

## **Accelerating Reading and Spelling with Synthetic Phonics: A Five Year Follow Up**

Rhona S. Johnston (University of Hull) and Joyce E. Watson (University of St. Andrews)

### **Introduction**

Interchange 57 (Watson and Johnston, 1998) reported on a study of around 300 Scottish Primary 1 children (Reception in England) in which we examined the effectiveness of a synthetic phonics teaching programme. Performance on the synthetic phonics programme was compared with performance on a typical analytic phonics programme, and also with a similar programme that included a substantial element of phonological awareness training. The synthetic phonics programme was by far the most effective. After a training period of 16 weeks, in March of the first year at school, the synthetic phonics taught children were reading and spelling seven months above chronological age, and were a similar amount ahead of the children taught by the two analytic phonics programmes. In this article we describe the progress the children have made from Primary 1 (Reception) through to the end of Primary 5 (Year 4), focusing on comparing the attainment of boys with that of girls. We have also examined the extent to which children underachieve when taught by a synthetic phonics compared with an analytic phonics programme.

### **Methodology**

Three training programmes were carried out for 16 weeks, starting soon after entry to Primary 1 (Reception). For 20 minutes a day, children were taught either 1) by a synthetic phonics programme, or 2) by an analytic phonics programme modelled on the methods commonly used in Scotland, or 3) by an analytic phonics plus phonological awareness training programme. Reading scheme books were introduced shortly after the phonics programmes started. Word reading and spelling were measured at the end of these programmes using the British Ability Scales Word Reading Test (Elliott et al, 1977), a measure of single word reading, and the Schonell Spelling Test (1952). At

the end of the initial programme, all of the children who had been taught by the two analytic phonics programmes then carried out the synthetic phonics programme, which they completed by the end of Primary 1 (Reception). The children's progress in reading and spelling has been monitored every year since then; from Primary 2 (Year 1) onwards we have additionally measured reading comprehension using the Primary Reading Test (France, 1981).

### **Phonics approaches for the teaching of reading**

There are two major approaches to teaching children the alphabetic principle: analytic and synthetic phonics.

#### ***Analytic phonics***

Analytic phonics is well known in Scotland, where it has formed part of the early years reading programme for many years. Teaching starts at the whole word level, and then involves showing children patterns in the English spelling system. It is generally taught in parallel with, or some time after, graded reading books, which are introduced using a look and say approach. Children are typically taught one letter sound per week and are shown a series of alliterative pictures and words which start with that sound, e.g. **car**, **cat**, **candle**, **cake**, **castle**, **caterpillar**. The teaching of the 26 initial letter sounds is generally completed by the end of the second term at school. At the start of the third term children are introduced to letter sounds in the middle of words, e.g. **cat**, **bag**, **rag** etc., and at the end, e.g. **nap**, **cup**, **pip** etc, and carry out exercises looking at letters in all positions of words. This stage is usually completed by the end of Primary 1 (Reception). At this point some teachers may show children how to sound and blend the consecutive letters in unfamiliar words to be able to pronounce them e.g. 'cuh-ah-tuh' for 'cat'. Starting in Primary 2 (Year 1), initial consonant clusters are taught, e.g. '**bl**', '**cr**', '**sp**', followed by final consonant clusters, e.g. '**nt**', '**st**'; vowel and consonant digraphs, e.g. '**ee**', '**oo**', '**ch**', '**ng**', '**sh**'; and silent 'e', e.g. '**slate**', '**blue**'. This programme is often completed at the end of Primary 3 (Year 2). In many respects this resembles the structure and pace of the phonics

programme advocated in Progression in Phonics (Department for Education and Skills, 2001).

