



Open Research Online

The Open University's repository of research publications and other research outputs

Teaching word recognition to children with severe learning difficulties: an exploratory comparison of teaching methods

Journal Item

How to cite:

Sheehy, Kieron (2009). Teaching word recognition to children with severe learning difficulties: an exploratory comparison of teaching methods. *Educational Research*, 51(3) pp. 379–391.

For guidance on citations see [FAQs](#).

© 2009 Routledge

Version: Accepted Manuscript

Link(s) to article on publisher's website:

<http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1080/00131880903156955>

Copyright and Moral Rights for the articles on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. For more information on Open Research Online's data [policy](#) on reuse of materials please consult the policies page.

oro.open.ac.uk

Teaching word recognition to children with severe learning difficulties: an exploratory comparison of teaching methods.

Kieron Sheehy,

The Open University, Milton Keynes, United Kingdom.

Abstract.

Background

Some children with severe learning difficulties fail to begin word recognition. For these children there is a need an effective and appropriate pedagogy. However, conflicting advice can be found regarding this derived from teaching approaches which are not based on a shared understanding of how reading develops or the skills which the non-reader needs to master

Purpose

In this research three techniques for teaching word recognition in this context are described and compared: 1) the handle technique, 2) morphing method and 3) word alone. It also discusses whether it is appropriate for such small scale research to influence pedagogy.

Programme description

The handle technique uses an abstract mnemonic cue use to teach word recognition and previous research indicates it is more successful than the presentation of words alone. The morphing method transforms a word into a photographic picture and a previous study suggested that it might also be more effective than presenting words alone.

Sample

Six children between the ages of 11 and 13 years of ages were selected. The criterion for selection was being unable to recognise any words from the British Ability Scales Reading Test. All the children attended a school for children with severe learning difficulties.

Design and methods

A three-condition related design was used. The order in which the conditions were presented was counterbalanced and each child was taught 12 words, four words in each experimental condition. The children encountered each of the three methods and overall each word was taught via each method. Within conditions (teaching methods) the presentation of words was randomised. The number of words which the children could read (without cues) before each session was recorded, following the presentation of the uncued words in a random order. The difference in the number of words recognised between the three conditions was considered using a nonparametric statistical analysis.

Results

The results suggest that the handle approach might be a more effective method of teaching word recognition.

Conclusion

Research in this area is necessarily small in scale. However it is ongoing and cumulative and can give insights into potentially beneficial changes in classroom practice.

Keywords: severe learning difficulties; word recognition; pedagogy, handle technique, morphing

Introduction.

There has been a recent move within the United Kingdom to look for an evidence base that might inform classroom pedagogies which can effectively include children identified as having special educational needs (Rix et al 2006). This has been tied to a critique of special i.e. different, pedagogical approaches for children with learning difficulties (Lewis and Norwich 2001). However, within the area of teaching initial reading skills to children with severe learning difficulties there appears to be an indication that current practices are failing this group and conflicting recommendations concerning pedagogy. This article looks at this area, gives the results of a small scale study comparing three teaching approaches and considers the nature of evidence needed to produce a change in pedagogic practice.

Some children with severe learning difficulties struggle to begin word recognition (Sheehy and Howe 2001). Although large scale data on the extent of this problem are lacking, recent longitudinal and cohort studies suggest this is likely to be a problem experienced by a significant number of these children. One study followed a sample of 82 pupils from eight special schools in the United Kingdom (Chadwick et al. 2005). After five years only 20 % of the children were able to recognise up to 10 familiar words and over 60 % read below this level, and their reading skills were classified as 'little or none'. Another study, of thirty-five special schools, came to the conclusion that relatively few of the pupils would learn to read and write conventionally (Lacey et al. 2007). This evidence might indicate that developing initial word recognition skills is not possible for many of these children, or that the methods used to teach word recognition are not appropriate for some of these pupils. Lacey et al.(2007) found that phonic based approaches were commonly being used as part of the daily literacy hour, which occurs in schools in England, and that this focus on learning was maintained even for pupils who would develop, at best, a very small sight vocabulary or 'a few key words' (Lacey et al. 2007, 157). This emphasis on a phonics based approach would seem to be ineffective for many of these children (Lacey et al. 2007). There is evidence to suggest that as the learner's degree of intellectual impairment increases, the utility of phonic based approaches decreases. (Fowler et al, 1995 cited in Verucci, Menghini, and Vicari 2006) and it has been argued that a phonic based approach assumes a skill base which this group of children may not have (Sheehy and Holliman 2009). Developmental models of reading describe the transition from non-reader to skilled reader (Seymour, 2007) and would characterise the way these children tackle printed words as 'primitive pre-alphabetic visually based word recognition' (Seymour 2007, 2). At this stage of reading development children demonstrate no phonemic segmentation skills and hence new isolated words are inaccessible. Further, some of this group of children experience significantly difficulty in learning such segmentation (Verucci, Menghini, and Vicari 2006)

