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What is “Metalinguistic Awareness”? 

Ability to talk about, analyze, and think about language independent of the concrete meaning of each word.
Metalinguistic Awareness: A Research Perspective

Metalinguistic skills are often distinguished as:

- **Epilinguistic capacity** — monitoring of the actual speech production (Tunmer, Bowey, Pratt, & Herriman, 1984).
- **Metalinguistic awareness** — ability to see words as decontextualized objects and manipulate and analyze them apart from content and production (Gombert, 1992; Shulman & Capone, 2010).
- **Metalinguistic awareness** has its foundation in semantic, syntactic, and pragmatic (linguistic) awareness and knowledge.

Metalinguistic Awareness and Language Disorders

- Students with language disorders who have received language intervention may have acquired adequate linguistic knowledge (e.g., semantics, morphology, syntax, pragmatics) and **perform in the average or low-average range on CELF-5**.
- Those students may not have crossed the bridge to metalinguistic awareness and metacognitive abilities that are separate from linguistic skills – “Paid the Toll”

Metalinguistic Skills and Academic Performance

- **Reading comprehension** and metalinguistic skills are strongly linked (Achugar, Schleppegrell, & Oteiza, 2007).
- **Teaching multiple meanings** (homonyms) and ambiguity detection skills to 3rd graders improves reading comprehension (Zipke, Ehri, and Cairns, 2009).
- **Metalinguistic facility** is essential in the writing process for initial production (composition) and revision (editing), as writers choose words, analyze communicative intent, and assess syntax for both functions (Myhill & Jones, 2007; Myhill, 2012).
- **Explicit teaching** about language and using language as a tool is important for literacy development (Achugar, Schleppegrell, & Oteiza, 2007; Enright, 2013; Fang & Schleppegrell, 2010).
Metalinguistic Skills and Academic Performance

Some metalinguistic skills that will have an impact on academic performance are:

- the ability to make and understand inferences
- using and understanding multiple meanings words
- using figurative language and humor
- formulating spoken or written sentences that meet cultural expectations for conveying messages or expressing emotions or opinions

METALINGUISTIC DIFFICULTIES

1. Planning for production of statements, questions, paragraphs, stories in speaking/writing.
3. Problem-solving for strategic language use.
4. Self-monitoring to identify errors and problems.
5. Correcting inefficient approaches and behaviors.
6. Recognizing syllable, word, phrase, clause, and sentence boundaries in speech/print.
7. Monitoring, self-correcting, editing speech and writing.
8. Playing with language (riddles, jokes, rhymes).
9. Analyzing and talking about language.

METALINGUISTIC NEEDS

1. Processing time to plan responses and/or pre-organization of expected responses.
2. Highlighting and explicating schema/scripts to foster planning, predicting and hypothesizing.
5. Identifying sources of breakdowns & correcting inefficiencies.
7. Highlighting syllables, words, phrases, clauses, and sentences.
8. Practice in playing with various language components (words, phrases, clauses).
9. Practice in analyzing- discussing oral and written language (meaning features, patterns, rules, applications)
KNOW

Purpose of Test

• Identify students 9-21 years old who have not acquired the expected levels of language competence and metalinguistic ability for their age.

Test Overview

• A revision of the Test of Language Competence-Expanded (TLC-E) with many updated test items appropriate for today’s students
• Assesses metalinguistic skills with a battery of five stand-alone tests
  • Metalinguistics Profile
  • Making Inferences,
  • Conversation Skills
  • Multiple Meanings
  • Figurative Language
• Ages: 9.0—21.11
• Designed for students who have adequate linguistic knowledge (understand basic concepts and speak in grammatically correct sentences), but lack the metalinguistic skills needed for Grades 3 and up
• Ideal for students with subtle language disorders or students on the autism spectrum
Description of Test

• Metalinguistics Profile
  – Rating scale that can be completed before or after testing; yields a norm-referenced score (with very high reliability)

• Two tests of meta-pragmatic skills: the expression of appropriate responses to the communicative demands of the situation
  – Making Inferences
    • Conversation Skills

• Two tests of meta-semantic skills: the appropriate understanding of language content as it relates to the larger communication context
  – Multiple Meanings
  – Figurative Language
Metalinguistics Profile

- Rating scale that can be completed before or after testing
- Can be completed based on your observations supplemented by information from parents/teachers/other informants if needed (only the SLP completes the form)
- Consider cultural influences when completing the form
- Yields a highly reliable norm-referenced score
Metalinguistics Profile

Item Analysis:

Score: Norm-referenced scores by age group

What skills are tested?

