2011

Improving K-12 ELL Students' Comprehension of Academic Text

Peggy Lynn Linsmeier
Minnesota State University - Mankato

Recommended Citation

Improving K-12 ELL Students'

Comprehension of Academic Text

By

Peggy Linsmeier

An Alternate Plan Paper Submitted

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree

In

English

Teaching English as a Second Language

Minnesota State University, Mankato

Mankato, Minnesota

May 2011

Improving K-12 ELL Students' Comprehension of Academic Text

Peggy Linsmeier

This Alternate Plan Paper has been examined has been examined and approved by the following members of the alternate plan paper committee.

Dr. Stephen J. Stoynoff, Advisor

Dr. Nancy L. Drescher

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Improving K-12 ELL Students' Comprehension of Academic Text

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of providing an education to American youth is to socialize them into the formal skills and knowledge they will need in order to become independent, contributing members of society, and in the school system this is done increasingly through reading. Full access to and comprehension of material is dependent on mastery of the academic register of English. This cornerstone of academic success and the cause of the ever-widening gap between the mainstream and the English Language Learner (ELL) population depends upon the ability to comprehend and produce written academic discourse efficiently, which follows a certain conventional structure, uses an authoritative tone typically found in the context of schooling, and is written for a specific purpose.

Importance of teaching academic English

The discourse found in the classroom setting is markedly different from that used for common interactions. This presents a challenge for students with limited experience and exposure to this type of language--even for native speakers. Those challenges are multiplied for students of different backgrounds. As the diversity in our classrooms increases, it becomes more important to recognize the linguistic challenges of schooling. Current theory assumes that competence in the academic English is acquired through implicit, incidental learning (Schleppegrell, 2001). However, many do not fully appreciate the complex nature of this register.

Cummins' (1984) theoretical model demonstrates that as students move through the school system, there is less contextual support and more abstract, cognitive demands. Students transition from learning to read, where there is a fair amount of literacy instruction, to reading to learn in the upper grades. In the upper grades, the amount of reading assigned increases significantly while the reading itself becomes more challenging conceptually and linguistically, both in vocabulary and sentence structure. In addition, students must learn to manipulate the concepts contained therein at high cognitive levels, such as analysis, synthesis, and evaluation.

The No Child Left Behind legislation mandates that English language learners (ELLs) must pass the same high stakes tests as native speakers. In the face of ever-increasing academic challenges, language learners are four times as likely to drop out of school (August & Hakuta, 1998; Fry, 2003). The Lau vs. Nichols decision calls for the equal opportunity to learn, and the learning materials must be equally accessible. How can we satisfy such demands?

The goal of this paper is to address these challenges by designing an effective curriculum based on research. Chapter 2 reviews the studies that investigate the nature of academic reading and identifies what contributes to the successful comprehension of English Language Learners. By examining the current literature, I intend to present the latest research-based approaches to teaching that can be integrated into the suggestions in chapter 3. I adopt a multi-dimensional framework in this paper and consider academic literacy development from socio-cultural, educational, linguistic and cognitive perspectives.

Key terminology

The teaching and learning of academic English is a very complex undertaking where linguistic components (phonology, lexis, grammar, sociolinguistics, and discourse) are interwoven with cognitive dimensions (subject matter knowledge, higher-order processing skills, and metacognition). In order to explore the topic, it is important to define key terminology. Scarcella (2003) presents a framework built on two domains: cognitive and linguistic. The cognitive domain builds the knowledge base with schemata, critical thinking skills, communicative competence, and metalinguistic awareness. This is the *what* of academic English. Her framework illustrates how the subject matter is disseminated through linguistic elements beginning with analysis of bottom-up processing skills and concluding with a top-down approach where the focus is on differences between genres. While sociolinguistics looks at language functions, discourse analysis identifies the set of distinct transitional markers associated with each. Thus we have the *how* of academic English—*how* the material is carried into the mind and processed.

Schleppegrell, (2004), takes a somewhat different stance on the subject, and emphasizes explicating lexical, grammatical, mood, linkage and conjunction, and finally organizational strategies. Briefly, academic text incorporates specific lexical choices, often using nominalization—a noun phrase used to elaborate and enhance the flow of information—to ultimately produce a very dense packing of academic material through a declarative mood. Cohesion and conjunction are achieved by carefully chosen embedded clauses, nouns, verbs and prepositions. A final hierarchical product is highly structured through the use of theme and sentence structure.

Often studied in isolation, grammar rules are difficult for students to transfer to authentic situations. Boscardin and Zenaida Aguirre-Muñoz (2006) therefore lean more heavily on Scarcella's approach as they analyze academic vocabulary through the functional linguistic approach, carefully gathering evidence of lexical and grammatical items specific to certain genres to enhance reading comprehension. Specifically, they looked for grammatical structures, long noun phrases for sentence variety, vocabulary indicating analysis or interpretation, verb choices signaling character or situation analysis or evaluation, grammatical structures used for certain

functions, such as providing cohesion at the sentence level, vocabulary signaling point of view, and indication of an impersonal tone (p. 66).

Echevarria, Powers, and Short (2006) provide a concise interpretation of *academic English*, synthesizing all the above views: the functional use of semantic and syntactic knowledge. In describing the nature of academic English, the following key terms and acronyms are used through this paper.

BICS are	Cummins' term for Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills, which facilitated through context clues such as the use of gestures, tone of voice, and facial gestures (Aukerman, 2007).
CALP	The corresponding term from Cummins, CALP, stands for Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency, a much more challenging language category than BICS as it conceptualizes abstract ideas and more demanding work.

ELL   English Language Learner. The Lau Remedies act of 1975

                 incorporated language for LEP, the Limited English Proficient

                 student. Schools therefore adopted this label. This term was followed

                 by the term ESL (English as a second language) in American public

                 schools. In recent years, C. Rivera of The Center for Equity and

                 Excellence in Education created the ELL (English language learner)

                 label. The term ELL was seen as offering a more positive view of

                 language learning was intended. But the context of the learning

                 environment is the key issue. ELL refers to the learning of English in

                 the context of an English-speaking country (the inner circle) to

                 students whose first and primary language is not that of the dominant

                 majority.

EL   The most current term is EL, standing for English Learner.

EFL   English as a Foreign Language. Whereas ELL refers to the

                 teaching of English in where English is the primary language,

                 EFL is in the context of teaching English in a non-English-

                 speaking country.

L1 and L2   First or primary and second language, respectively.

Learning strategy   This refers to "mental processes that students can consciously control

                 when they have a learning goal" and they are used to understand and

                 retain material (Richard Amato and Snow, 2005, p. 93).

NCLB   No Child Left Behind is a legislative act passed by Congress and intended to help close the <u>achievement gap</u> between majority and minority students.

Organization

The purpose of this first chapter is to state the aim of this APP, which is to examine how the comprehension of academic text promotes ELLs' developing academic literacy and to present key terminology. Chapter 2 to present a review of the social, educational, linguistic, and cognitive perspectives on the topic. Then in chapter 3, I present an instructional program based on the Reader's Workshop method of imparting textual knowledge, academic English and functional linguistics through interaction with text, peers, and teachers (Boscardin & Zenaida Aguirre-Muñoz, 2006). Chapter 3 also includes a course syllabus and lesson plans for a unit of grade 7 social studies. Finally, in Chapter 4, I reflect on the challenges and strengths of using this method of teaching academic English with ELL students.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Little research exists on ELL literacy development. Therefore, the field draws heavily from the work done in first language development. For those second language studies available, a wide range of methods and measures have been utilized to examine the development of academic language ability, ranging from discrete phonological skills to metalinguistic competence. Because of this diversity in focus and methodology, the conclusions that can be drawn are limited. The studies selected here address academic reading development and what contributes to academic success in the pre-K through the college setting.

This review first considers how Academic English cannot be disentangeled from social influences. The scope then narrows in on the role of education. Finally, the focus turns to linguistic and cognitive aspects that guide classroom goals and objectives.

Social Component

Chall, Jacobs, and Luke (1990) explored the influence of low-income environments on literacy. They observed that the academic foundations are built on a number of home-related factors, including the parents' educational level, the mother's educational expectations for her child, family outings, encouragement from caretakers, and the home literacy environment. Access to print, regardless of the language, is of prime importance.

This Chall et al. (1990) study reports a high correlation between student ability and school expectations in the primary grades, where the focus is on phonetics and decoding. But as texts become more difficult in upper grades, the below-average reader begins to

experience a "fourth grade slump. . . on tests that do not rely on the use of context" (p. 33). Specifically, test scores on word meanings fell first, followed by word recognition and spelling due to deficiencies in vocabulary, syntax, and lack of background knowledge.

Another home-related factor that crosses all socio-economic boundaries in America is the prevalence of television. Uchikoshi (2005) decided to use viewing habits for an educational advantage in a study contrasting a top-down intervention versus a bottom-up control group of 108 kindergarteners using two Public Broadcasting Service (PBS) children's programs. He notes that early narrative skills are important predictors for later language and literacy achievement, including the ability to comprehend text.

While the narrative structure is familiar to mainstream children, ELLs may be at a disadvantage in that not only are they lacking in English skills, but may also culturally focus on different aspects of the narrative (Uchikoshi, 2005). For example, Latinos tend to focus on description, evaluation, and interpersonal relationships rather than events and sequencing. This can lead to problems because academic standards for narrative development typically include temporality and reference. Academic texts are characterized by various linguistic features. For example, narrative components call for the use of the indefinite article and noun in the introduction while the events, resolution and coda require intensifiers, adjectives, negatives, causal markers, and connectives. Other environmental factors, in particular book reading, can support ELLs' ability to produce narrative development, but Latino preschoolers are less likely to have this type of experience. Therefore, the idea of using an educational TV program, such as *Arthur*, a PBS educational program, could be a top-down way of teaching narrative development (Uchikoshi, 2005).The control group viewed a different television program, *Between the Lions,* based more on bottom-up processing skills (Uchikoshi, 2005).

Results were measured as the children told a "Bear Story" aided by three pictures. The stories were coded according to the inclusion and frequency of use of the literary and grammatical elements entailed in each of five categories: story structure features, events, evaluation, temporality/reference, and storybook language. Teachers noted that the *Arthur* group engaged in more discussion, which could have affected comprehension and improved extended discourse. Those viewing *Arthur* also had improved narrative skills.

 Ghiaciuc (2003) examined how four second and third grade bilingual students and their teachers negotiated selected classroom literacy tasks. At one end of the scale was a student who, in an effort to assert identity and equality, achieved accommodation by refusing to speak English though observations indicated he could. The student only worked with bilingual aides or manipulated the teacher to act as scribe. At the other end of the scale was a "good student." With no primary language support at home, she worried that she was losing her Spanish-speaking skills and consequently, ties to her grandparents. While teachers strive to promote students to see themselves as readers, many bilingual students develop negative stereotypes of themselves due to current educational policy and the labeling that occurs in schools. Ghiaciuc stated: If an instructor does not comprehend the literacies and/or the home culture a child already carries with them to class, how can they be expected to encourage individual development without potentially alienating them? (2003, p. 126).

Academic success is threatened when teachers possess pre-conceived ideas about ELLs. Rubinstein-Álvila (2004) reported on the viewpoint of an eighth-grade student who was seen as struggling in the school system; but his translating abilities were regarded as a source of strength to his family, and he himself was taking notice of recent gains in skills and learning strategies. Of significance in this study is the statement that "students who do not necessarily conform to teachers' notions of 'academic applied pupils' may possess a great deal of awareness about their own learning and be highly motivated to develop their literacy

repertoires" (Alvila, 2004, p. 300).

In literate society, power is associated with the use of the academic register. In response to NCLB legislation in state curriculum frameworks, high-stakes tests, passage of an English-only school district referendum and mandated literacy approaches, ACCELA Aliance, a federally funded program delivered through the University of Massachussetts, sought to provide support for the educational field in their midst (p. 420). A collaborative partnership ensued with a teacher in an economically-struggling community in Massachusetts where a fifth grade classroom had lost recess to more test preparation (Gebhard, Harman, & Seger, 2007). The teacher harnessed the strong feelings of her students to motivate the study of academic literacy through the Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) approach. Since the students had not been sufficiently exposed to form, as related to function and purpose, the teacher decided to have the class analyze texts for context, audience, and purpose to discover how certain grammar gives words power. The class discovered how dense text, realized through nominalization, produced a more impersonal and authoritative tone. They compared connective words and noted differences according to the function and genre of the text.