In contrast these children are able to learn to recognise logographic symbols (see figure one) relatively easily (Sheehy 2001; Wu and Solman 1993). These symbols are more accessible because they represent a word or concept but do not require decoding via constituent sounds.

Insert figure 1 about here.

Figure 1. Examples of logographic symbols

These symbols have become widely used within the teaching of children with severe learning difficulties (Abbott 2005), in particular as part of language and communication development programmes (Makaton 2008). It is not surprising therefore that teachers and educational researchers have endeavoured to harness logographic symbols as a means of helping children to learn word recognition. One established approach uses the symbols in spatial conjunction with the printed word. After repeated presentations the symbol is gradually faded away. There is evidence that some children have consequently learned to recognise words (Detheridge 1993; Van Oosterom and Devereux 1982) and this method is a recommended approach within special education (Makaton 2008). The implied theory of learning here is a behaviourist one, where a transfer of association occurs between the symbol cue and the written word. However, this evidence arises from educational case studies and investigations without controls or comparison groups. A review of such evidence from a range of controlled empirical studies reveals that this approach is no better than presenting the 'word alone' (Solman and Wu 1995) and that the symbols may sometimes act to interfere with the pupils development of word recognition (Solman and Singh 1992; Singh and Solman 1990).

The current situation suggests that there is a need for a demonstrably effective alternative to phonics and symbol fading approaches. One line of research which attempted to develop such a technique began by considering the skills used by children beginning word recognition. The assumption was that these skills might then be explicitly taught to children who were failing at this first step (Sheehy and Howe 2001). There is evidence that children beginning to recognise words, can be described as 'logographic readers' (Frith 1985; Seymour 2007). These logographic readers do not use letter sounds to decode the alphabet script or relate graphemes to phones (Bowman and Treiman 2002) but rather make a connection between the visual symbol and its meaning (Gensio and Bastien-Toniazzo 2003). They make this connection using a salient visual feature of the word itself (Bowman and Treiman 2002). This recognition strategy has been noted in early educational research where young children described the parts of the words which they used for recognition. For example '... monkey because it has a tail' (Gates and Boeker 1923, p.470).

A new approach was therefore developed which attempted to use a salient feature to support logographic word recognition i.e. it was based on established developmental model of typical reading development. The technique was known as the handle technique (Sheehy and Howe 2001). It is essentially a mnemonic approach in which the child's understanding of the word is encoded as a non-pictorial cue called a handle (mimicking the salient local feature). A word is identified from the student's spoken or signed vocabulary and written on a flashcard. This word is discussed with the child and their personal associations and understanding of the word are noted. The teacher then selects the attribute that seems to have the most personal salience and adds a handle to the written word (Sheehy and Howe 2001). Table 1 below shows some words with their associated handles and illustrates their idiosyncratic nature.

Insert Table 1 about here.

Table 1: Words and handles.

Abstract words can also be encoded, often using aspects of the child's non-verbal communication (e.g. 'this' might be represented as a tongue shaped when saying the word or a pointing finger). This technique has been explored and refined through a series of experiments (Sheehy 2001, 2002a, 2002b). The optimum site for a handle emerges as around the first or final letter (2002b) and there are several ways in which a handle might be faded or removed. The evidence suggests that a feedback cuing approach is most efficient. The word is shown first, then the word/handle compound shown briefly and finally the word alone again (Sheehy and Howe 2001). In all of these studies the handle technique has been shown to be significantly more effective than a word alone approach. However, an alternative approach to the handle technique was developed and there was some evidence to indicate that it was also more effective than the simple presentation of words alone. This method, known as morphing method (MM) was derived from a symbol accentuation approach (Miller and Miller 2000). In this a picture is gradually transformed into a word. Sheehy (2005) utilised morphing software, with a feedback cuing approach, transforming a word into its corresponding picture and then back again. This process is illustrated in Figure 2.