• Meta-pragmatic skills
  – the expression of appropriate responses to the communicative demands of the situation

• Meta-semantic skills
  – the appropriate understanding of language content as it relates to the larger communication context
Meta-Pragmatic Skills

• Tests appropriate responses to the communicative demands of the situation

Making Inferences

People often tell us about things that happen, but they don’t always tell us why they happen. Then we have to guess for ourselves. Turn to the MI Demo page and say, For example, this morning my Uncle Freddy sent me a message that said (point),

I was hoping to wash my car today. I guess I’ll wash it tomorrow.

I figured out a couple of reasons why my Uncle Freddy couldn’t wash his car today:

1. it was raining, or
2. He didn’t have enough time.
Listen to this one. The students had to go safely outside for a fire drill. After the fire drill, Amy and Gary were called to the principal’s office. Now I’ll read four other sentences that could explain why Amy and Gary were called to the principal’s office. I want you to select the two sentences that best explain what could have happened. You may read your choices aloud to me, point to them, or say the letters of your choices.

Amy and Gary were called to the principal’s office after the fire drill because:

a. They talked loudly during the drill.
b. They walked out of the building quietly.
c. They ran outside instead of walking.
d. They both have a parent who is a firefighter.

SAY: Now I want you to tell me a reason other than the ones listed here why Amy and Gary could have been called to the principal’s office.
The dad could have said, “Pam, don't be late for dinner.” (point to the words in the order that you say them) Or the girl could have asked her friend, “Would you like to join us for a late dinner, Pam?” (Point to the words in the order that you say them.) Then say, Here's another one.

---

Turn to the CS Trial 1 page and say, Here’s a picture of two students in a school hallway. Listen to the words I heard one of them say (point to them) don’t (pause), leg. Tell me a sentence one of the students could have said using the words don’t, leg. Make sure your sentence is about the picture and that all the words are in it. The words can be used in any order.

---

Turn to the CS Trial 2 page and say, Let’s try one with three words. Here’s a picture of a coach and her students in the gym. Here are the words I heard one of them say (point to them); basketball (pause), fun (pause), easy. Tell me something one of them could have said using these three words. Remember, you can use the words in any order, but it must be something that someone in the picture could say.

If the examinee produces a sentence with the three words, say, That was a good sentence. If you used the words in a different order, you could say, (make up a sentence that uses the words in a different order to emphasize the fact that the words can be used in any order). Proceed to the test items.

If the student can’t produce a sentence using the three words, say, One of the girls could have said, “I think it’s fun and easy to play basketball.” Or, the coach could have said, “Basketball will be easy and fun if you practice.” Point to the words in the order that you say them in each sentence.
**Item Examples on Conversation Skills**

**TRIAL ITEM 2**

basketball  fun  easy

---

**How are Meta-Semantic Skills Tested?**

Tasks test students’ understanding of language content as it relates to the larger communication context

*Multiple Meanings*

Look at the ball.

*Figurative Language*

Situation: A boy talking to his little brother who wants to play a game with him
Expression: “Get lost!”

---

**Examples from the Multiple Meanings Test**

*Multiple Meanings*

He wrote several letters.

Andrea moved one foot to the left.

Visiting relatives can be annoying.
DEMO INTRO

Turn to the MM Demo page and say, Sometimes people say or write something that could have two meanings. If I said, Look at the bat (point to the sentence), it could mean look at the baseball bat or look at the flying animal. That's because this word bat (point to it) means two things—a baseball bat and a flying animal. Let's do another one.

Look at the bat.

TRIAL 1

Turn to the MM Trial 1 page and say, Here's another sentence that means more than one thing (point to it)! Be careful not to say the stimulus sentence in a way that stresses one word more than another. What two things can the sentence mean?