### ***Synthetic phonics***

Synthetic phonics is used in Germany and Austria and is generally taught before children are introduced to books or reading (Feitelson, 1988). Right at the start of schooling, the children are taught a small group of letter sounds very rapidly, and are then shown how these letter sounds can be co-articulated to pronounce unfamiliar words. Other groups of letters are then taught, and the children blend them in order to pronounce new words. In a UK version of synthetic phonics, i.e. Hickey's Multi-Sensory Language Course (Augur and Briggs, 1992), the first block of letter sounds is 's', 'a', 't', 'i', 'p', 'n', which make up more three-letter words than any other six letters. Children are shown many of the words that these letters generate (e.g. 'sat', 'tin', 'pin').

As analytic phonics as well as synthetic phonics can involve sounding and blending, how can these two methods be distinguished? According to the National Reading Panel (2000, 2-89), in analytic phonics children analyse letters sounds after the word has been identified, whereas in synthetic phonics the pronunciation of the word is discovered through sounding and blending. Another critical difference is that synthetic phonics teaches children to sound and blend right at the start of reading tuition, after the first few letter sounds have been taught. In analytic phonics children learn words at first largely by sight, having their attention drawn only to the initial letter sounds. Only after all of the letter sounds have been taught in this way is sounding and blending introduced. It can be seen therefore that the phonics approach advocated in the National Literacy Strategy is of the analytic type.

In our version of synthetic phonics children use magnetic letters to build up words and to help them understand how letter sounds can be blended together to pronounce the words. In order to read a word, the appropriate magnetic letters are set out; the children then blend the letter sounds together, smoothly co-articulating them, whilst pushing the letters together. The words are not pronounced for the children prior to their sounding and blending them. The approach is also used for learning to spell

(and to reinforce blending for reading). The children listen to a spoken word, select the letters for the sounds, and then push the letters together, sounding and blending them to pronounce the word. Consonant blends are not explicitly taught at all as they can be read by blending, although digraphs (i.e. a phoneme represented by two letters e.g. 'sh', 'th', 'ai', 'oa') are taught.


A typical lesson using our scheme would be as follows. Right at the start of schooling the children are taught the sounds for the letters 't', 'a', and 'p'. As soon as this is done, the children learn to sound and blend. A child at the front of the class is then asked to select these letters from the teacher's large magnetic board, and to place them in a row below the other letters of the alphabet. The class then give the sounds of the letters, 't', 'a', 'p' and then blend the sounds together to pronounce the word 'tap', whilst the letters are pushed together. Only at this point do the children learn what the word is, it is not pronounced by the teacher prior to sounding and blending by the class. To practise spelling the teacher might hold up a picture of a word. The children pick out the letters for the sounds that they hear in the word, and place them together on their own magnetic boards. They will then sound and blend, pushing the letters together.

### **Long term follow up**

Although the synthetic phonics children in our study were significantly ahead of the two analytic phonics taught groups in reading and spelling at the end of the programme, it was important to carry out a long term follow up. The National Reading Panel in the United States found, in a review of the literature, that gains from experimental programmes diminish in subsequent years (National Reading Panel, 2000).

At the end of Primary 2 (Year 1), the 264 children available for testing who had been taught by the synthetic phonics method (either early or late on in Primary 1/Reception) were reading on average eleven months ahead of chronological age and spelling eleven months ahead of chronological age (see Figure 1). There were no differences between girls and boys at this age.


**Figure 1:**  
**Mean word reading, spelling and chronological ages with synthetic phonics, end of Primary 2 (Year 1)**



### **Gender Differences**

It is a common finding in many countries that girls learn to read better than boys, and that boys are over-represented in dyslexic samples. For example, at the age of nine, girls have been found to perform better than boys in England (Brooks et al, 1996) and New Zealand (Elley, 1992). In a previous study of 228 children taught by the analytic phonics approach in Scotland, by the end of Primary 3 (Year 2) the boys were, on average, reading three months behind the girls, and spelling was around four months behind (Watson, 1998), see Figure 2.


Figure 2: Mean word reading, spelling and chronological ages with analytic phonics, end of Primary 3 (Year 2). From Watson (1998), n=228.