Insert Figure 2 about here.

Figure 2: An example of morphing.

The apparent success of these two methods raises a question. The underpinning rationale for the morphing method was *not* based on developing local feature recognition, rather it arose from a refined symbol fading (i.e implicit behaviourist) approach. This sees children with severe learning difficulties as learning to read words in a different way to other children. Its success, albeit in a single study, seemed to undermine the 'local feature' explanations which had been given for how the handle technique worked (Sheehy and Howe 2001; Sheehy 2002b). There was therefore a need to make a direct comparison between these two approaches. Further, given that other symbol based approaches have been shown to be no better than the simple presentation of words alone, comparisons of both handle (HT) and morphing (MM) approaches needed to be compared to a simple word alone (WA) approach. This study therefore made a direct comparison between three approaches: the handle technique; the morphing method and the word alone method. In keeping with a local feature perspective it was predicted that the handle technique would be most effective method overall.

Hypothesis

There would be a significant trend across the methods in the number of words recognised by the participants:

HT>MM>WA.

The null hypothesis was that there would be no significant difference between the three conditions.

Method.

Participants

Six children between the ages of 11 and 13 years of ages were selected. As in previous research (Sheehy 2002, 2005) the criterion for selection was the absence of a sight vocabulary following extensive focussed teaching. The children were unable to recognise any words from the British Ability Scales Reading Test (Elliot 1983). All the children attended a school for children with severe learning difficulties. As with other children for whom these pedagogies were developed, these participants could not be regarded as a homogenous group. Their individual needs encompass physical impairments, epilepsy and speech and language problems. Supportive signing was used by several children.

Ethics

The study was run in keeping with the BERA ethical research guidelines (BERA 2004). Initially the children's parent's or guardian gave consent on behalf of each child, following the receipt of an information sheet and a written consent form. The children were asked if they would like to volunteer. However, their communication difficulties and age meant that monitoring their ongoing assent was particularly important. The research sessions would be stopped if a child appeared upset by the programme or expressed unwillingness during a session.

Procedure

Because of the potentially significant variations between individuals regarding sensory and cognitive impairments a between groups comparison is inappropriate. A within-participant design was therefore used to control for this factor. A three-condition related design was used. This design had been trialled in previous research and found to be suitable for this group of children (Sheehy 2002b). The order in which the conditions were presented was counterbalanced and each child was taught 12 words, four words in each experimental condition. The children encountered each of the three methods and overall each word was taught via each method. Within conditions (teaching methods) the presentation of the four words was randomised.

Stimulus words

The use of a repeated measures design necessitated that the same words were used for each participant. This departed from the original HT method of taking words from the child's expressed vocabulary, but had been trialled previously (Sheehy 2002a, 2002b). The words used were taken from the Makaton Vocabulary: ball, car, biscuit, house, dog, bed, tree, egg, cake, banana, drink and chair (Walker, Cousins, Parson and Carpenter 1985). For each session the same person undertook all the teaching. This happened within a one week period, with a follow up session one week after the final teaching session. Before each teaching session began the teacher presented the child with the uncued words, in a random order. The number of words that the child correctly identified was recorded.

The three conditions.

1. *The Handle technique (HT)* In the first session a handle was developed and attached to each word. The child was told "this says..." and then asked 'tell me about....' This was written on one side of the card, with the word alone on

the other. In the sessions which followed a feedback cuing method was used. The word (without handle) was shown. The child was asked “what does this say?” and the word and handle was shown and then the word (without handle). In essence the card was ‘flipped over’ to briefly show the handle.

2. *Morphing Method (MM)*. The words were presented on the screen of a laptop computer. The child was told “this says...” To match the other conditions, in the first session the child was asked ‘tell me about...’ The child was asked to name the word as the morph began. If the child was unable to name the word he or she was again told its name and prompted to repeat it. (Sheehy 2005).
3. *Word Alone (WA)* The words were presented, individually, on a card. The child was told “this says...” To match then other conditions, in the first session the child was asked ‘tell me about...’ The child was asked to name the word and if unable to do so were told its name and prompted to repeat it.

Results.

The results of the teaching sessions are summarised in Figure 3. This shows the number of words recognised, for each method, without cues at the start of each session.

Insert Table 2 about here.