1. Your drinking glasses are dirty, and 2. Your eyeglasses are dirty.

Your glasses are dirty.

If the student produces both essential meanings, say, That's right, the word glasses (point to it) means two things, so the sentence, “Your glasses are dirty,” can mean the glasses you drink from are dirty, or your eyeglasses are dirty. If the student produces only one or none of the expected responses, say, There are two kinds of glasses—drinking glasses and eyeglasses. So, the sentence, “Your glasses are dirty,” can mean the glasses you drink from are dirty, or your eyeglasses are dirty.

TRIAL 2

Turn to the MM Trial 2 page and say, Here's another sentence that means more than one thing—The fish was ready to eat. Be careful to say the sentence so that your stress or intonation pattern does not cue the student as to one meaning or the other. Say, What two things can the sentence mean?

1. The fish was cooked and ready to be eaten by someone.
2. The fish was hungry and ready to eat some fish food.

The fish was ready to eat.
The fish was ready to eat.

If the student produces both essential meanings, say, That's right, the words ready to eat (point to them) mean two things, so the sentence, "The fish was ready to eat," can mean that the fish was cooked and ready to be eaten by someone, or the fish was hungry and ready to eat some fish food.

If the student produces only one or none of the meanings, say, Ready to eat can mean ready to be eaten by someone or ready to eat food. So, the sentence, "The fish was ready to eat," can mean the fish was cooked and ready to be eaten by someone, or the fish was hungry and ready to eat some fish food.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lexical</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>6 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples from the Figurative Language Test

Situation: Two friends talking about the surprise party they’ve planned for another friend.

Expressions: “He wanted that Mary is going to spill the beans to Andre about the party.”

1. Mary will keep the bag of beans.
2. Mary will keep it under her hat.
3. Mary will be the one out of the loop.
4. Mary will run over spilled milk.

Sample responses: Mary will keep the bag of beans. Mary will keep it under her hat. Mary will be the one out of the loop. Mary will run over spilled milk.
Item Examples on Figurative Language
DEMO INTRO

Turn to the FL Demo page and say: Sometimes we say something that seems to mean one thing, but really means something else. This is called an expression.

For example, a boy who was talking to his little brother who wants to play a game with him might say, “Get lost!” Point to the expression.

If we heard this expression, we would know that the big brother didn’t really want his little brother to actually get lost; he just wanted him to go away and stop bothering him. I’m going to tell you what other people said and the expressions they used in different situations, and I want you to tell me what you think they really meant.

Item Examples on Figurative Language
TRIAL

Turn to the FL Trial page and say, The first situation is a girl talking to her friend about a flat tire. (Pause.) The girl said, “I have to change the tire, so would you give me a hand?” In your own words, tell me what does give me a hand mean?

• Help?
• Assist?

Item Examples on Figurative Language
TRIAL Continued

Turn to the next page (FL Trial Continued) and say, Tell me which of these sentences means almost the same thing or could be used instead of would you give me a hand? Wait until you have heard me read all of them before you choose. You may read your choice, point to it, or say the letter. Read each sentence, pausing between them. You may point to each sentence as you read it.

a. You know this like the back of your hand.
b. I sure wish you would pitch in.
c. Hold out one of your hands.
d. Why don’t you turn your back on me?

For the Trial Item only, read the correct response (I sure wish you would pitch in) aloud if the student chooses incorrectly or does not respond. When the Trial Item is completed, say, Now let’s do some more.
Test Scores

- Individual tests
  - Standard Scores
  - Percentile Ranks
  - Age Equivalents
  - Growth Scale Values
- Composite scores for
  - Meta-Semantics Index
  - Meta-Pragmatics Index
  - Total Metalinguistics Index

Classroom Performance Assessment

Classroom Content, Form & Use
Using CELF-5 ORS with CELF-5
Metalinguistics

Observational Rating Scales (ORS)
Wayne A. Secord, Ph.D.
Elisabeth H. Wiig, Ph.D.
THE NORMAL CURVE, PERCENTILES, SUBTEST AND COMPOSITE SCALES
ORS ASSESSMENT APPROACH
- ORS (Rating Scale – Checklist)
- Interview
- Observation
- Follow-up Meeting