The class was eager to use its new-found academic skills to address their recess problem by writing a formal letter to the principal and was rewarded by a response from him in the form of a compromise. This illustrates the sociolinguistic component of academic English where the function, such as complaining or persuading, will call for certain choices of grammar, register, and form of genre.

The SFL approach, born of the need for social justice, is also the foundation of a literacy development approach called the reading to learn methodology developed by Martin and Rose (2005). Reading is key in the SFL teaching/learning cycle. Rather than students trying to grasp meaning from words, a backdoor approach is used: students are presented with the

meaning and "guidance through interaction" (p. 4) is used to highlight the discourse and grammatical features used to realize these meanings. Two stages, preparation and detailed (guided) reading, give students equal access to the curriculum and prepare all students to consistently respond successfully.

Hawkins (2004) also recognized that social dynamics necessitate the functional use of language. She articulates the relationship of the researcher and that of the teacher. While researchers clarify the *what* and *how* to teach ELLs, in order to give access and engagement, the teacher puts them into practice by offer[ing] students access to the range of knowledge, abilities, and forms of language (discourses) that will enable them to lay claim to the social identities that afford them a participant status in the social communities of their choice, and to provide scaffolding (and a truly supportive environment) for the attainment of these. (p. 23)

Hawkins (2004) contends that ELLs' literacy abilities are essentially different from that of the majority with different schemata of world experiences, beliefs, and patterns of communication. She focused her qualitative report on an ESL student who primarily engaged in parallel play, noting that her English verbal interaction was limited to the adults in her school environment. This pre-schooler often used her limited speech inappropriately, further distancing her from classmates. The teacher could have scaffolded social interaction and language practice, teaching proper language for the setting and purpose. More participation could have led to increased language competence and a higher degree of interaction and social/emotional development.

Academically-centered social interaction, talking about texts with native speakers, is a must for language learners as meaningful interactions with an interlocutor promotes comprehension and language practice while learning the rules of usage. Also being interested

in student perceptions, Alvermann, et al. (1996) shared video-taped discussions between groups of 43 middle and high school participants of mixed heritage, including Hispanic participants, across the country to learn their perceptions of text-based discussions. Students realized one important function of group discussion was the negotiation of meaning concerning difficult vocabulary in their readings. Surprisingly, however, the students did not prefer to have difficult vocabulary pre-taught. From group dynamics to staying on topic, this study provides insights for effective teaching methodology of group work on academic texts.

Although many believe a common language promotes equality in society, in reality individuals are unequally situated due to diversity in linguistic backgrounds (Ghiaciuc, 2003; Corson, 1997; Martin and Rose, 2005). Society has put in place an educational institution to provide for literacy development as regulated by social norms.

<div align="center">Educational Component</div>

Reviewing studies on Canadian immersion programs, Cummins (1984) laid the groundwork for ELL programming by providing theoretical principles. He depicted a *common underlying proficiency,* a reservoir of linguistic ability from which a bilingual can draw for use in either language (p. 24). Language development is conceptualized as running along two continuums: cognitively un/demanding and context embedded/reduced (p. 12). This becomes the foundation for his terms Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS) and Cognitively Academic Language Proficiency (CALP).

BICS, he postulates, takes one-to-two years to develop in contrast to five to seven years for CALP. Lack of context, where the material presented is not related to prior knowledge in terms of language or culture, will leave the student floundering. Having no base on which to build, the higher level of vocabulary, syntactic structures, and discourse conventions absent

in conversational interactions but common in academic texts will compound the problem. When the primary language is seen as the cause for academic failure, discredited by society and not supported in school, a student's identity is threatened and the student may experience subtractive bilingualism (Cummins, 1984).

Cummins' theories are substantiated by the work of Thomas and Collier (2002) who conducted a nation-wide qualitative and quantitative study on effective programming. In one case study of a community in Maine, the Franco-Amerian/Acadian students spoke a variety of French considered sub-par by both their English school and their close French-Canadian neighbors. The researchers initiated changes which promoted students' French linguistic ability while also promoting community pride in their cultural heritage. Not only did this result in students' improved academic standing, but as trade was established with their Canadian neighbors, the community benefitted economically. Subtractive bilingualism was no longer a threat.

Thomas and Collier (2002) also compared program models for ELL academic achievement and found that those programs that provide formal primary language (L_1) development made the greatest gains. It was found that one- and two-way developmental bilingual programs and newcomers with a strong academic foundation in their primary language may reach mid- to high-levels of achievement. Where parents refused services, students performed poorly and had a high level of dropout. Remedial program students made no gains and risked falling further behind. Even the best of content programs only closed about half the gap. Thus, the amount of formal L_1 schooling predicts achievement in a second language (L_2) setting. In contrast to Cummins' (1984) time frame, Thomas and Collier (2002) claim that it can take even longer than seven years to become proficient in academic settings, depending on academic background and program model.

Freeman and Freeman (2003) present a brief case study of four ELLs who portray three different categories of learners, specifying how background influences academic potential. The first type includes recent arrivals with a history of formal L_1 educational background. Their parents are middle class and well-educated. They have established literacy in their L_1 and only need support in coping with culture shock and comprehensible input of content while they learn English and transfer knowledge. The second kind is composed of recent arrivals with interrupted or limited educational history resulting in under-developed literacy in the primary language and at least a two-year deficit in content knowledge compared to their English-speaking peers. The parents are minimally educated and come from poverty. Having a weak foundation on which to build, it will take considerably longer for them to catch up.

The third kind is made up of long-term ELLs who have been in the country more than seven years, perhaps maintaining the ELL status throughout their entire academic career. Consistent academic failure has brought about additional problems of poor attitude and low motivation. Their parents are of low socio-economic status (SES) with limited education. Low SES frequently induces an unstable environment which will not only be felt in the home but in the school experience due to inconsistent program models. In effect, these students suffer an interrupted education with scant learning of academic English in L_1 or L_2 partially due to frequently missing large chunks of school. Teachers often pass them for effort.

The problem of taking five to seven years to acquire academic language proficiency can be addressed either by learning content through the primary language or learning language through content. Pease-Alvarez (1991) depicts two primary grade classrooms in another qualitative study that chose the former, following the school policy of switching between English and Spanish use on alternate days and allowing for a student-centered, collaborative, meaningful, cognitively demanding learning environment in a California school where 50%

were performing at or above grade level in reading and math. Unfortunately, "the political realities that surround bilingual education have an impact on the actions of individuals, particularly administrators . . . . staff is dealing with threats to their school's underlying commitment" (Pease-Alvarez, 1991, p. 359). Threats against commitment to an optimal educational experience for all are not limited to this school. The following studies note shifts in educational policy which led to change.

Poor performance in the Los Angeles school district in 2000 resulted in the Open Court Language Arts Program. Determining that second grade introduces academic language, a critical point in future success, Ajayi (2005) observed vocabulary lessons in a second grade mixed classroom (14 native speakers, 6 ELL) in California through a sociocultural perspective. He identified vocabulary as an essential component of academic language and a major challenge for ELLs. Vocabulary was crucial for competent participation. Although the classroom seemed to be correctly implementing the Open Court Program, it was teacher-centered with tight control, marginalizing those with limited English resources. In addition, identity formation and language learning needs were not provided. These Los Angeles submersion programs used remedial English components to address problems rather than providing for their lexical and grammatical needs. It is important to be aware that educational weaknesses may be institutional and unavoidable.

Shifts in 2002 NCLB educational policy also led to change in the instructional program offered in Clark County, California, where the English language development (ELD) program, was replaced with remedial reading. Comparing the two programs, Callahan (2006) found that as grade level rose, performance lowered. English proficiency was a positive predictor of performance. The grade point average (GPA) of long-term ELLs was much lower than recent immigrants. The previous year's comprehensive ELD program produced

higher language arts scores. Because high school students no longer qualified for services if they scored higher than a sixth grade reading level, the 66% of students consequently not served earned D's and F's for fall semester. The school's reaction was to initiate a study skills class in the spring. Note that this reading intervention for high school students was aligned to elementary standards—not high school, not ELL. Of significance was the remedial program's absence of the four modes of English language development: reading, writing, listening and speaking—particularly oral work in phonology and language functions. Neither did it address discourse, higher order thinking or strategy use. This program model is consistent with the research of Thomas and Collier (2002) whose work discourages remedial programs.

Saunders, Foorman, and Carlson (2006), who studied English Language Development (ELD) programming with 1,399 bilingual kindergartener participants of California and Texas, wondered whether ELD classes should have a separate block of its own. In phase 1 they compared programs in English immersion, dual language, maintenance and transition programs, noting that the latter three programs used about the same amount of English in their reading and ELD blocks. Phase 2 looked at oral and literacy outcomes in Spanish and English to find if there were benefits to having a separate block. They found that separate blocks made better use of their time and therefore had higher test scores. In this study less than 6% of the lessons were addressing academic English. This study highlights the need for teacher training on the importance of teaching "the decontextualized register of academic language" (p. 197).

Boscardin, Aguirre- Muñoz, Chinen, Leon, and Shin (2004) realized that academic language proficiency necessitates looking at the school's language policies and politics, cultural diversity, and analysis of texts for rhetorical and aesthetic effects (p. 3). Noting that

sixth grade marks a sharp decline in California students designated as ELL and correspondingly consistent poor performance in standards-based assessment for this group, Opportunity to Learn (OTL) variables were studied in a sixth grade Los Angeles school district. Through a sample comprised of 1,038 students and 27 teachers, the greatest OTL variables were explored. In addition to ethnicity, gender, and language proficiency, insufficient opportunity to discuss content, and the resulting development of textual linguistics resulted in a gap between ELLs and native English speakers. Higher scores for all students were possible when the teacher was able to cover more content moderated by her ability to make the content comprehensible. This calls into question whether society sufficiently trains teachers to work with ELLs.

Aguirre-Muñoz, et al. (2006) ascertained that teachers are not trained to teach functional grammar, "lexical knowledge of content as realized through mode, tenor and field" (p. 28), and that chances of providing sufficient exposure were slim, even if such training was provided. Therefore, a week of instruction was provided to 21 of 32 language arts teachers of three urban middle schools of southern California. Contrary to their earlier study (Boscardin, Aguirre-Muñoz, Chinen, Leon, and Shin, 2004) scores were not dependent on content coverage. Instead, explicit instruction in academic language with appropriate procedural and scaffolding strategies to provide comprehensible input were decisive. Across the board, students were not provided the adequate exposure to functional grammar. Teachers were strong in field concepts and taught some mode (organization), but were especially weak in tenor—the word choice used for opinion in academic text. Students performed better when functional grammar was made explicit and linguistic expectations were clear.

In addition, the metacognitive and scaffolding strategies for reading comprehension were lacking. Specifically, direct instruction was over-used and followed immediately by

independent work with an absence of small group and pair work—the lack of classroom management skills apparently a major obstacle—nor was individualization observed. While adaptations used by many of the teachers such as simplified text, slower speech, and graphic organizers, are appropriate for beginners, over time they need to be removed and replaced. Other ELL and comprehensible input strategies using authentic text can provide full access and participation with opportunities for critical thinking. Findings suggest that without linguistic support, participation and motivation suffer resulting in an over-reliance on the teacher. Consistent, linguistic access to the curriculum is necessary. When missing, the achievement gap between native and non-native speakers is expected to steadily increase over time. A secondary gap points to the growing number of ELLs in American schools and the inadequate training of teachers to work with this group of students.

