. rough v
9. enough v
10. tough v
11. percoit x
12. ghork x
13. birthday
14. buy v
15. dance v

1/15
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs

/ʃ/ gh, ph

1. paragraph
2. petroglyphs
3. photo
4. telephone
5. graph
6. laugh
7. cough
8. rough
9. enough
10. tough
11. pursuit
12. recruit
13. birthday
14. boy
15. dance
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. Paragraph ✓
2. Petroglyphs ✓
3. Photo ✓
4. Telephone ✓
5. Graph ✓
6. Laugh ✓
7. Cough ✓
8. Rough ✓
9. Enough ✓
10. Tough ✓
11. Pursuit ✓
12. Recruit ✓
13. Birthday ✓
14. Buy ✓
15. Dance ✓
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. paragraph ✓
2. petroglyphs ✓
3. photo ✓
4. telephone X
5. graph ✓
6. laugh ✓
7. cough ✓
8. rough ✓
9. enough ✓
10. tough ✓
11. pursuit ✓
12. recruit ✓
13. birthday ✓
14. buy ✓
15. face X
Dictation

Consonant Digraphs
/f/ /gh/ /ph /

1. paragraph
2. petroglyphs
3. photo ✗
4. telephone ✗
5. graph
6. laugh
7. cough ✗
8. rough ✗
9. enough ✗
10. tough ✗
11. permit ✗
12. recruit ✗
13. birthday ✗
14. buy ✗
15. dance

11/15
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. paragraph
2. petroglyphs
3. photo
4. telephone
5. graph
6. laugh
7. cough
8. rough
9. enough
10. tough
11. pursuit
12. recruit
13. birthday
14. buy
15. dance

5/15
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. paragraph
2. petroglyphs
3. photo
4. telephone
5. graph
6. laugh
7. cough
8. rough
9. enough
10. tough
11. pursuit
12. recruit
13. birthday
14. buy
15. dance
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. paragraph √
2. petrole y ph y X
3. photo √
4. tele phone X
5. graph √
6. la gh X
7. cough √
8. pough
9. enough √
10. tough √
11. p u c r u i t
12. sec r u i t √
13. birthday √
14. buy √
15. d an c e
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. paragraph [ ]
2. destructions ✓
3. photo [ ]
4. telephone X
5. graph ✓
6. laugh ✓
7. cough ✓
8. rough ✓
9. inough X
10. tough ✓
11. paragraph X
12. pursuit X
13. birthday X
14. bag X
15. dance
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. paragraph x
2. patrols x
3. ph t x
4. flieen x
5. graph v
6. taught v
7. cough v
8. pough x
9. anough x
10. tough v
11. pursur x
12. saowit x
13. drhbb y x
14. diy x
15. donc x

Total: 4/15
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs
/f/ gh, ph

1. paragraph
2. patroglysphs
3. photo
4. telephone
5. graph
6. tough
7. cough
8. rough
9. enough
10. tough
11. pursuit
12. recruit
13. birthday
14. buy
15. dunce
Dictation

Consonant Digraphs

// gh, ph

1. biograph ✓
2. photograph ✓
3. photo ✓
4. telephone x
5. graph ✓
6. laugh ✓
7. cough ✓
8. rough ✓
9. rough ✓
10. tough ✓
11. pursuit ✓
12. recruit x
13. rhythm ✓
14. buy ✓
15. dance ✓
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs

/gh, ph /

1. Paragraph
2. Paragraph
3. Photo
4. Telephone
5. Graph
6. Laugh
7. Cough
8. Cough
9. Enough
10. Tough
11. Purple
12. Recruit
13. Birthday
14. Busy
15. Dance
Dictation
Consonant Digraphs

/f/ gh, ph

1. paragraph
2. petroglyphs
3. photo
4. telephone
5. graph
6. laugh
7. cough
8. rough
9. enough
10. taught
11. backpack
12. recruit
13. birthday
14. buy
15. dance

14/15
Dictation

Consonant Digraphs
/ff/ gh, ph

1. paragraph ✓
2. petroglyphs ✓
3. photo ✓
4. telephone x
5. graph ✓
6. laugh ✓
7. cough ✓
8. rough ✓
9. enough ✓
10. tough ✓
11. pursuit ✓
12. recruit ✓
13. birthday ✓
14. bug ✓
15. dance ✓