ORS Performance Sample
Interview Outcomes
- Weakness Patterns
- Strength & Interest Patterns
- Learning Adjustments
  - Positive
  - Negative

INTERVIEWING
MAJOR CONSIDERATIONS
- SHARED RESPONSIBILITY
- RESPONSIVE LISTENING
- CLARIFICATION, AND
- PROBLEM SOLVING
Practical Considerations

- KEEP THINGS VERY PRACTICAL
- LENGTH (No More than 2 Pages)
- COMPLEXITY (K.I.S.S.)
- PRIORITIZING (TOP 10)
- LINK TO INTERVIEWING
- CONNECTION TO OBSERVATION
- A FEW THINGS DONE WELL!
- CELF-5 ORS is PERFECT

A FEW THINGS DONE WELL!

- FOCUSING ON FUNCTIONALITY ... in context
- FOCUSING ON THE MOST IMPORTANT THINGS
- DESIGNING INTERVENTION ... with and through others!
- PUTTING A SYSTEM ... in place that works when you're not there!
- KNOWING YOUR CLIENT ... Well enough to help him!

AND

DATA – DATA – DATA – DATA – DATA

Trust In DATA!

Case Examples
Case Study 1 – Kim  Female (9;7)

Background Information

Kim is 9 years 7 months old and attends the 3rd Grade. She was referred for a language evaluation because her grades in reading and writing have been falling during the past school year. She started out in school without obvious difficulties in learning to read (decode) or write (encode) and the difficulties with literacy acquisition emerged gradually as the demands for language knowledge and use have increased. The referral question from her teacher was: “What causes her difficulties in reading and writing at this point?”

Case Study 1 – Kim  Female (9;7)

- **CELF-5 Composite/Index (90%) Level of Confidence**
  - Core Language Score: 82 ± 4 (78-86)
  - Receptive Language Index: 89 ± 5 ** (84-94)
  - Expressive Language Index: 75 ± 4 (71-79)
  - Language Content Index: 89 ± 6 ** (83-95)
  - Language and Memory Index: 75 ± 4 (71-79)

** Critical Value Discrepancy (Level of Significance) = .05

Case Study 1 – Kim  Female (9;7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CELF-5 Tests:</th>
<th>Standard Score</th>
<th>Variation from Test Ave.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recalling Sentences</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulated Sentences</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-3 (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Classes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantic Relationships</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following Directions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence Assembly</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding Spoken Paragraphs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Definitions</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragmatics Profile</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Comprehension</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-3 (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured Writing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 74/11 = 6.72 or 7
Case Study 1 – Kim  Female (9;7)

CELF-5 Index scores indicate:
- Core Language Index of 82 (78-86) = mild severity range
- Receptive Index is 89 (84-94) = average to low average range
- Expressive Index is 75 (71-79) = moderate severity range
- Receptive Language is significantly better than Expressive (.05)
- Language Content is 89 (83-95) = low average range
- Language-Memory is 75 (71-79) = moderate severity range
- Language Content is significantly better than Memory (.05)
- Subtest Scores range from 9 to 4 – Formulated Sentences (4) and Reading Comprehension (4) are both intrapersonal weaknesses
- Literacy based subtests (RC = 4) & (SW = 5) are both depressed.

CELF-5 Metalinguistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composite Scores</th>
<th>Standard Score</th>
<th>SEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Metalinguistics Index (TMI)</td>
<td>77 ± 6</td>
<td>(71-83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meta-Pragmatics Index (MPI)</td>
<td>82 ± 9</td>
<td>(73-91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meta-Semantics Index (MSI)</td>
<td>73 ± 6</td>
<td>(67-79)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variation
- Making Inferences (MI) 9 + 3 (+)
- Conversations Skills (CS) 8 - 1
- Multiple Meanings (MM) 6 ± 0
- Figurative Language (FL) 4 - 2
- Metalinguistic Profile (MP) 7 + 1

Mean of the Tests 31/5 = 6.2 or 6
One Intrapersonal Strength (MI)
Case Study 1 – Kim  Female (9;7)

CELF-5 Metalinguistics scores indicate:
- Overall Metalinguistic ability in the low average to moderate range (TMI = 77); Confidence Interval (71-83)
- Meta-pragmatic skills are slightly lower than average and at risk (MPI 82); Confidence Interval (73-91)
- Meta-semantic skills are in the lower than average range (MSI 73); Confidence Interval (67-79)
- Subtest scores range from 9–4 with a significant strength for making inferences.