One cannot assume sufficient training or use of best practice in ELL strategies (Baker, Gerseten, Haager, & Dingle, 2006) in today's schools. A 2009 study by Preciado, Horner, and Baker explored if a functional relationship existed between threatening environments caused by demanding tasks and Latino ELL students' demonstration of escape-motivated problem behaviors. Researchers implemented a study using LMIP: language-matched instructional priming where the primary language of the student was used to "prime" the student for the next day's reading instruction. The students' primary language was used to teach decoding skills as well as vocabulary for the next day's reading lesson along with an explanation of the directions for the independent work they would be expected to do, and socially appropriate behaviors. Teachers nominated students demonstrating problem behaviors during reading class. This study found no evidence of individualization or instructional modification. Fewer escape-motivated behaviors (staring out the window, talking with and threatening of peers, looking at anything else but assignment, etc.) were

observed when teachers' expectations matched students' ability levels. This study provides evidence that a teacher must match instructional demands to the skill level of the student, and the need for training in ELL strategies.

Warschauer, Grant, Del Real, and Rousseau (2004) provide a model of educational excellence through the use of technology with case studies of two schools, one in California, the other in Maine. The California group, comprised of Hispanics, was 6 months to 1 year behind in reading level. The fourth-grade language arts teacher used technology in a variety of ways including a pre- and post-reading strategies. Post-reading methods included the deconstruction of genres and structures to learn their grammar and discourse components. One of the genre studies is a book review. After careful analysis, a review of their own is sent in to Amazon.com. Here is an example of the sociolinguistic component of academic English "used for apprenticeship into communities of practice" (p. 530).

The second focus of the Warschauer et al. study (2004) was on a district in Maine where 70% of a recent influx of immigrants from Somalia fell into the low SES category. In spite of this, test scores were rising through Expeditionary Learning Outward Bound (2004). All seventh- and eighth-graders were issued laptops. The entire school collaborated—teachers in interdisciplinary teams and students as they worked together on projects. Beginners either had their own "expedition" or joined a team. Scaffolding was provided as students developed syntax, vocabulary, structure and mechanics skills through extensive background reading and editing with the support of peer editors and teacher feedback. Those more able created links to further research on the topic. Final projects were presented to pertinent community members, creating social ties. This study is one of few positive reports of success.

Thus far, the socio-cultural perspective, which shapes literacy through its educational institutions, has been discussed. Educational success is dependent on the functionality of students' language while performing academic tasks. Linguistics is the science on which schools base their approach to teaching second language literacy. Languages have common elements in terms of structural devices. The educational goal is to point out these similarities as well as the differences in order to facilitate second language learning.

Linguistics and Its Components

Phonetics

The science of linguistics includes phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, pragmatics, and discourse analysis. This section looks at these discrete elements and analyzes studies on reading development, the composition and study of (academic) vocabulary, and how these individual elements occur in textbooks.

To explore relationships between foundational literacy skills, Cardenas-Hagan, Carlson, and Pollard-Durodola (2007) tested 1,016 Spanish/English kindergarteners to explore the language of instruction in relation to the transfer of skills between languages. Tests were given in both Spanish and English to determine skills in letter name and sound identification, phonological awareness and oral language measured at the beginning and end of the school year. It was determined that, depending on initial proficiency and the language of instruction, transfer of skills was occurring in varying degrees—specifically, those with beginning strong Spanish skills and low English saw increases in English measures when the language of instruction was in Spanish. This study is useful in helping educators understand the importance of both initial L_1 and L_2 skills for acquisition of L_2. This supports Cummins' hypothesis (1984) of a common underlying proficiency, and contributes to the understanding

of language transfer. A second point is that the language of instruction will have a bearing on the level of performance that is possible, which supports the studies of Thomas and Collier (2002). This study adds letter-naming and oral skills to cross-linguistic transfer studies (earlier studies naming phonological awareness and word reading).

Closely related to this study is the longitudinal study by Vaughn, et al. (2006a) who worked with 175 first-grade ELL (Spanish/English) children at risk for reading problems. Along with the mainstream high quality core instruction used for the contrast group, intervention students also received a reading/ language arts model designed for mono-lingual English speakers, adapted by adding ESL strategies such as the use of visuals, facial expressions, explicit instruction in vocabulary and ample opportunity for elaborated response (p. 163). Questioning about vocabulary and key ideas followed story reading, then new vocabulary was used in complete sentences in guided story retelling and discussion where each student had an opportunity to participate in order to build oracy and vocabulary (p. 164).

Although the intervention was conducted in English, results compared English and Spanish gains on letter naming fluency, phonological processing, oral language, reading and academic achievement. The same interventions that support monolingual English speakers, with the addition of ESL adaptations and retell exercises, also benefited ELLs. English Learner (EL) adaptations included the use of visuals, facial expressions, gestures, explicit instruction in usage, clarification, and opportunities for elaborated responses. Results compared intervention with non- intervention students with Spanish and English measures reported separately. Most importantly, whereas earlier studies with monolingual English speaking students revealed no growth in comprehension, the ELLs in this study improved significantly with a gain of .87 points, probably due to the retell component. However, there were no meaningful gains in oral skills.

This study sheds light on understanding the possible gains at-risk language learners can make given effective methods of intervention, and furthers understanding of transfer of skills across languages. Of note are the authors' conclusions that when learning to read in English, phonemic awareness, letter knowledge, alphabetic decoding, decodable reading practice and comprehension strategies are vital practices for bilingual students. In addition, the listening and discussion implemented in retell tasks supported comprehension. Authors recommend more attention to vocabulary and the elaboration of prior knowledge in future work. In the next section, phonemes are linked into words through a focus on the lexical system.

Lexis

Academic vocabulary, demonstrated in Nation's University word list (Table 2, Nation, 1990; academic word list in Nation, 2006) comprise more than half of the English language and is used almost exclusively in print (as opposed to conversation) which narrows access and makes it "rarely recognized, used or understood by pre-adolescents" (Corson, p. 689). The abstract nature and low frequency makes this vocabulary difficult to acquire. Whereas morphemes carried meaning in the past, those meanings have been lost, making associations attached to this category of words low. Therefore, whole words need to be processed which takes longer. Morphological processing of words in the brain suggests that differential exposure to language creates different arrangements of the mental lexicon that can lead to sociocultural variations in learning and use of words across all four language modes in L_1 and L_2 (Corson, 1997, p. 673).

Distinguishing the differences in the use of academic vocabulary in different English genres, Nation chose adolescent novels, graded readers, newspapers, and children's movies for his subject pool. Nation (2001a) distinguishes three categories of vocabulary. First, high frequency words provide coverage of 80% of the words in academic texts such as *a, some,*

and *two*. Next are specialized or technical words (listed in his Academic Word List, Appendix 1, p. 407) These include common words that have uncommon meanings in a specific content areas such as *table* in math and *drop* in science, or *demand* in economics and usually have Greek or Latin-based forms. Finally, low frequency words include proper names, archaic terms or very formal English. Scarcella (2003), in contrast, uses the categories of *general, technical*, and *academic* while Beck, McKeown, and Kuchan (2002) use the terms *tier 1*-the most basic words, *tier 2*-found across domains and hence most productive in terms of time spent studying, and *tier 3*-low frequency and not very useful.

As compared with fiction consisting of 1.7% academic vocabulary and newspapers with 3.9%, textbooks are composed of 8.5% technical terminology (p. 188). This means that when a student has acquired a 2,000 high frequency vocabulary, one word in five of these will be unknown. If the next 1,000 high-frequency words are added, 4.3% of the words will be understood whereas knowing the University Words List (supplied in appendix A) will harness a 10% word comprehension (p. 18), thus one in ten words will be covered. Well-educated native speakers know about 20,000 words and well-educated non-native college students know 8,000-9,000 words (Nation, 2006). Nation determined that 98% of the vocabulary of a text must be understood in order for a text to be comprehensible, translating to 8,000-9,000 word families. This demonstrates the need for explicit teaching of vocabulary in the K-12 setting with work in semantics, spelling, morphology, and word families, as well as oral practice.

Academic English requires precise and effective use of vocabulary and grammar for effective communication, which necessitates explicit teaching. Since the great expanse of English terminology cannot be covered in the classroom alone, time availability will help decide which teaching approach is useful for short and long-term goals. Webb (2009) studied the effect of pre-learning vocabulary on comprehension and writing in a Japanese EFL

university setting with 71 participants. He enumerated comprehension factors to include the difficulty of the vocabulary, density of unknown terms, background knowledge and context. Students were randomly assigned to receptive or productive vocabulary learning tasks using word pairs, a list of vocabulary on one side of the page, their meanings on the other. Then it was a matter of which list to cover and recall.

Webb found that although vocabulary knowledge scores were similar in both groups, the receptive tasks group had significantly higher comprehension scores, and productive tasks led to greater effects for writing than reading. Thus while intensive vocabulary work will certainly yield greater gains in learning vocabulary, decontextualized learning may have a place in teaching pedagogy where the goal is to gain much in a short period of time (test preparation). This method could be used along with contextualized work and intensive vocabulary exercises when time is available. The message is that one needs to balance time with depth and breadth of vocabulary knowledge and match the strategy to the purpose. A limitation of this study is that retention is not addressed.

Retention was not overlooked by Min (2008) who compared 50 male Chinese high school students in reading plus vocabulary enhancement activities versus narrow reading for vocabulary acquisition. Methods included reading a selection (longer narrative and expository genres where all target words were boldfaced), doing a comprehension activity (true-false), then vocabulary-focused activities (reading plus vocabulary enhancement). Instead of vocabulary work, the control group read two to three more texts on the same topic (narrow reading).

Results revealed the superiority of supplementing reading with vocabulary tasks, maintaining gains of 13.28% for receptive and 17.84% for productive vocabulary knowledge after three months. But the narrow reading group also made gains with retention of 9.68%

receptive and 10.32% productive vocabulary word knowledge. A limitation of narrow reading is that students could have been relying on the context for meaning rather than vocabulary, though the words were boldfaced. This study extends previous research on vocabulary acquisition strategies by comparing the type of word knowledge (receptive/productive) in a single study, using a longer retention period with a more valid assessment and using a more authentic setting and materials. How words are strung together into the discourse of textbooks is next.

Syntax and Semantics

A Study in Textbook Anaylsis. While primary grades learn to read with an emphasis on bottom-up processing, middle school sees a shift toward reading to learn. Butler, Bailey, Stevens, and Huang (2004) analyzed fifth-grade texts as they engaged in test development, to ensure valid test items in terms of content knowledge vs. language proficiency. Three excerpts each from science, social studies, and math textbooks were evaluated for sentence length, lexical diversity, grammatical data, and discourse.

Common verb tenses in academic English are present, past and present perfect. Those structures that the research literature suggests are most difficult—passives and participial modifiers (Schleppegrell, 2001)— were reported as follows. With about one passive in every four sentences, science had the most compared to one in six for social studies and one in twenty-five for math. Social studies contained about one participial modifier in every nine sentences; science had one in eleven, while math did not have enough to compare in this manner. Relatively speaking, the percentages of these difficult syntax structures were low at this grade level. The low count for math may be partially due to the fact that only word problems were used. Academic vocabulary was especially prevalent in social studies and

science while science incorporated one-time word usage, "a hallmark of conceptually dense prose" (p. 39). This study of academic texts yielded little identification of the differences by discipline as compared to a study of oral language demands of school (Baily, 2007). Perhaps more differentiation would be found in studies of upper grades.

Academic English engenders a great variety of definitions and frameworks. Thus far the socio-cultural, educational, and linguistic aspects of bilingual literacy have been discussed. The final section hones in on cognitive aspects of literacy—the mental exercises intended for growth in language skills as related to age and development, including strategy usage in metacognition.

Comprehension as Related to Cognition

Language learners need a challenging curriculum integrating critical thinking skills while learning the language. Scarcella's (2003) outline of the cognitive academic dimension of language consists of processing of concepts through verbalization (oral or silent) in keeping with the constructivist view of language learning and Píagetian accommodation and assimilation negotiated through developmental stages (Furth, 1970). Skill in using word attack and context to find meaning and the ability to pick out key ideas is crucial. In terms of CALP, higher levels of analysis such as synthesis and evaluation will be increasingly critical, balanced with the age and proficiency of the learner (Bloom & Krathworth, 1969). Throughout the following paragraphs, comprehension is related to literacy and cognition depending on age, ability, and developmental level resulting in variance of later literacy skills and abilities among students. The following studies on print exposure, the simple view, intervention, cohesion and metacognition involve a multitude of cognitive skills.