We therefore expected that by Primary 3 (Year 2) our synthetic phonics trained cohort would show girls to be ahead of boys in reading and spelling. In carrying out comparisons across years we have analysed data from the subset of children for whom we have a complete set of test scores available for word recognition, spelling, and reading comprehension in Primary 3, 4 and 5 (Years 2, 3 and 4). This allows us to look at the development of the same group of children across time.


Contrary to our expectations, the boys had not fallen behind the girls in word reading and spelling in Primary 3 (Year 2). In fact they were a significant eight months ahead of the girls in word reading (see Figure 3). The boys had a slight, but not statistically significant, advantage in spelling and reading comprehension. However, the boys' reading comprehension was five months ahead of chronological age, yet boys had been five months behind in Primary 3 (Year 2) when taught by the analytic phonics method (Watson, 1998).

**Figure 3: Mean word reading, spelling, comprehension and chronological age, synthetic phonics taught boys and girls, Primary 3 (Year 2)**




The question arose as to whether this advantage for boys was a one-off result that would not be retained in subsequent years. However, we found that in both Primary 4 (Year 3) and 5 (Year 4) these same boys were a significant seven months ahead of the girls in word reading ability (see Figures 4 and 5).

**Figure 4: Mean word reading, spelling, comprehension and chronological ages, synthetic phonics taught boys and girls, Primary 4 (Year 3)**



At Primary 5 (Year 4), this means that when the children were 9.7 years old, the girls had a mean word reading age of 11.6 years, and the boys of 12.2 years. Spelling and comprehension scores were also significantly above chronological age but did not differ significantly between boys and girls.

Figure 5: Mean word reading, spelling, comprehension and chronological ages, synthetic phonics taught boys and girls, Primary 5 (Year 4)



Thus the benefits of the synthetic phonics training lasted for at least four years after the end of the programme. For word reading skill the effects increased in magnitude, from a seven month advantage in Primary 1 (Reception) to a 26 months advantage in Primary 5 (Year 4), over what would be expected for chronological age.

### Reading irregular words

One concern about such a method is that it might only be effective with regularly spelt words, and that it might prove to be a handicap in reading irregular words, such as 'once' and 'said'. However, at the end of the programme in Primary 1 (Reception) we examined the synthetic phonics taught children's ability to read irregular words, and found it to be significantly




better than that of the two analytic phonics trained groups. Furthermore, at that stage the synthetic phonics trained children were the only ones that were able to read words by analogy. For example, on being told the pronunciation of the unknown word 'ring', these children would then be able to read the unknown words 'sing' and 'king', whereas the analytic phonics taught children would not.

### Underachievers

Another area of interest was to examine the long term impact of synthetic phonics tuition on the incidence of moderate and severe reading difficulties. The proportion of children reading 12 or more months behind chronological age in Primary 3 (Year 2) was 1.7%. Three boys out of 126 were behind (2.4%) and 1 girl out of 112 (0.9%), with one boy being more than two years behind. However, in Watson's (1998) study of 228 children being taught by the analytic phonics method (see Figure 6), 10.1% were reading 12 or months behind (10.6% of boys and 9.6% of girls); one girl and two boys were over two years behind.


Figure 6: Children scoring 12 or more months behind chronological age in word reading with analytic and synthetic phonics in Primary 3 (Year 2)



We have charted the proportion of children in the synthetic phonics study falling a year or more behind in Primary 4 and 5 (Years 3 and 4) (see

Figure 7). 6.5% of children were behind in Primary 4/Year 3 (12 boys out of 128, 9.4%; four girls out of 119, 3.4%), with no child more than two years behind. In Primary 5/Year 4, 7.1% of children were more than 12 months behind (11 boys, 9.0%; six girls, 5.1%), with one boy being more than two years behind.

**Figure 7: Children scoring 12 or more months behind chronological age in word reading with synthetic phonics in Primary 4 and 5 (Years 3 and 4)**



The increasing proportion of low achievers suggests that some children who initially made good progress are now showing a slowing of development. However, most of the children had only moderate reading difficulties, being between one and two years behind chronological age. Only one child was 28 months behind in reading in Primary 5 (Year 4), constituting 0.4% of the sample. In Primary 5 (Year 4) we introduced a Revisiting Programme to remind the low achievers of the principles of the synthetic phonics method. We monitored a group of 12 children, and found that over the year they on average gained a year in reading competence, contrasting with gains of around only six months in Primary 4 (Year 3).