WISC-IV Index Scores (90%) Level of Confidence
- Verbal Comprehension 95 ± 6  89-101
- Perceptual Reasoning 104 ± 6  98-10
- Working Memory 79 ± 6  73-85
- Processing Speed 102 ± 8  96-110

The WISC-IV profile suggests that working memory deficits contribute to the expressive language/language-memory problems and to difficulties in literacy acquisition (reading comprehension and written expression).
Intervention Targets for Kim

- Develop ability to plan for language production for speaking and writing through explicit teaching (webbing, mind maps, flow charts).
- Highlight and explicate narrative scripts and schema to support planning, inferencing, predicting and hypothesizing and develop awareness of genres.
- Develop awareness and understanding double meaning statements (ambiguities) at the word and sentence level, in humor and jokes, and in idiomatic and figurative language use.
- Allow extra time for responding, test taking, and project completion to counteract working memory difficulties.

Case Study 2

Male (13 yrs. 8 mo.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CELF-5 Subtest</th>
<th>Standard Score</th>
<th>Subject Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recalling Sentences</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulated Sentences</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantic Relationships</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding Paragraphs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Classes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence Assembly</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following Directions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supplementary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Comprehension</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured Writing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragmatics Profile</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean of Subtest Standard Scores: 68/10 = 6.8 or 7
Case Study 2  Male (13 yrs. 8 mo.)

- **CELF-5 Composite/Index** (90%) Level of Confidence
  - Core Language Score 80 ± 5 (75-85)
  - Receptive Language Index 88 ± 5 * (93-83)
  - Expressive Language Index 76 ± 5 (81-71)
  - Language Content Index 82 ± 5 (87-77)
  - Language & Memory Index 76 ± 5 (81-71)
  - Critical Value Discrepancy (Level of Significance) = .05

* Case Study 2  Male (13 yrs. 8 mo.)

- **CELF-5 Metalinguistics Standard**
  - Making Inferences (MI) 5 - 1
  - Conversations Skills (CS) 3 + 3 (+)
  - Multiple Meanings (MM) 7 + 1
  - Figurative Language (FL) 6 + 1
  - Metalinguistic Profile (MP) 7 + 1
  - Mean of the Tests 28/5 = 5.6 or 6
  - One Intrapersonal Weakness (CS)

* Case Study 2  Male (13 yrs. 8 mo.)

- **CELF-5 Metalinguistics**
  - Total Metalinguistics Index (TMI) 73 ± 7 (66-80)
  - Meta-Pragmatics Index (MPI) 68 ± 10 (58-88)
  - Meta-Semantics Index (MSI) 81 ± 7 ** (74-88)
  - Difference of 13 Points is Significant at the .15 level of competence
Case Study 2

Male (13 yrs. 8 mo.)

- WISC-IV Index Scores (90%) Level of Confidence
  - Verbal Comprehension 93 + 6 87-99
  - Perceptual Reasoning 108 + 6 102-114
  - Working Memory 90 + 6 84-96
  - Processing Speed 101 + 8 93-109
  - Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test - IV (PPVT-IV)
    - Total score 98

---

Case Study 2

Jack

Male (13 yrs. 8 mo.)

---

Case Study 2

Male (13 yrs. 8 mo.)

---

Case Study 2

Male (13 yrs. 8 mo.)