Studies in Print Exposure

Interest in print exposure has prompted research into its antecedents and benefits. Cunningham and Stanovich's (1997) longitudinal study of 56 middle class first graders, following them through the eleventh grade, examined the relationship between early reading ability and long-term print exposure through reading tests and an author recognition test for eleventh graders. Findings revealed that moderate to low frequency words appear much more often in common reading materials than they do in common speech and that early reading success predicted print exposure, which imparts declarative knowledge and verbal ability. However, even if beginning reading development lags, the student stands a good chance of success if he can catch up by grade five.

Baker (2002) investigated the relationship between print exposure and reading achievement using Virginia's state-wide second and third grade test results of the Early Intervention Reading Initiative and a title recognition task. He noted a positive correlation between low literacy development and low exposure to print. This study provides further evidence of the gap that grows between adept and low-ability readers with its spiraling effect that occurs when discouraged students are disinclined to read due to the fact that it holds no joy for them. When all cognitive resources are depleted trying to decode and understand vocabulary, comprehension suffers. This "rich get richer and the poor get poorer" finding echoes the work of Stanovich (1986).

Print exposure, moderated by age and ability level can enhance vocabulary development and hence literacy. Ten-to-twelve exposures to a word are necessary to learn it according to Coady (1997). A monolingual speaker between the ages of two to seven will learn about 15 words a day, signifying the importance of reading. But, "we must pay more serious attention

to the problem facing those language learners who are beginners and who face a truly paradoxical situation. How can they learn enough words to learn vocabulary through extensive reading when they don't know enough words to read well?" (p. 229). Graded readers are not recommended because in lowering the vocabulary load, quality in vocabulary, syntax and pragmatic usage are lost. More important is the interest of the reader in the subject, even if the material is a bit challenging. Moreover, he says that a learner needs about 3,000 word families to be able to transfer L_1 learning to L_2 and be able to gain the benefits of incidental, extensive reading. This study by Coady supports the work of Min (2008). Another prominent reading method in schools centers on decoding through phonics.

Studies in the Simple View

Decoding in itself is not enough to ensure comprehension—the decoded word must be present in the student's lexicon. This presents a problem for language learners who may not recognize the word once heard. Hoover and Gough (1990) tested the simple view of reading, decoding (transforming symbols into phonetics) and linguistic comprehension (the process of interpreting lexical, sentence and discourse information), on bilingual children in early elementary grades to explore causes of variance in comprehension finding it dependent on two skill categories. If one of these factors was deficient, comprehension suffered.

In an effort to produce a research-based L_2 reading model Proctor, August, Carlo, and Snow (2006) expanded on the simple view by adding speed of real word reading. Of 135 bilingual Latina/o students, one group was instructed initially in Spanish, transitioning to English, the second in English only, making the study highly generalizable to typical US schools. Rather than looking for any support from a possibly non-existent L_1 literacy foundation, the focus was on the development of L_2 skills that are the strongest L_2 predictors.

Results were collected in the third year of a four-year longitudinal study. An interaction was found between Spanish vocabulary knowledge and English fluency. The cross-linguistic transfer of phonological awareness promoted English vocabulary knowledge and was crucial for comprehension. Therefore, if a student had mastered L_2 decoding skills, vocabulary knowledge was decisive for comprehension. Recognizing the special needs of ELLs, this study built on a reading model originally designed for native speakers and adapted for ELLs by adding vocabulary and listening components. The means by which vocabulary was taught and acquired in a typical class varied, depending on the student's language.

Revisiting the simple view as a model explaining reading comprehension, Netten, Droop, and Verhoeven (2010) conducted a longitudinal study analyzing the results of standardized tests and questionnaires of 822 Dutch students, 93 of whom had parents from other countries and were considered second language learners, to find a model explaining the differences in reading development among L_1 and L_2 upper elementary grade students. Specifically, they looked at the differences between these two groups in grades four and again in grade six in the areas of decoding, language, math, non-verbal reasoning skills, reading motivation, self-confidence and home reading resources to find whether any of these areas affected literacy development differently between the two groups.

As expected, results revealed a marked difference between first and second language learners' literacy abilities by the end of elementary school. Conforming to earlier studies on the simple view, word decoding and language proficiency predicted reading literacy (Hoover & Gough, 1990; Proctor, August, Carlo, & Snow, 2005). Greater literary abilities in grade six were associated with positive reading motivation and increased self-confidence in grade four. Nonverbal reasoning influenced reading literacy and variables in language, math and self-confidence. This once again provided evidence of cognitive ability impacting reading

literacy, particularly in later grades. Especially interesting was that, whereas home reading resources had an impact on L_1 students' reading, language abilities, and motivation, such was not the case for L_2 students. This may have been countered by the family's socio-cultural status and language use.

Given the importance of reading ability in academic success and the far-reaching consequences it has for society, Netten, Droop, and Verhoeven (2010) support the practice of providing early intervention for pre- and primary-grade language learners. For this context, the authors suggest a content-based approach focused on vocabulary acquisition and oral language proficiency. Based on the results of the speed reading tests, the study indicates the importance of decoding skills even in upper elementary grades. Finally, parental involvement will help bridge the gap between home and school literacies, resulting in improved motivation, participation, and engagement of the student in the classroom. Conclusions are limited both by the small size of the language learning group as well as their heterogeneous nature. Next, when cognitive abilities are found to be low, schools turn to intervention.

Studies on intervention with ELL students

Mentioned earlier in connection with a heavy emphasis on phonetics, Vaughn et al. (2006b) aimed to create an effective reading intervention for ELLs at risk for reading problems. A second study, delivering instruction through both Spanish and English, is reported here. In this randomized study, 215 first grade bilingual participants were enlisted with the goal to read rapidly with comprehension. The English and Spanish intervention techniques are described in two areas—curriculum and vocabulary/oracy. The interventions were different in sequence and focus, owing to what is appropriate in terms of the language, but similar in design and delivery. For example, teachers accommodated the nature of

Spanish being syllabic by teaching multisyllabic words by syllable, rather than phonemes.

Results compared intervention and non-intervention groups— each with an English and Spanish cohort—revealing that the students scored better in their language of instruction. Those taught in English had higher test results when tested in English, and likewise for Spanish. In addition, there was some transfer from Spanish to English skills. Although this study had lower results than a previous study conducted by the authors, pretest scores were also notably lower. The intervention group generally outperformed the control group. The lack of transfer of abilities from English to Spanish was attributed to a lack of exposure to Spanish literacy, while the more regular spelling to phoneme patterns of the Spanish language spurred growth in the Spanish group's fluency. This piece closed with foreboding concerning the future of these participants who scored very low in oral language, explaining that as students move on in grade level, successful reading is increasingly dependent on vocabulary knowledge and oral language proficiency.

Long-term studies are valuable in ascertaining the retention of early gains. In their follow-up study a year later, Vaughn et al. (2009) reported the outcomes of Spanish and English interventions and looked more closely at reading outcomes and language transfer when that language was not used in the classroom, the ultimate goal being comprehension. Of the original sample, 81% of the first-grade participants were retained.

As expected, the students in the treatment group outperformed the control group, and both the Spanish and English intervention groups outperformed the non-intervention groups in their particular language of instruction. Of the intervention groups, the Spanish group showed higher results when testing in Spanish, but no difference was noted between them and the non-intervention Spanish group when tested in English. The Spanish group scored

higher on most measures. The results of this study support similar studies, as well as this study's predecessor, and the early gains were maintained. In spite of these gains, however, the authors still foretell a gloomy future for these students as they move on and will be confronted with longer reading assignments of increasing difficulty, while having to transition to the English language with low English oral skills. This study supports literature on the importance of early intervention as a way of reducing later, more costly problems. Being that these studies are on-going, the findings reported here are preliminary. Comprehension of text is also constrained by age and the ability to understand cohesion.

Studies in Cohesion

While struggling students often get graded readers (p. 60), better readers are presented with better quality texts, more meaning-focused activities, and also engage in more independent reading, all of which develops a more advanced awareness of cohesion strategies. By third-grade "developing cohesion knowledge already separates good from poor readers" (p. 59), according to Cox, Shanahan, and Sulzby (1990), who explored the relationship between reading performance and cohesion. The writing of 48 third- and fifth-grade middle SES participants of high versus low readers were compared using the following categories of cohesion in discourse: co-referential, co-classificatory, co-extensive, and superordinate. One term replacing another, such as the use of pronouns, is termed c*o-referential* while *co-classificatory* uses comparison or ellipsis. Co-*extensive* makes use of related words such as synonyms, antonyms, and categories (type of verbs, grammatical category of words or phrases, or even saying comparable things about like concepts). Finally, a common theme can tie elements together in the category of *superordinates*. By studying the cohesion of a text, not only does one learn about cognitive relationships, but also the function of text in various genres. Whereas earlier work on cohesion merely counted ties, this work

adds evidence on cohesive harmony by recognizing these different types and devising a more exact measurement.

Cox, Shanahan, and Sulzby (1990) measured reading cohesion knowledge by its use in writing. Both strong and weak readers produced better results with narratives. But in more challenging expository writing, more proficient use of complex cohesion and less co-referential and co-classificatory errors were tied to reading proficiency rather than grade level, supporting previous literature on cohesion. Graded readers and the corresponding instructional practices used with poor readers may account for lower cohesion skills. Due to the mainstream middle-income suburban sample, results are limited.

 "One of the most essential aspects of our understanding of the world we live in is the ability to recognize the relations between the events that we encounter*"* largely accomplished by the use of connectors in discourse (Van den Broek, 1997, p. 321). This author describes developmental trends concerning transition markers. A child first becomes aware of cause by age four. Between ages 6 and 10 un-related information, or *dead ends,* are soon forgotten, but causal chains are retained. By 8 years of age, children come to rely on causal relations for comprehension (p. 329) and only recognize goals or motivation if they are in the same episode. A growth spurt occurs between ages 8 through 11, which marks the extent of progression. From here they can make cross-episodic connections. Finally, by age 14 what is considered most important and retained best are thematic relations. Thus, development moves toward causal structures, toward cross-episodic connections, and from concrete actions toward abstract thought, focusing on the internal goals and intentions of the protagonist. This is in keeping with the Píagetian developmental shifts from pre-operational toward symbolic thought (Furth, 1970).

Working with 82 first year university-level English for Academic Purpose students in a compulsory course in for a medical university in Medunsa, South Africa, Pretorius (2005) predicted a somewhat different developmental pattern in acquiring connectors proceeding from additive, to temporal, to causal, and lastly, to adversative—noting that discontinuative, or contrasting, logic seemed to be a "cornerstone" of comprehension and ultimately, academic performance (p. 446). Furthermore, he hypothesized that local relations would be attained before global. This was measured in two reading comprehension tests with items on logical relations, administered during regular class time. Although time was not restricted, the amount required by each student was noted. The results were compared to a language proficiency test and academic performance measured through final exams.

Findings revealed illustrative as the easiest and adversative as the most difficult, the local easier than global to comprehend. There was a remarkably consistent pattern of ability level as related to understanding logical relations with the two higher groups doing much better than the two lower groups. This adds to the strength of Pretorius' (2005) claims: stronger students search for patterns and relationships. She explains that understanding relatedness enables integration and construction of new knowledge. Cognition and comprehension are dependent on age and ability level. Comprehension of text is influenced by cohesion and the relatedness of new knowledge with that of past experiences and knowledge.

Comprehension: Vocabulary or background knowledge?

Working at the university level, Johnson (1982) gave varying amounts of vocabulary instruction with a reading passage—parts of which dealt with familiar topics and others not—to determine the importance of prior knowledge. Based on testing conditions, if comprehension was based on vocabulary knowledge, the group with no vocabulary instruction should have scored the lowest. As it was, familiarity with the content made the difference, whereas earlier vocabulary work improved comprehension on the familiar section

of the text. This study does not support the high correlations reported between vocabulary knowledge and comprehension found by Anderson and Freebody (1979). Johnson (1982) reiterates that if a large amount of vocabulary is unknown it will affect comprehension, but she places a greater emphasis on prior knowledge.