## **Discussion and conclusions**

We have found that the beneficial effects of our synthetic phonics programme are long lasting; for word reading the gains increased in magnitude from a seven months' advantage over chronological age in Primary 1 (Reception) to a 26 months' advantage in Primary 5 (Year 4). The reason for this continued increase is likely to be that, in learning to sound and blend, children are given a procedure that they can apply for themselves whenever they meet an unfamiliar word; that is, they have a method for decoding unfamiliar words when they meet them in text.

The proportion of children who had moderate reading problems was found to be increasing but was still only 7% at the end of Primary 5 (Year 4), and of these only one child had severe reading problems at that stage (0.4% of the sample).

The advantage for boys that emerged in Primary 3 (Year 2) was entirely unexpected; keeping parity with the girls would in itself have been a very good outcome. This superiority has now been maintained over three successive years. The children are currently being followed through Primary 6 and 7 (Years 5 and 6), so that we can determine whether boys keep their advantage to the end of their primary schooling. It is not clear whether all synthetic phonics programmes will be so effective for boys, but it is evident that the methods used in our study gave them long lasting benefits.

The synthetic phonics programme was taught more slowly than was originally envisaged as the teachers in the study were concerned about the faster pace we originally proposed. Similarly, the teachers were unhappy about carrying out the programme prior to the introduction of reading books, so these were introduced at the normal time. However, we have also carried out a study where a synthetic phonics programme was taught over a period of 8 weeks for one hour a day (Johnston and Watson, 1997). Reading books were introduced afterwards. By March of the first year at school, the children's word reading was around 16 months ahead of chronological age, compared to 7 months ahead in our 20 minutes a day/16 week programme.

We conclude that although a synthetic phonics programme is likely to show the largest gains if carried out intensively before reading books are

introduced, very satisfactory gains can be made with a less intensive programme carried out concurrently with the use of attractive reading books.

## References

Augur, J. and Briggs, S. (1992) *Hickey Multi-Sensory Language Course*. London: Whurr Publishers Ltd.

Brooks, G., Pugh, A. & Schagen, I. (1996) *Reading Performance at Nine*. Slough: NFER.

Elley, W.B. (1992) *How in the World Do Students Read?* Oxford: Elsevier Science Ltd.

Elliott, C.D., Murray, D.J., and Pearson, L.S. (1977) *The British Ability Scales*. Slough: NFER Nelson.

Feitelson, D (1988) *Facts and Fads in Beginning Reading: A Cross-Language Perspective*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

France, N. (1981) *The Primary Reading Test (revised)*. Slough: NFER.

Johnston, R.S. and Watson, J. (1997) Developing reading, spelling, and phonemic awareness skills in primary school children. *Reading*, 31, 37-40.

National Reading Panel (2000) *Report of the National Reading Panel: Reports of the subgroups*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development Clearinghouse.

Department for Education and Skills (2001). *Progression in Phonics* London: Crown Copyright.

Schonell, F.J. and Schonell, F.E. (1952) *Diagnostic and Attainment Testing*. second edition. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd.

Watson, J. (1998) *An Investigation of the Effects of Phonics Teaching on Children's Progress in Reading and Spelling*. PhD thesis, University of St Andrews.

Watson, J.E. and Johnston, R.S. (1998) *Accelerating Reading Attainment: The Effectiveness of Synthetic Phonics*. Interchange 57, SOEID, Edinburgh.

*Rhona S. Johnston is Professor of Psychology at the University of Hull*

*Dr. Joyce E. Watson is a Research Fellow in the School of Psychology at the University of St. Andrews*

*This article is based on Insight 4, published by the Scottish Executive Education Department, March 2003.*

<http://www.scotland.gov.uk/library5/education/ins4-00.asp>