---
### CASE NUMBER 2 (MALE, 13:8)

#### Performance Pattern Summary

##### (I) Pattern No. 1  Study Skills (Planning – Organization)  Rank ____

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Study Skill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Completing Assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Turning work in on time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Remembering things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Disorganized and sloppy work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Finishing assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Sloppy note taker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Utilizes study questions or guides</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

##### (II) Pattern No. 2  Literacy (Writing/Reading Process)  Rank ____

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Literacy Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Repetitive sentences make little sense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Few links between written sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Building up and breaking down sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Revising written work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Recognizing errors in writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Disorganized and sloppy writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Distinguish important from unimportant information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

##### (III) Pattern No. 3  Social Communication Skills  Rank ____

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Social Communication Skill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Negative communication affect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Poor at relating to others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Rarely volunteers to talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Passive communicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Pays little attention to what others say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Rarely socializes or communicates with other students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Won't talk or communicate in class</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

##### (IV) Pattern No. 4  Motivation and Responsibility  Rank ____

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Motivation and Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Passive, avoids school work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Always has an excuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Doesn't turn work in on time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Fails to finish assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Doesn't remember his work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Turns off during lectures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Difficulty attending to work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Avoids reading and writing activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

##### (V) Pattern No. 5  Metalinguistic (Critical Thinking)  Rank ____

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Metalinguistic Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Simple language forms, sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Struggles to understand subtle meanings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Uses concrete language, talks about simple things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Difficulty with abstract (figurative) language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Written sentences lack complex forms and structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Poor performance on metalinguistic test tasks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

##### (VI) Pattern No. 6  Sense of Competence  Rank ____

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Sense of Competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Little success with academic activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Avoidance behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Passive communicator with low social skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>History of unsuccessful communication experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Negative attitude wears on teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Rejected negatively by peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Needs successful communicative interactions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS:**
REVISED LIST
Following Teacher Input

CASE NUMBER 1 (MALE, 13:8)
Performance Patterns for IEP Development

Study Skills (Planning and Organization)
1. Completes - Finishes Assignments
2. Turns work in on time
3. Remembers things
4. Is organized and produces work that is neat in appearance
5. Takes organized and useful notes
6. Utilizes study questions or guides

Social Communication Skills
1. Adopts a positive communication affect
2. Relates more effectively with peers and teachers
   - Responds more openly to others
   - Pays attention to what others say
3. Volunteers information in class
4. Responds effectively when called-upon in class

Performance Patterns for IEP Continues (Male, 13:8)

Literacy (Writing/Reading Process)
1. Writes clearer sentences that make more sense
2. Establishes more meaningful links between written sentences
3. Recognizes errors in writing
4. Revises written work
5. Writes in a more organized manner
6. Uses more appropriate grammar and syntax

Abstract Language Reasoning & Critical Thinking
1. Develops a broader understanding of word meanings in context
2. Understands language with figurative and multiple meanings

RELATED AREAS

Motivation and Responsibility
1. Adopts a more positive attitude toward school work
2. Accepts responsibility for completing assignments and turning work on-time
3. Takes pride in submitting work that is neat and organized in appearance

Sense of Competence (Self Concept)
1. Enjoys success with academic activities
2. Gains greater confidence on school related tasks
3. Gains peer confidence and respect
CASE NUMBER 2 (MALE, 13;8)

PRESENT LEVELS OF PERFORMANCE
Jack is an eighth grade student at Washington Hunt Middle School. Standardized assessment indicates the following: (1) receptive and expressive language performance in the marginal educational range, and (2) metalinguistic skills that fall in the low to very low educational range. Classroom-based assessment using the CELF-5 Observational Rating Scales (ORS) suggests four performance patterns and two related areas that limit academic success, reduce his participation in school, and affect his sense of competence as a learner. These patterns, in order of concern are: (1) Planning and Organizational Skills that negatively impact study habits, (2) Social Communication and Social Skills which limit classroom participation and negatively affect Jack’s relationship with teachers and peers, (3) Written Language Skills (the writing process itself) as well as editorial skills, and (4) Metalinguistic language skills which limit critical thinking and analysis in several subject areas. While he has some obvious weaknesses, Jack’s sense of competence as a learner, willingness to participate actively in school, and motivation to improve pose major barriers for all teachers. These four areas require targeted instruction and other supports but Jack has considerable potential given his artistic strengths, knowledge of computers and interests in sports. These supportive strengths and interests exist in the presence of average to above average intelligence.