Johnson's (1982) study relates to Palinscar and Brown (1984) wherein comprehension was related to *considerate texts.* In these texts, background knowledge harmonizes with content in keeping with what is expected. Strategies were taught in order to understand, remember, and get around obstacles by means of reciprocal teaching (RT), which uses the four strategies of questioning, clarifying, predicting, and summarizing. Six students were placed in each of the following groups: RT, locating information, practice in reading followed by questions, and finally, a control group who received the regular classroom lessons. The criteria for success were 1) reliable improvement during training classes, 2) independent improvement, 3) improvement in independent reading of novel passages, 4) durability, 5) ability generalized across settings, and 6) transfer to new tasks in science or social studies (p. 9). Reciprocal Teaching showed strong, positive results while the control group scores were maintained.

Although this study used native speaker subjects described as poor in comprehension, one of them is identified as an ethnic student who at first is unable to formulate a question. When asked a *why* question, he was silent. Finally, given a model, he repeated it with difficulty. Furthermore, the study participant had obtained a low IQ test score of 70, was four years delayed on standardized tests of reading comprehension, and scored 0 on the pretest. This student improved daily both in ability to generate questions and to summarize. By day 10 he was 75% successful, and by day 15 he no longer required help. He finished with 85% on comprehension assessments, went from 20 to 60% on generalization probes, and increased

from 0 to 65 points in question generation. He gained 20 months on the standardized comprehension test. Recognizing RT's effectiveness for breadth and durability of comprehension, this method is widely implemented in today's classrooms.

Recognizing the goal of reading as making a "coherent model of meaning of a text" (p. 181), with organization of knowledge as the basis for comprehension, Armbruster (1984) proposed a text structure applicable to the teaching of history by building on the research-based story grammar and working with the psychological perspective of history, that of people acting to accomplish a goal. Her frame map of goal, plan, action and outcome can be altered to include problem/solution and sequence. Supported by the work of Van den Broek(1997) as well as Pretorius (2006) on coherency, this textual organizational tool has a number of classroom applications including where to supplement, presentation organization, support of reading strategies, assessment, and textbook evaluation.

Another common method used to promote comprehension and vocabulary acquisition is textual simplification which usually means providing shorter texts through elimination of nonessential morphological inflections and simplified syntax. In an effort to strike a balance between this type of modification, which denies access to lexical acquisition and linguistic structures, O'Donnel (2009) studied whether elaborative modifications improved comprehension. Though these undergraduate students had to read more text and produce a written recall in the same 50-minute time frame as provided for authentic texts, O'Donnel found increases in recall (16%) as well as vocabulary scores. The latter showing a great range, depending on the difficulty of the original text. The study indicates that rather than being applied universally, elaboration should be used selectively on challenging texts, where it has a greater impact and students attend to vocabulary rather than being able to ignore it as in easier texts. This study supports the work of Coady (1997) where context and elaboration

support comprehension, as well as Boscardin et al. (2004) who advise textual simplification to be used judiciously. Next, the cognitive dimension entails metalinguistic utilization.

Metacognition

Metacognitive awareness varies according to one's linguistic and sociocultural background. "People get it from the narratives and stories told during interactions within a culture's meaning system" (Corson, 1997, p. 708). Learning strategies lower the amount of activation of synapses needed for learning and retrieving lexicon. Krashen and Brown (2007) suggest that we teach the learning strategies that are not naturally acquired, such as those that make input more comprehensible and contribute to content learning—such as problem-solving. There have been a number of studies on strategy usage which has been shown to be especially helpful for ELLs.

Jíminez, Garcia, and Pearson (1996) were interested in learning what strategies successful Latina/o readers use. The reading strategies of fourteen students were compared through background questionnaires, interviews, think-alouds, and text retellings. All Latino/a students were bilingual and biliterate, with eight Latino/a strong English readers, three marginally successful Latina/o English readers, and three strong monolingual Anglo readers. Reading seemed to be quite a different activity for native speakers, who exhibited no vocabulary problems and could therefore devote more energy to comprehension. Less able Hispanic readers saw their Spanish as a hindrance. With the goal of getting done, problems were either ignored or (vocabulary) merely pronounced. The background knowledge called upon was often off target. Quick conclusions were drawn in spite of all evidence to the contrary as they worked their way through a text. In contrast, successful Latina/o readers, saw their bi-literacy as a strength and the reading task as not differing though the language may. They monitored their comprehension using a variety of strategies such as using cognates and translating to facilitate comprehension, continuing to work out problems as they

read.

One hundred and fifty-two ESL high and low readers were also compared to 150 native speakers by Sheorey and Mokhtari (2002) at the college level to compare the differences in the value placed on each of the metacognitive, cognitive, and support strategies. Both non-native and native speakers prioritized these groups in the same order with cognitive being the most valued and support being the least. ESL students appreciated support reading strategies (using a dictionary, taking notes, etc.) more than native speakers. (The only group that did not seem to value strategy use was low ability native US students.)

Dole, Brown, and Trathen *(*1996) tested the hypothesis that different strategies are better for different goals by randomly assigning 39 at-risk fifth-grade and 28 sixth-grade readers into three groups, replacing their regular reading instruction. The story content group was taught declarative knowledge using prior knowledge and presenting key information with vocabulary and outlines. The strategy group made use of text structural knowledge such as how to make predictions, identify main characters, etc. This group received explicit coaching on procedural and conditional knowledge to foster independent use of strategies for independent reading, including a fading process through group work, pair work, and scaffolding. Finally, the control group received basal instructional as is still common in today's schools. Instead of the expected story content group performing best, the strategy instruction group outperformed the other two. Lack of motivation and interest (possibly due to little interaction) may have led to the discipline problems and poor gains of the story content group.

A secondary analysis looked into other unexpected results: A poor reader who happened to be an ELL made great strides while a strong reader, who increasingly demonstrated a lack

of motivation, dropped in comprehension scores. The latter student verbalized dislike for group work, while the other saw it as an opportunity for helpful exchanges. Authors speculated that strategy instruction may have been forcing the strong student to interrupt her enjoyment of reading in order to implement strategies. Perhaps metacognitive work on favored strategies would be more appropriate for such students. This study reinforces strategy instruction and the importance of motivation for comprehension during independent reading.

A fading process was also used in the 1993 study by Schunk and Rice, who worked with 44 special education students. Of these, 55% were Hispanic and 25% of those were ESL students and close to transitioning out of the program. The researchers backed up teachers' claims that they would be able to handle the intervention with supplementary testing and found them to be of normal intelligence, then put them through a comprehension training, including strategy instruction, of 5 steps: 1) Read the questions. 2) Read the passage to get the gist. 3) Find commonalities in the details. 4) What would make a good title? 5) Reread if I don't know the answer. The strategy was initially verbalized, then whispered, and finally said to self silently. This fading process internalized the method and ultimately helped with academic deficits for students with learning disabilities. Success and feedback promoted self-efficacy by giving students control over their learning through comprehension strategies.

Thus strategy fading and feedback were demonstrated to be useful procedures for a high-level special education population that happened to consist of a significant percentage of non-native speakers. The authors recommend it for students with reading problems in various settings including regular and self-contained classes (Shunk and Rice, 1993). This study aids in understanding the processes involved in teaching comprehension strategies. Self-efficacy predicted skillful performance and advocated self-regulated strategy use.

Iwai (2008) asked two college-level Japanese subjects to share the comprehension strategies they use in America compared to previous practices in an EFL context. Reflecting with examples of their interactions with text lying before them, they shared that when encountering difficult vocabulary, the focus shifts to the context and prior knowledge, relying on a dictionary only as a last resort. Immersing themselves in reading, they read different kinds of literature thereby expanding their vocabulary. In the environment of having to read large amounts, these students became more aware of their purpose for reading and more selective in strategy use. Thus Iwai (2008) found that comprehension was dependent on vocabulary knowledge facilitated by learning strategies

That strategies can support any learning task has great potential for elevating academic achievement of linguistic minority students. Strategy transfer from a content-based English for academic purposes to mainstream classes was the focal point of James' 2006 study with guiding questions of 'What strategies transfer, and what facilitates that transfer?' gleaning his findings from five students, their teacher and tutors, plus an administrator. He learned that reading comprehension and writing strategies transferred in this Canadian university setting and occurred mostly where there was opportunity to apply the strategies and where the strategies supported personal weaknesses. In final analysis, transfer cannot be assumed as it depends on many variables. In the next study the level of strategy use is tempered with the ability level of students

The purpose of Chamot's (1993) study was to learn the effects of cognitive instruction in math using Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA). She wished to identify the strategies used by three different ability groups, then compare and describe the differences. Staff development was a significant piece of this puzzle, with teachers themselves rated as high or low implementation. Scores were computed by the right answer,

the number and sequence of steps used, as well as the number of metacognitive and cognitive strategies used.

Results showed that high implementation rooms did not use more steps—but strategic students were aware of and used strategies in the appropriate sequence to get the right answer. The intervention was not successful for mid- and lower-ability students who were perhaps lacking in mathematical background and language proficiency. As only one word problem was used, these findings are limited. Yet due to the lack of further qualified studies on this approach, this work serves as a foundation for a great following.

Finally, the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) model (Echevarría, Vogt, & Short, 2008) is designed to make content comprehensible as academic language is developed. Based on the work of Madeline Hunter and refined through 15 years of research by these authors, SIOP defines a pattern for lesson design using eight components—lesson preparation, building background, comprehensible input, strategy instruction, interaction, lesson delivery, practice/application, review and assessment. As these are the very same topics covered by the studies reviewed in this paper, this provides a fitting conclusion to this chapter.

Summary of the Chapter

Successful acquisition of academic English is dependent on a multitude of cognitive, linguistic, and educational variables, all based on the socio-cultural perspectives and powers that regulate what occurs in the classroom. Study of these educational and socio-cultural variables uncovers a number of gaps worthy of attention. The first has to do with the need to rely on studies of mono-lingual readers. We look to the future for more studies focused

exclusively on bilingual academic reading development for this growing community of ELLs. A second gap is demonstrated by the disparity between a growing number of ELLs in the classroom and inadequate teacher training in ELL best practices. Third, the field of literacy comprehension offers a staggering array of reading intervention models, methodologies, and strategies. The ELL teacher must choose those in keeping with her philosophy, students' needs, and social and legal mandates. Finally, a gap exists between the language learner and the curriculum. Meaning systems are built on culture and thus are unequally available to those whose culture differs from the dominant one.

The function and meaning of academic texts may be lost on the student with limited knowledge and experience with academic social contexts. The teacher must work within the confines of societal and educational boundaries and may not be able to utilize the methods research has revealed as best practice for language learners. Yet, the goal is to prepare students to be independent, productive citizens, to pass the same tests as their native-speaking peers, and to meet the state standards. Therefore, the classroom should work to make the materials accessible to all, as is mandated by the No Child Left Behind legislation. This will necessitate the provision of experience, motivation, and opportunities for interaction. The next chapter will focus on this last area of concern. I will demonstrate how a research-based methodology described in chapter 2 can be used to address the gap between text and student by making academic text comprehensible and accessible when English is a second language, while providing equal access.

CHAPTER 3

APPLYING THE FUNCTIONAL GRAMMAR APPROACH TO READING

ACADEMIC TEXT

Earlier chapters introduced the academic register of English and four approaches to the topic: socio-cultural, educational, linguistic, and cognitive. Because of their common purpose and context, textbooks contain common elements of lexis and logical relations through an authoritative tone. To reiterate, highly condensed information is presented through a specific choice of grammatical and lexical alternatives through the declarative mood. In the absence of face-to-face interaction where comprehension of the interlocutor is supported by such prosodic features as pauses, duration, pitch, and tone, as well as, the use of gestures and facial expression, academic text takes great care in the use of elaborated noun phrases. Such clauses are embedded into a highly structured genre of academic text. Recognizing communication as a means toward accomplishing a purpose, the goal of textual analysis and explicit teaching of its linguistic elements is to reveal that function for meaning.