Table 2 illustrates that although words were learned in each of the three methods, more appeared to be learned through MM and HT. There is an association with a greater number of children achieving success with these methods. In analysing such a small and idiosyncratic sample standard parametric tests would present misleading findings (Leech and Onwuegbuzie 2002). For small samples which do not conform to a normal distribution non-parametric approach is needed (Siegel and Castellan 1988), which can have more power in this situation than parametric tests (Clark-Carter 1997). This form of analysis suggests that there was no significant difference between the conditions until the final teaching session. At this point there was a significant difference across the three conditions ($p < 0.01$ Pages L Trend Test, one-tailed, Siegel and Castellan 1988). As predicted the trend, in terms of words recognised, was $HT > MM > WA$. At the follow up session the same trend was also found, with a significant difference existing across the three conditions ($p < 0.01$ Pages L Trend Test, one-tailed, Siegel and Castellan 1988).

This pattern was explored in more detail using a multiple comparison of conditions (Siegel and Castellan 1988). This analysis indicated that at the start of the final teaching session (i.e. session 4) there were significant differences between WA and MM, ($p < 0.05$), and also MM and HT ($p < 0.05$). Thus both cued approaches were more effective than the presentation of words alone. One week later, at the follow up session (session 5), a different picture is found. At this point there is no significant difference between the WA and MM conditions. There is however a significant difference between WA and HT ($p < 0.05$), and also HT and MM ($p < 0.05$).

Discussion.

At the final teaching session (session 4) both the cued approaches (MM and HT) resulted in more words being recognised than with the WA approach. This supports previous research where, under certain circumstances, additional cues can be used successfully in teaching word recognition (Carpenter and Detheridge 1994; Miller and Miller 2000). This contradicts the claim that additional cues are inherently detrimental to the process of learning word recognition or, at least, no better than the presentation of words alone (Solman and Singh 1992). The results at the follow up session (session 5) show that learning words through the handle technique resulted in significantly greater retention of learning, at least in the relative short term, by this group of children. The morphing method at this point performed no better than the presentation of words alone. This result might be seen as supporting the 'local feature' view of beginning word recognition (Gough 1993). The HT approach was designed to support this process and therefore should be more effective than approaches which do not do so. In almost every session the HT resulted in a greater number of words being recognised and at the follow up session (session 5) there was no significant difference between the other, less effective, approaches.

The handle technique had the benefit of being an *individualised* mnemonic cue for each child, whereas the morphing method utilised the same set of photographs. Previous research has suggested that, when developing word recognition, individualised mnemonics are more effective than 'given' ones (Sheehy 2002b). The individualisation is of the meaning which the child associated with a picture. This could not be used within a morphing method as these associations are not representations of the picture itself, or necessarily pictorial in nature. However, each child was able to name the photographs readily and without difficulty. In terms of cuing the correct word, the photographs worked well but, when used in the MM morphing, they were not efficient in leaving the child able to name the word without pictorial cues. This is in line with previous research in which pictorial cues are found to be readily recognised (Solman and Singh 1992), can be manipulated to become as effective as words alone (Sheehy 2005; Wu and Solman, 1995) but are not as effective in developing uncued recognition as HT (Sheehy 2002b). It has been argued that this performance reflects pictorial cues inefficiency in developing local feature recognition (Sheehy and Howe 2001).

As in previous research the children did learn some words from the presentation of words alone (Solman and Wu 1995; Wu and Solman 1993). Anecdotal evidence from the sessions reported that some of the children began looking for handles on the WA words, although none appeared to develop this further. This suggests that the children may have begun to change the way in which they approached the non-cued words, even within such a short period of time. Future research might consider if a transfer of strategy occurs and, if so, the extent to which it supports subsequent learning. Because the methods have been counterbalanced it is difficult to unpick whether a particular word was recognisable because of its nature, because of the method used to teach it, or because it was the 1st, 2nd or 3rd method experienced by the child in a session. With this caveat there appeared to be individual differences in the children's responses. In terms of individual words some appeared to more

recognisable than others. For example 'Egg' was learned relatively quickly in all three methods, whereas 'Chair' and 'Drink' were rarely recognised. This may be because 'Egg' is the most physically distinctive of the words. Its large 'E' followed by two 'swinging g's' seems to foreground salient features which beginning readers use as recall cues (Gate and Boeker 1923).