Chapter 1 discussed some of the challenges our classrooms face— mandates of equal access for all, and all students being held up to the same high standards in the face of growing diversity. Chapter 2 described many ways that schools and teachers have tried to address these challenges, including the use of CALLA, SIOP, and others that have incorporated explicit vocabulary and strategy teaching, as well as the use of graphic organizers, interaction, modified speech, and more. This chapter describes a framework for applying the method of functional linguistics delivered through the Readers Workshop (Augirre-Muñoz, et al., 2006).

Description of Context

The following syllabus is designed for intermediate to advanced seventh grade ESL students integrating language arts and social studies in an American, mid-west middle school context consisting of both native and non-native speakers (see syllabus A). This grade was chosen because it is in the middle school years where the gap between mainstream and ELLs begins to grow as the material becomes increasingly abstract and cognitively challenging. This happens at a period of time when language support tends to be slowly removed. The daily schedule follows a typical middle school model where students move to different rooms for different subjects. Goals, objectives, materials, assessment, and schedule follow.

The seventh grade is found in a middle school situation where the school building will hold grades 6 through 8. The middle school provides a transition between the elementary and high school situation. As such, the environment is child-centered. Classes are about 50 minutes daily, but the middle school philosophy endorses a flexible block schedule to allow for varied grouping and collaboration.

Constraints of the Context

In consideration of adopting the functional grammar approach delivered through Reader's Workshop as suggested by Aguirre-Muñoz, et al. (2006) in a middle school context, one must consider how the two philosophies mesh and what problems may be encountered. In this hypothetical classroom teaching social studies with language arts challenges will be felt in the areas of time, materials, communication and collaboration.

Time Requirement

In light of the current high-stakes-testing pressures confronting each teacher and classroom, teachers need to focus on the goal of teaching literacy. Students need large amounts of time to read and to be read to. The class needs appropriate procedural and scaffolding steps that take the time to model and break things down. Students need time for interaction as well as one-on-one guidance and intervention.

Materials

A second challenge in a reading class for English Language Learners is finding appropriate materials for their proficiency and interest level, especially as RW encourages large amounts of time spent in independent reading. Because one of the goals of the class is equal access, their textbooks will be used and the burden of finding resources is somewhat alleviated. The search for appropriate materials, then, is for supplementary, enrichment, and primary source reading materials. As students are expected to be checking materials out, a system will be needed both to encourage such independent reading and to track resources.

Communication and Collaboration

NCLB legislation encourages teamwork between language arts and other mainstream courses, as does the middle school philosophy. The high probability of having a diverse classroom population urges a joint effort among mainstream and ELL instructors. This can be realized through many program models including pull-out, push-in, direct, and indirect services. Which method to implement will depend on how the individual school operates and the specific needs of the people involved. By keeping the needs of the students at the forefront of all interaction, the decision-making process will be guided along a positive path.

Presentation of a Functional Linguistics Language Arts/Social Studies Unit Delivered through

Reader's Workshop (RW)

The ultimate goal of teaching literacy is to nurture lifelong learning where reading is key, a worthwhile endeavor. In order for that to happen, reading experiences need to be meaningful. This is supported by Pease-Alvarez (1991) and Ajayi (2005), who suggest activities wherein students choose that which is meaningful to them and assign meaning based on personal background. Warschauer, et al. (2004) used technology to enhance meaning. As pointed out by Cox, Shanahan, and Sulzby (1990), the wider use of authentic text along with more meaning-focused activities led to more cohesion awareness.

Ajayi's (2005) study gave a picture of a classroom that was teacher-centered, witnessing the marginalization of linguistically challenged students. He suggested a student-centered environment was established that was through provision of choice and collaborative goal-setting which honors the background of others to promote a level of comfort conducive to learning. Aguirre-Muñoz, et al. (2006) and Dole, Brown, and Thathren (1996) stated that another means of providing a safe environment is by using appropriate procedural and scaffolding strategies, such as slowly moving from direct instruction to small group, to pairs and then to independent work. Choice was a common denominator for all these studies. Choice promotes ownership and responsibility for learning.

Strengths of RW

In Reader's Workshop (RW), the main focus is to differentiate. The importance of individualization is supported by the work of Aguirre-Muñoz, et al. (2006), as well as the study by Preciado, Horner and Baker (2009), who detected no evidence of it among their

teacher subjects. RW allows students to move at their own pace. Guided reading meets a variety of needs of all the students. Here students are introduced to strategies and have ample opportunities for practice. This practice, with teacher support, has the student working in the zone of proximal development as recommended by Vygotsky (1978) as well as Krashen's i + 1 (Brown, 2001). Methods are used to help the student internalize the new strategies and skills determined as a need for the group and practiced in independent reading.

Success is built on the explicit revelation of purpose and relevance. First, expectations are clarified along with the objective. Next, the lesson is connected to the student in a meaningful way. Therefore, authenticity of receptive and productive literacy activities becomes necessary. Warschauer et al. (2004) support the importance of authenticity in their study. Min (2008) also prioritized an authentic setting and materials.

The lessons are not valuable unless they can cross boundaries and transfer to all reading environments. This need was also recognized by the studies on Reciprocal Teaching by Palinscar and Brown (1984) and was the focus of the study by James (2006). Through RW the student learns how to read and what to do when meaning breaks down. This is done through modeling as well as skill and strategy instruction provided through mini-lessons among a variety of texts.

Social nature of reading

Chapter 2 portrayed reading as an event in a social context where the goal is the construction of meaning from text. Social interaction is necessary for deep understanding of text. When working with ELLs, it is important to integrate the four communicative skills of reading, writing, listening, and speaking. The RW approach offers opportunities for every student to interact in order to articulate thoughts, ask questions, justify opinions, make

connections to prior knowledge, support interpretations, solve problems, and negotiate meaning with peers and the teacher. This means that the interlocutors will need to practice listening as together they explore literature, shedding light on the strategies others use to uncover meaning while strengthening the sense of classroom community. This sense of community is nurtured by the teacher as she recognizes that background and culture come together to form a unique schema, and that students enter the classroom with distinctive literacies built from home and life experiences, all of which will affect the meaning construed by the reader. Thus another need for interaction and teacher feedback becomes apparent—to share cultural information assumed by authors and to clarify misunderstandings.

Language, ethnicity, and social class affect communication patterns, language functions, and interaction structures in a way that is often dismissed in the school environment. Instead of perceiving the student as lacking in a literate foundation, the RW teacher builds on each particular background, reinforcing social identity. Sharing the language of books through read alouds, she exposes less able readers to literacy conventions and offers yet another avenue to strengthen listening skills.

Reading as a social event is supported by the studies of Alvermann et al. (1996), who base their study on textual interaction, by Pease-Alvarez (1991), whose school is one of the few that can demonstrate success of ELLs, and Boscardin et al. (2004), who state that the social nature of reading is important for the development of textual linguistics and that the gap between ELLs and mainstream will widen if not provided. Vaughn, et al. (2006) found that retell and discussion was the primary element that led to improved oracy and vocabulary. In Reciprocal Teaching (Palinscar and Brown, 1984) interaction is the primary avenue of learning. The study by Dole et al. (1996) indicated that the lack of interaction led to discipline problems and poor gains.

In addition to oral response, written response is an integral part of RW where the student may reflect, summarize, think aloud, learn new approaches of response such as using graphic organizers, and otherwise deepen understanding through journals. Thus the four skills of reading, writing, listening, and speaking (RWLS) are addressed through RW.

Guiding Principles of RW

As mentioned, opportunity to learn depends on access to comprehensible input through authentic materials and experiences. RW recognizes that a generous amount of time is conducive for reading ability, depending on grade level. Accessibility can further be supported through recorded texts, parents/volunteers, or the teacher, as well as peer helpers as reading partners. Thus diverse needs, experiences, learning styles and interests can all be accommodated through RW. The need for time and practice is substantiated by Vaughn et al. (2006), and Coady (1997), who claim 10-12 exposures to a word are needed to learn it, and by Iwai (2008), whose subjects immersed themselves in print to expand their vocabulary.

One of the strengths of the RW is that the process builds into a storehouse of problem-solving methods that the student calls upon repeatedly over time. Another strength is individualization. As the study by Dole, Brown, Thathren (1996) demonstrated, it is unwise to force upon a student a strategy that does not work for them or that is below the ability level of the student. RW gives the student power in goal-setting and planning.

Framework

Reader's Workshop is divided into three sections: the mini-lesson, independent reading/conferencing, and sharing (Alley & Orehovec, 2003; Dorn & Soffos, 2004; Ellis & Marsh, 2007; Keene & Zimmerman, 1997; Serafini, 2001; Serafini, 2004; Tovani, 2002). See Figure 3.1. Each is further explained in the following paragraphs.

COMPONENTS	TIME	FUNCTION
I. Mini-lesson and Read Aloud	10-15 minutes	• Direct instruction with reading o Strategy instruction o Skill instruction o Review • Modeling and link • Practice and formative assessment • Enjoyment, motivation • Active listening, engagement
II. Independent reading and conference	35-60 minutes	• Guided Reading or strategy group • Literature Circle group • Independent or partner reading • Conferring with individuals (2-8 minutes) including assessment • Writing response

III. Sharing	5-10 minutes	• Formative assessment
		• Sharing
		• Reinforcing
		• Clarification
		➢ Activities
		▪ Book talk
		▪ Reactions to text
		▪ Small group activities
		▪ Exit card:
		• I learned. . .
		• I want to try . . .
		• I wonder . . .
		• 1 more thing I want to say

Figure 3.1 Reader's Workshop Framework

Read Aloud and Mini-lesson. During this 10-15 minute whole group section the teacher models fluency through a read aloud and may integrate reading into math, science, or social studies, or use literature to explicitly teach grammatical skills, vocabulary techniques, or reading strategies. A review connects today's work with past lessons, then provides the motivation for the lesson. Going back to re-read, the teacher models what to do when, for example, meaning breaks down through a think aloud and visually represents concepts on a chart. These charts are not discarded but set aside in order to make connections to them in subsequent lessons. The information may also be reproduced into bookmarks or collected into a classroom book in order to facilitate internalization of the material. The teacher is involved in constant assessment throughout the workshop and may therefore ask students to take a moment and share with their neighbor their thoughts and reactions or to quickly try out the skill while she moves around observing and doing comprehension checks. She makes a point of sharing how her background knowledge helped her understand and how this text changed her schema.

Independent Reading and Conference. The student then attempts to put the ideas into practice through independent reading for the next 30-45 minutes and may do so through small response groups, pairs, or individually. Teachers have adapted RW to suit their needs, and therefore a variety of activities may occur during this time.

Conferencing is a constant in all models. For 10-15 minutes the teacher will meet with each individual for 2-8 minutes, visiting with 4-5 students daily with the goal of influencing future reading. She may do a quick diagnostic assessment to determine needs through running records, retellings, or comprehension checks. The teacher shares observations and offers suggestions and guidance. The teacher documents observations, the teaching point discussed, and refers back to them with the student to check progress as well as to plan for future instruction. The student's role is to be prepared, apply the strategies, explain any confusion, and collaboratively set goals. He should document current strengths, needs and responses, respond and reflect in writing to clarify thinking, cultivate divergent thinking, or ponder questions as directed by the teacher.

Guided Reading and Literature Circles. Depending on the needs of the class and the match between standards and curriculum materials, the teacher may choose to meet on alternating days with small groups during Independent Reading time for Guided Reading or Literature Circles. Guided Reading further scaffolds learning while Literature Circles provide enrichment. For this context, Literature Circles are taught by the mainstream teacher while the ELL teacher leads a daily guided reading group of perhaps 5-6 students with common needs in a co-teaching situation. If no co-teaching situation is possible, daily guided reading is a priority for this high risk group. Where specific lessons are not presented, this unit draws on the work of Webster, Matthiessen and Hasan (2005) using their *Learning to Read: Reading to Learn* methodology to structure the lessons. Based on the deconstruction phase of

the Systemic Functional model, students tackle reading with guidance through interaction in a three-move cycle: Prepare, Task, and Elaborate.

The teacher begins by situating the text in the overall field and provides background with a short summary of the topic and the sequence of moves. The logic of organization is made explicit, metaphors are unpacked, abstract nominalization is re-cast as people in action. The text is then read aloud by the Teacher or a competent student. Next, the sentence is paraphrased in student-friendly language and read aloud. After this, students are cued to find the specific wording in the text with either a *wh—*question or the technical or literary wording the text uses in place of the teacher's paraphrase. The sentence is then elaborated upon-- terms defined, metaphors and concepts explained, connections to student experiences may be drawn. Thus, students are set up for success. Rather than having to struggle to find meaning from reading, they identify the words that carry the meaning.

Sharing. The session concludes with a 5-10 minute whole group sharing time. Activities may include reactions to text, reporting back on how a strategy worked or what successes were made.

Sample Syllabus

The syllabus is designed for 7th –grade students in American schools. The 7th grade is often situated in a middle school structure. Being of mid- to advanced proficiency, the ELLs are mainstreamed with their native-speaking peers. They are ready to make the transition from needing adapted materials to having full access to the curriculum through the regular course materials with the kind of support appropriate for their level. Although originally designed for the California model where language arts is teamed with social studies, the schedule for this course is hypothetical and intended for adaptation to specific school needs

and broad application. Discussion of goals and objectives, materials, assessment and schedule follows.

Goals and Objectives

This unit is created with the primary goal of constructing meaning from academic text. The RW approach is used to improve language skills in a safe environment insuring a comfort level conducive for thinking, communicating ideas, and defending positions. By analyzing the language used to convey ideas, students develop new understandings and critical thinking skills. Opportunity to learn is strengthened when students are able to unlock meaning through analysis of the conventions used for organizing messages. Thus linguistic purpose is made explicit. The grammatical choices used for field, tenor, and mode are examined through different genres.

Materials

As the goal of this functional grammar language arts course is to provide full access to academic text, the materials are chosen to support the subject matter and literary expectations of the seventh grade core classes. For this sample syllabus, a variety of literary genres are selected throughout the course of the year that highlight the vocabulary and grammar points to be studied in a short, concise manner. Favored topics of the books will echo the content in the mainstream classes. Presentations will use problematic areas of the textbook to model methods to uncover meaning. In the sample unit that follows, a seventh-grade social studies book *A More Perfect Union* (Houghton Mifflin, 1991) is used.

Assessment

Besides the assessments required by the school and its stakeholders for this social

studies/language arts class, RW recommends alternative assessment (the documentation of which would support the assigned grade). This would include regularly assigned reading logs/journals, re-tellings (written), individual conferences, checklists, anecdotal records, and running records. A rubric incorporating all of this evidence of learning and different degrees of mastery, modeled and explained in introductory classes, would further provide documentation and justification of the grade assigned.

Schedule

The schedule will reflect the ESL teacher co-teaching with the content (social studies) teacher in daily classes of 50 minutes each. Since functional linguistics is the focus with field, mode, and tenor the primary elements of consideration, this syllabus will incorporate the sequence of genre structures suggested by Hyland (2004). The following section offers a sample unit with possibilities for approaching the material through RW.

Sample unit

When the same text can be used for two classes, it can ease the assignment load for the student. In addition, the goal of this ESL/language arts class is to unlock meaning in academic text. Social studies can be especially challenging for language learners due to the heavy linguistic content, little hands-on experiential learning, and because the authors assume much cultural knowledge by the readers. The unit is described through its subsections of theme and purpose, goals, objectives, outline with rationale, and finally assessment of the unit. Care is taken to move from simple to more complex, to link new material to previous knowledge, to note similarities, and to discuss why differences appear. This will bring in aspects of genre, social context, as well as field, mode, and tenor.

Unit Theme and Purpose

Based on the work of Achugar, Schleppegrell, and Oteíza (2007), along with

identification of the standards, one begins unit design with guiding questions. This unit asks,

"How did the principles of the Revolution play out in this new nation?" From this, the thesis

is constructed: Internal conflicts and external pressures necessitated decision-making, which

was guided by America's (newly-made) principles.

History genres fall into three different categories: historical account, historical

explanation, and historical argument (Schleppegrell, 2005). Discussion of historical account

will first identify the organizing framework, which student will mimic in retell incorporating

chronological order. Next, the author's interpretations of the cause and purpose are linked to

the author's choice of words in a discussion of bias and modals used for thinking/feeling

verbs. Thus the student is prepared to move to the next level of explanation where

organization has changed. The more advanced genres of explanation and arguing will be

covered in high school years as is developmentally appropriate according to Coffin (2006).

The primary purpose of this class is to learn language skills in context, naturally, learning

academic English simultaneously with history. Therefore, the class will analyze different

historical genres (narrative, recount, account) in order to become familiar with the language

elements seen in historical discourse. By simultaneously attending to both form and meaning

to see how meaning is affected by language choices, the student will begin to internalize the

process and transfer it to other contexts. By slowing the reading process, adept students are

encouraged to look deeper into meanings that may have otherwise been overlooked, while

those at the lower end are given the means to engage in classroom discourse, discussing how

the grammatical features function to interpret historical meanings.

Rather than simplifying text, the aim is to unpack the linguistic cues that represent

meaning. The text is analyzed, clause by clause, to uncover how the author's grammatical

choices (ambiguous use of conjunctions, nominalization, clauses using different verb choices to indicate reasoning). Specific grammatical choices are used to show the purpose of the text, identify the participants (or the purposeful lack thereof), and how they understand how they are being portrayed—as agents or passive experiencers. The process used to enact events is made explicit. In addition, the text is examined critically for author/audience relationship (tenor), point of view, and organization (mode).

Each unit, then, examines the following features. First, by looking at the structure and moves, the social purpose of the text is revealed. Then verbs (action, saying, thinking/feeling, relating) are related to processes. Participants, shown by noun phrases in either subject or object position, are recognized as the acting agent, a sensor, beneficiary, or goal. Additionally, the circumstances of the event help establish the context in terms of time, place, cause, etc.

Organization is key for comprehension. The type of connectors being used casts light on the type of organization in use. Likewise, theme in paragraph and sentence beginnings pulls the ideas back to the main idea, while nominalization can prepare for further information.

Students whose familiarity with English is limited to conversational speech are likely to find tenor and stance a challenge. This register of English, through terms of address, pronouns, and types of clauses gives a formal sense of relationship between the reader to the writer in terms of power, and distance. Finally, the text can be critically analyzed for stance indicating point of view through vocabulary of evaluation, modal verbs, degree of probability, or frequency.

Unit Goals

Based on the above purpose, goals for this unit follow. Students will categorize grammatical elements and interpret them functionally, focusing on the meanings (verbs to

events, noun phrases to tell about the participants, linguistic elements to text organization, etc.) Students will make a claim and support it with evidence.

Unit Objectives

Following these unit goals, are the unit objectives. Students will identify temporal terms including adverbs, prepositional phrases, and conjunctions. Verbs and verb tenses will be classified, leading to comparison and contrast. Students will analyze noun phrases. Students will distinguish the vocabulary and resources used for cohesion, reasons and results, point of view, stance, and modality. Students will use a variety of strategies to develop academic vocabulary and monitor comprehension.

Unit Outline and Rationale

The unit outline uses the functional linguistics pedagogy following the model of the RW as recommended by Boscardin et al. (2004) in light of the success of the program for both language learners as well as native speakers. The outline provides a picture of how the instruction of a historical genre can be organized around and presented through RW in order to provide individualization and appropriate procedural and scaffolding strategies including modeling, substantial immersion in reading, practice in using skills and strategies, and manipulation and accommodation of ideas through interaction and writing. Retell is frequently the task assigned for journaling to develop fluency and insure comprehension, as recommended by Uchikoshi (2005) and Vaughn et al. (2006b).

Rationale for the Outline. The unit follows the modeling and deconstructing of the teaching-learning cycle as well as the read aloud and mini-lesson presented under RW framework, chapter 3, because it effectively models how to functionally construct meaning from linguistic elements. Students are expected practice it in pairs and finally, individually. Additional guidance can be provided through small groups and is recommended for low-end students.

As with all RW lessons, Session 1 begins with a short story, after which comes a mini-lesson, pair work, then independent reading/conferencing/small group time, followed by a closing sharing time. Unless otherwise indicated, the guided reading small group will use the learning to read: reading to learn methodology of accessing meaning from text. This lesson is designed to contextualize the material before them. A think-aloud will compare the opening narrative to the history textbook genres to notice features. This is followed by pair discussion that explores prior knowledge, questions, connections to self, what looks helpful/difficult, and predictions.

During Session 2, a story structure features checklist is modeled, then it is broken into parts and distributed to groups for a jigsaw activity. The class listens to a different recording of a retell using the same story. Groups report on their findings and assign a grade. The guided reading group does a group retell of the introductory story. During sharing time the group creates a class rubric for a retell to be used to assess their daily journals.

Following the introductory story, Session 3 introduces the textual structure of the explanation genre. The teacher models with a graphic organizer. In pairs, students practice using this frame map using familiar textbook material. Independent time will have students use the graphic organizer to write a retell while the guided reading group uses the graphic organizer to complete a sentence frame.

In session 4, attention is drawn to the use of technical or scientific terms. The students take stock of the strategies they have for vocabulary problems. The teacher then introduces a new one to try during independent reading while the guided reading group identifies difficult vocabulary from the textbook. Through a think-aloud, the teacher demonstrates a new strategy, a word web. Finally, the word is re-positioned in context to understand the meaning of the passage.

Verbs are the focus of session 5. After identification, they are labeled in terms of tense (simple). But the scope is broadened. Students are introduced to a new way of categorizing based on the verb function—events, comments, reports, description—in order to discover point of view. The guided reading group reviews the material with a different, familiar section of text.

Session 6 develops field through a game designed to have students notice specific features of field: the level of vocabulary, the topic, the participants, the verb choices. The game also has students transform verbs into nouns, enhancing understanding of nominalization. The guided reading group continues to engage in retell of assigned material.

In Session 7, the class identifies noun groups while the skills group orders the elements of the noun phrase. A guided worksheet supplements their independent reading of the textbook. The worksheet is designed to guide comprehension of nominalization, through multiple choice exercises that ask for the correct interpretation. It also casts light on the tone of the text by looking at adjectives. Sessions 7-11 are described in *sample lessons*.

Unit Assessment

Grades will be determined from both daily work assigned to the student and intermittent checks. Students will be expected to complete journals daily to support pair discussion. Retell will be prominent. The teacher will clarify what is expected both in terms of content and quality. Journals will be collected weekly. In addition, retells will be asked of the student at the conclusion of each book and/or end of each genre with a multi-genre approach. Individual conferences will be documented. Students are expected to be prepared to discuss the strategies and skills that have been individualized for them or the mini-lesson of the day. Running records, checklists, and anecdotal records will also provide assessment for learning. A rubric listing each of these elements will be introduced to the class at the start of the year.

Sample Lessons

Sessions 1-7 introduce the historical genre of explanation in order to provide access to the textbook. Students also begin to work with grammatical elements for function and meaning. Sessions 7-11 continue to develop a functional approach for grammatical items while also strengthening reading skills through substantial independent reading practice and skills/strategy instruction. Figure 3.2 depicts the plan described.