Not all children preferred the cued methods. Child 3 found the HT method particularly difficult and she persisted with a single strategy, ignoring the handle altogether. She would point towards the first letter of the word and then 'guess'. This appeared to be how she thought reading was done and she maintained this approach in each session.

Another possible influence is the use of the computer presentation. It is debatable whether the outcomes for the two 'paper' conditions (WA and HT) would have been different if presented via a computer screen. Previous research has controlled this in a direct comparison of on-screen WA and MM and obtained findings in line with those obtained here (Sheehy 2005). It is also important to consider the overall purpose of the research, which is to identify an effective teaching approach which can be used in the classroom. The handle technique uses cards because pilot studies suggested that this was more 'teacher friendly' in terms of producing handled words (Sheehy 1995). So it would appear to be valid to compare the two approaches (HT and MM) as they stand, and as they would be used in the classroom.

The question is raised as to the extent to which that this type of research constitutes enough evidence to inform, or recommend, a change in classroom practice. An obvious issue is that the samples in this and similar studies are very small, and run for short periods of time. This style of research occurs in response to two main factors. Firstly, the number of children with severe learning difficulties, who are non-readers, is relatively, a very small group even within each school. Secondly, this group of children are typically, within the United Kingdom, educated in Special Schools. Here they receive a variety of support and activities in addition to that which might be seen as classroom teaching. A child's day may well contain speech therapy, occupational therapy, music therapy, physiotherapy and a range of other out of class activities. This puts their teacher contact time at a premium. Taking the children out of this situation to 'try out' new pedagogies is problematic. One option here is action research but, as in this research, sometimes experimental comparisons are needed. Therefore this approach includes at least one teaching method which has evidence of effectiveness so loss of 'learning time' is minimised.

Because children with severe learning difficulties are not a homogenous group with regard to their learning interactions, it can be argued that within-participant designs are the best form of experimental design to use. Yet although this works well in controlling for individual variability, it creates new issues. Children are presented with more than one teaching approach in a short period of time. Whilst experimentally elegant this can be seen as a pedagogically poor way of proceeding. This method reveals the relative effective of the methods being compared, but does not show the potential of each approach if delivered by a skilled teacher in a more straightforward manner. It could be argued that the MM and WA methods might have improved their performance under more typical teaching circumstances. It is not necessarily good practice to teach this group of children for a such a few short sessions and then expect

development and recall of learning. That the children retained some word recognition in this event indicates that all the methods being tested are potentially useful ones, and longer term a different picture might have emerged regarding their relative effectiveness. With this caveat the current research does add to a range of evidence which supports the use of the handle technique.

Using a within participants design means that potential order effects, i.e. the presentation order of the teaching methods, need to be counterbalanced. This is particularly important for children with severe learning difficulties who may experience fatigue when presented with a series of learning tasks. Whilst counterbalancing the conditions deals with this effectively for the purposes of experimental design and statistical analysis, it creates an ethical issue in terms of the demands it imposes. Consequently, the scale of the current design has arisen through pilot studies but is also informed by experience as a class teacher and a judgement of what is 'reasonable'. For children who have experience years of failure in beginning word recognition being faced with a reading related task can create anxiety. It is therefore essential that the children's ongoing assent is monitored carefully during the investigation.

Concerning sample size, the design itself imposes constraints. In order to consider three methods, six children, or additional groups of six, are required to ensure a balanced comparison. In the current research suitable groups of 12 or 18 children did not exist within the school. However the within-participants design allows nonparametric analysis to be undertaken on such a small sample and levels of significance to be reported (Leech and Onwuegbuzie 2002; Siegel and Castellan 1988). Further, because the design controls for individual difference and order effects, it allows for some comparisons to be made with similarly designed studies (Sheehy 2002b). The approach developed in this line of research has therefore been a series of small studies which explicitly build on research which has gone before (Sheehy and Holliman, 2009). This contrasts with a 'one-off' large scale investigation, and presents an alternative way to help to develop understanding of pedagogical issues whilst being sensitive to the ethical issues of working with this group of learners. Although based on small samples, the use of nonparametric analysis effectively controls for accepting a 'false positive' in the results (Zimmerman 2001) and the effects noted in this study are likely to be seen if replicated in classrooms. The results of this study need to be replicated and in a design which gives has greater more pedagogical validity. This might be achieved by a design which incorporates longer term action research in addition to a short term controlled study and follow up. This could reveal the extent and limits to which the cued approaches (HT and MM) develop word recognition. The argument has been developed that learning local feature recognition underpins the success of the HT and differentiates it from other approaches. However, the nature of how nonreaders interact visually with words and cues, as children move from cued to unsupported word recognition, needs to explicitly has not been explored in this context and needs to be investigated.

Slavin (2002, 15) argues that 'children deserve the best educational programs, based on the most rigorous evidence we can provide' and in these circumstances this research approach attempts to be both ethical in practice and rigorous in nature. There is a need to develop approaches for a children for whom current teaching

approaches appear to be failing (Lacey et al. 2007; Chadwick 2005) When children with severe learner difficulties fail academically it is easy to attribute this failure to factors within the learner. This attribution might act to reduce awareness that a change in pedagogy is needed and therefore it is important that research is designed which might reveal evidence capable of challenging this attribution and current teaching practices.

Conclusion.

These findings add to a line of research that reveals insights into supporting the development of word recognition. In contrast to picture fading approaches, the handle technique is based on a local feature approach to word recognition. It assumes that children with severe learning difficulties learn to recognise words in the same way as all other children, but need a particular type of support to take an initial step in word recognition.

References

- Abbott, C. L. and H. Lucey 2005. Symbol communication in special schools in England: the current position and some key issue. *British Journal of Special Education* 32: 196-201.
- BERA 2004 British Education Research Association Ethical Guidelines <http://www.Bera.ac.uk/guidelines.html> (accessed February 14, 2008).
- Bowman, M. and R. Treiman 2002 Relating print and speech: The effects of letter names and word position on reading and spelling performance *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology* 82: 4, 305-340
- Carpenter, B. and T. Detheridge 1994. Writing with symbols. *Support For Learning: Serving Special Educational Needs*, 9: 27-32.
- Chadwick, O., M. Cuddy, Y. Kusel, and E. Taylor 2005 Handicaps and the development of skills between childhood and early adolescence in young people with severe intellectual disabilities. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research* 49: 12, 877 – 888
- Clark, C.R. 1984. A close look at the standard Rebus system and Blissymbolics. *Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps*, 9: 37-48
- Clark-Carter, D. (1997) *Doing Quantitative Psychological Research*. Hove: Psychology Press.
- Detheridge, T. 1993. Symbolic significance. Special Needs. *The Times Educational Supplement*, 30-31
- Elliot, C.D. 1983 *The British Ability Scales*. Windsor: NFER-Nelson

- Frith, U. 1985. *Beneath the surface of developmental dyslexia*. In M. Coltheart, K. E. Patterson and J. C. Marshall (Eds.), *Surface Dyslexia* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul
- Gates, A. and E. Boeker, 1923. A study of initial stages in reading by pre-school children. *Teachers College Record*, 24: 469-488
- Genisio, V. and M. Bastien-Toniazzo 2003. Is logographic processing holistic or analytic? *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 18: 239-249
- Gough, P. B. (1993). The beginning of decoding. *Reading and Writing*, 5: 181-192.
- Lacey, P., L. Layton, Miller, J. Goldbart, and H. Lawson 2007. What is literacy for students with severe learning difficulties? *Exploring conventional and inclusive literacy. Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 7 3: 149 – 160
- Leech, N.L. and A.J Onwuegbuzie. (2002). A call for greater use of nonparametric statistics. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid- South Educational Research Association, November, in Chattanooga, TN.
- Lewis, A. and B. Norwich 2004. *Special teaching for special children? Pedagogies for inclusion*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Makaton 2007. Using symbols and signs: including the word under a symbol or sign. http://www.makaton.org/about/ss_word.htm (accessed 15 October 2008)
- Miller, A. and E. Eller-Miller 2000. The Miller method: a cognitive-developmental systems approach for children with body organization, social and communication issues. In S. Greenspan & S. Weider (Eds), *ICDL Clinical Practices Guidelines: Revising the Standards of Practice for Infants, Toddlers and Children with Developmental Challenges* 489–516. From <http://www.millermethod.org/> (accessed 10 October 2007)
- Rix, M., Hall, K. with M. Nind, K. Sheehy, J. Wearmouth, J. 2005. A systematic review of interactions in pedagogical approaches with reported outcomes for the academic and social inclusion of pupils with special educational needs in mainstream classrooms. In: *Research Evidence in Education Library*. London: EPPI-Centre, Social Science Research Unit, Institute of Education
- Seymour, P. H. K. 2007. Continuity and Discontinuity in the Development of Single-Word Reading: Theoretical Speculations In Elena L. Grigorenko & A. J. Naples (Eds.), *Single-Word Reading: Behavioral and Biological Perspectives* London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates
- Sheehy, K. 1995. Teaching word recognition to children with severe learning disabilities. In G. Shiel, U. Ni Dhalaigh and B. O'Reilly (Eds.), *Reading Development to Age 15: Overcoming Difficulties*. Reading Association of Ireland Blackrock, Co. Dublin. 64-70

- Sheehy, K. 2002a Overcoming failure to begin word recognition using a local feature strategy: The handle technique and children with severe learning difficulties'. *The Journal of the Irish Learning Support Association*, 24: 78-87.
- Sheehy, K. 2002b. The Effective Use of Symbols in Teaching Word Recognition to Children with Severe Learning Difficulties: a comparison of word alone, integrated picture cueing and the handle technique. *International Journal of Disability, Development & Education*, 49:1, 47-59.
- Sheehy, K. 2005. Morphing images: a potential tool for teaching word recognition to children with severe learning difficulties. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 36: 2, 293-301.
- Sheehy, K. and A. Holliman, (2009). Logographic routes to word recognition. In (Eds) C. Wood and V.Connelly. *Reading and Spelling: Contemporary Perspectives*. London. Routledge
- Sheehy, K. and M.J. Howe, 2001. Teaching non-readers with severe learning difficulties to recognise words: The effective use of symbols in a new technique. *Westminster Studies in Education*, 24: 61-71.
- Siegel, S and J.N. Castellan 1988. *Nonparametric statistics for the behavioural sciences*. London: McGraw International.
- Singh, N. N. and R.T. Solman 1990. A stimulus control analysis of the picture-word problem in children who are mentally retarded: The blocking effect. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 23: 525-532.
- Solman, R. T., and N.N. Singh 1992 . Pictures block the learning of sight words. *Educational Psychology*, 2: 143-153
- Solman, R. T., and H.M. Wu 1995 . Pictures as feedback in single word learning. *Educational Psychology*, 15: 227-244
- Slavin, R.E. 2002. Evidence-Based Education Policies: Transforming Educational Practice and Research *Educational Researcher*, 31: 7, 15-21
- Van Oosterom, J. and K. Devereux 1982. Rebus at Rees Thomas School. *Special Education: Forward Trends*, 9: 31-33
- Walker, M., S. Cousins, F. Parsons and B. Carpenter 1985. *Symbols for Makaton* Camberley, Surrey, UK: Makaton Vocabulary Development Project
- Worrall, N. and Y. Singh 1983. Teaching TMR children to read using integrated picture cueing. *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, 87: 422-429.
- Wu, H. M. and R.T. Solman 1993. Effective use of pictures as extra-stimulus prompts. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 63: 144-160
- Zimmerman, D.W. (2001) A note on the influence of outliers on parametric and nonparametric tests. *The Journal of General Psychology*. 121: 391-401.

Figure 1. Examples of logographic symbols



Shoe

Ball

Man

Rebus symbols (Clark, 1984)

Table 1. Words and their associated meanings.

Word	Associated Meaning	Word plus Handle
Birthday	Squirty ..gun	birth [˘] day
Katy	Gotta ponytail	K [˘] aty
Home	Signs 'Home'	H [˘] ome




Figure 2: An example of morphing

Table 2 showing n words (out of four words) correctly recognised by each child in each experimental condition

	teaching sessions														
	1			2			3			4			5 (follow up)		
	WA	MM	HT	WA	MM	HT	WA	MM	HT	WA	MM	HT	WA	MM	HT
Child 1	0	3	3	1	3	4	2	3	4	3	3	4	2	3	4
Child 2	0	2	3	1	4	3	2	4	3	1	4	4	1	4	3
Child 3	1	0	0	2	2	0	3	0	0	1	2	1	1	1	1
Child 4	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	2	1	2	3	2	2	4
Child 5	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	2	0	0	2
Child 6	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	2	1	4
Total	1	5	10	4	11	9	7	8	14	6	12	15	8	11	18

Please note that the presentation order of each method was counterbalanced to control for order effects overall. An individual child may score 'worse' on one method simply because they did that method last