Day	Lesson Plan Overview
1	Following an opening story, history textbook contextualizing activities include a preview, noting organization, title, headings, sub-headings, visual aids, bold-faced words to familiarize students with topics and issues. Pair work: activation of prior knowledge, questions, how this relates to me.
2	Following the opening story, teacher models a story structure feature checklist after listening to a retell and following a transcript. Students then engage in a jigsaw-type activity using sections of a Story Structure features checklist to evaluate a retell of the same story. During sharing time, the class constructs the class' retell rubric to be used to assess their daily reading logs. The strategy/skills group does a group retell.
3	Following opening story, textual structure and moves
4	Following opening story, the genre is connected to word focus (technical or scientific words). Known vocabulary strategies are listed and one new strategy is introduced to be practiced in pairs, then independently. The skills group reads the textbook assignment, explaining their strategy use aloud. The group makes strategy suggestions as needed.
5	The focus is on verbs: identify some from the text. Label category. Connect the type of verbs used in explanatory genre: action verbs, simple tense. Introduce new categories based on function: action verbs (events), thinking/feeling verbs (comment), saying verbs (report), and relating verbs (description) to discover the author's point of view. Co-construction, pairs/small groups, independent.
6	Following opening story, a game is modeled and played designed to draw attention to vocabulary in terms of field: -level of vocabulary (indicate on a scale between everyday to technical), topic, participants (in/human?) verb choices. Practice constructing nominalization by adding suffixes (-ment, -ism, -ings for the result of an action, -ion or –ation) Strategy/skills group: determined by needs
7	Opening story. Review. Introduce noun groups, practice finding. In pairs, students read textbook assignment and complete guided worksheet working

	with noun groups and their meaning, also draws attention to the tone of the piece through attention to adjectives. Skills group: the order of elements in the noun phrase.
8	Tie to past lessons on grouping verbs to learn their meanings. Focus: author's choices. Text is charted in terms of Agent (noun group), Action (verb), Reciever (noun group). Sharing time: Author's point of view. Skills group: determined by needs.
9	Opening story: "Jefferson's Foreign Policy Is Challenged", 154 *A More Perfect Union*. Focus: author's point of view discovered by looking at the thinking/feeling or saying verbs. Chart: Participant (Sayer or experiencer), thinking/feeling or saying verb, message. Sharing time: Discuss findings: Who is involved in events, what are their feelings? How events are being interpreted (positively/negatively)? Etc. Skills group: determined by needs.
10	Opening story: same text. Model/Think Aloud: Mode. -Cohesive devices, conjunctions and connectors help us understand the organization of the message. Review matching activity of text structures/ graphic organizers. Begin Chart of grammatical sign-posts to recognize text structure. Give copies of text (from textbook) with blanks where cohesive devices should be, and a bank omitted cohesive devices. Students work in pairs to decide where each should be used. Sharing time: Discuss findings. Elicit that in history, we expect the organization to be related to time with cause and effect also explained. Skills group: categorize word bank of cohesive devices, beginning first with only prepositional phrases and verbs.
11	Opening story: same text, p. 154. Model/Think Aloud: Reference Devices. Activity: Teacher reads text, pause when hit reference device. Students put thumbs up, down or sideways if they think they know what is being referred to, then whole class answers. Skills group: Same activity. Use wipe-off boards. Independent work: underline and draw arrows in text
12	Opening story: p. 154, "Caught in the Middle Again." Pulling it all together. What happened? Who did it? To whom? Under what circumstances? Organization shown by connectors. Chart: Connector, Participant, Process, Participant, circumstances. Discuss, what was most difficult? Independent work: Paraphrase. Skills group: prepositional phrases. Name some, pair, share. Identify in text, compare. In our chart, they are referred to as circumstances. Tell what each refers to.

Figure 3.2 Unit Outline

Session 8

History books present information with an impersonal tone by using nominalization and

impersonal constructions (passives, *it* or abstract subjects). The author is positioned as

coming from a more informed writer of a higher station than the student reader. This makes the text seem to be above reproach and trustworthy. This lesson considers the attitude of the authors. Authors must be selective. They choose what will be portrayed. They also choose to report what was said and by whom. The authors' interpretations of events point to their view of the consequences of those actions.

This lesson reviews the lesson on verbs, then asks the students to look further: who or what caused the verb and who is the actor. Then students look for the receiver of the action. Recalling the lesson where the class changed verbs into nouns (session 6), these nouns or noun phrases are labeled as participants and may or may not be named. Participants might be a person, a group of people, or even things, places, or abstract ideas. The teacher rips paper and asks what the action was, what is the verb? Students reply with the obvious answer of rip or tear. Then the teacher asks who made it happen? When the students answer, "the teacher," she renames herself as the participator who acted, the agent. She asks who the receiver of the action is which is the paper. Transitioning from the concrete example to text interpretation, the teacher charts *agent*, *action*, and *receiver of the action*. A discussion ensues about the author's interpretation, why he chose to write it this way. The class compares the interpretation with reality—the idea that some people only actors or only receivers. (See appendix D)

Session 9

Not everything in print is trustworthy. This lesson works with text that may be argumentative or biased. Students confront the need to be discerning readers when others try to influence their thinking. Therefore, readers need to detect the author's point of view. This is done through analysis of the thinking/feeling or saying verbs. After charting the *participant* (sayer or experiencer), *thinking/feeling* or saying verb, and the *message*, the students can understand who is involved, what the participant's feelings are, and if the events are being

interpreted positively or negatively. In addition, by seeing which side is being portrayed and which is absent, the author's bias is uncovered. By transforming the text into this kind of chart, it is easy to see if the participants are in agreement or not. Modals should be included in this category of verbs and should be discussed in terms of degree of accuracy (*will*=certainty, *would*=probability based on hypothetical condition, *may, might* or *could*=possibility, *possibility*=weak). (See appendix E).

Session 10

This lesson builds on one of the early lessons about stages (Session 3), explaining how background knowledge is very important. A short, scrambled composition proves the point. The lesson progresses with a discussion about structure. Students share what kinds of structures they are familiar with and how they recognize them, aided with examples. Then comes a matching activity of text structures/graphic organizers. The teacher initiates a chart of text structures and their grammatical sign-posts. Working with a text from their books where the cohesive devices have been replaced with a blank and a word bank provided, the students will work in pairs to construct a composition that makes sense. The heading of the word bank is: *Cohesive Devices: verbs, prepositional phrases, and adverbs.* Students check their work against their textbook readings for accuracy. During the final sharing time, the teacher elicits that historical organization is expected to be related to time, with cause and effect also explained. The guided reading group categorizes cohesive devices beginning with only verbs and prepositional phrases. (See appendix F).

Session 11

Another way to achieve cohesion (and thus coherency) is through the use of reference devices. But ELLs may get lost in the maze of who or what is being referred to. Therefore, this lesson works on making those connections to pronouns, demonstratives, and synonyms. The class completes a worksheet making connections to reference which the teacher

introduces b reading aloud. The teacher pauses at reference words. The class puts thumbs up, down, or sideways indicating whether they know what or who is being referenced. If all is well, the class states the answer aloud, together. If not, an arrow is drawn back to the originator. The worksheet is completed cooperatively, underlining the reference device and drawing an arrow back to the originator. The skills group receives additional practice with wipe-off boards and copies of the text which the teacher reads aloud. (See appendix G).

Session 12

This lesson pulls it all together, reviewing the processes that participants engage in (noun groups and verbs), the mode (organization) and what kinds of verbs go with each kind of text structure, as well as the relationships between clauses. Through charting *connector* (referrers and synonyms), *participant* (Nominal groups), *process, participant,* and *circumstances*, the students can comprehend what happened and who the main actors are, who did what, to whom, and under what circumstances. The skills group will have additional work on prepositional phrases (bingo with prepositions) to aid them the circumstances element. The students are to demonstrate understanding by paraphrasing the assigned reading after charting with a partner. (See appendix H).

Summary of the Chapter

Keeping in mind the constraints of the context as discussed in the beginning of this chapter, that of time, teamwork, and materials, I presented a sample syllabus, unit, and lessons that could be employed in a functional linguistics approach to reading comprehension of academic text. Working collaboratively, these challenges could be answered in a number of ways. Two class periods could be combined as is described in the middle school philosophy. The activities could be broken up between the two classes, or time itself could be modified by requiring the students to do the independent reading outside of class. Care would

need to be taken to continue to provide the procedural and scaffolding strategies to ensure comprehensible input as well as small group and individual conferencing. This will include modeling and clarifying expectations, small group, pair work, and finally independent completion of assignments. The teacher will build on the repertoire of skills and strategies by reinforcing them through charts, bookmarks, and Post-its as well as re-visiting topics and goal-setting during individual conferences. Conferencing should be scheduled by groups/day of the week. By combining two classes, the amount of students would double, but teamwork can alleviate many of the inherent problems. In addition, teachers may find the experience rewarding in terms of support. When collecting weekly journals, the teacher could assign certain groups due on different days of the week to alleviate a heavy load on one day. A steadfast and creative pursuit of materials to fit students' needs will be rewarded by confident and happy students.

CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSION

As set forth in Chapter 1, teachers are presented with a dilemma due to the fact that the materials used in class are to be equally accessible to all, including those with limited English language skills from other cultures. These students are expected to pass the same standardized tests as their native-speaking peers. The ultimate goal is for them to become independent, contributing members of society, but this population is at high risk for dropping out of school.

In Chapter 2 this issue was approached from four points of view—socio-cultural, educational, linguistic, and cognitive. A society that strives for equality was found to succumb to the same problems that abound elsewhere—that individuals may come into the educational system with a different set of literacy resources that are not recognized or valued in this institution. In general, academic English is not given enough support in the classroom both in terms of explicit vocabulary instruction and grammar used in discourse. Additional problems stem from the lack of appropriate procedural and scaffolding strategies; this was reported to be due to inadequate management skills. This sets language learners up for a host of risks. They are at risk for being marginalized in the classroom where they may choose to act out or give up.

Under difficult circumstances, some classrooms have found successful ways of providing a quality education to this population. For example, there is substantial documentation of the importance of comprehensible input, such as the use of simplified text, slowed speech, and graphic organizers. Although appropriate for beginners, modifications do not reach the goal of providing equal access to the curriculum. At some point, the students must use the same

textbook as their peers. But finding meaning in this register of English with which they have little experience is key.

The functional linguistic approach described through the study done by Aguirre-Muñoz et al. (2006), presents a particularly attractive approach. Through the Reader's Workshop approach, students receive the individualization, clear linguistic expectations, metacognitive and scaffolding strategies, and most importantly, full access to the curriculum. Equally important are the opportunities for participation, interaction, and critical thinking. By situating exposure to functional grammar including verb types, nominalization, and cohesion in a content class, both mainstream and language learners were found to improve their scores.

As mentioned, the implementation of such a program comes with challenges which will need to be addressed. First, I have suggested that the issue of time could be handled in a number of ways. Time itself could be altered requiring students to do more independent reading outside of class. This may result in further problems of poorly motivated ELL students not taking responsibility for their learning by doing the required reading. Another resulting problem would be what to do with the small group conferences and one-on-one conferences that are normally conducted during this independent reading time. Another option was combining two periods with the resulting problem of space and double class size. This could be a solution where classrooms are easily adjoined and the teachers collaborate.

The second challenge was teamwork. This type of collaboration would necessitate teachers who are willing to overcome the obstacles of co-teaching. By prioritizing the needs of the students and recognizing the strengths of collaboration as well as the strengths of the other teacher, the teacher may discover an exciting environment of a growing friendship and professional zeal.

The third challenge was that of finding adequate and appropriate materials for this age and ability group. As stated, the constant search and creativity of the teacher(s) will provide

answers to this problem. But one must remember that the goal is for the students to read the same materials as the mainstream students, using the strategies, interaction, and writing taught in class to unlock meaning.

A final challenge to implementing a program based on this study is that the design was not spelled out in detail. The authors acknowledged their delivery through RW and based their work on functional linguistics with careful attention given to field, mode, and tenor. Schleppegrell provided a foundation for their approach. Developing my understanding of Schleppegrell's functional perspective through further exploration (Schleppegrell, 2005; Schleppegrell & Achugar, 2003; Schleppegrell, Greer, & Taylor, 2008; Schleppegrell & de Oliveira, 2006; Achugar, Schleppegrell & Oteìza, 2007), Chapter 3 is my interpretation of what this could look like. Most literature about RW is oriented toward younger students. Teachers experienced with its use for younger students were able to easily adapt it to older students. The search for materials seemed to be their only concern. Additional resources for implementing a functional linguistics program in other areas of academics would be highly desirable.

References

Achugar, M., Schleppegrell, M., & Oteíza, T. (2007). Engaging teachers in language analysis: A functional linguistics approach to reflective literacy. *English Teaching: Practice and   Critique*, *6*(2), 8-24.

Aguirre-Munoz, Z., Boscardin, C. K., Jones, B., Park, J.-E., Chinen, M., Shin, H. S., Lee, J., Amabisca, A. A. & Benner, A. (2006). *Opportunity to learn measures* (CSE Rep. 678). Los Angeles: University of California, National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing.

Ajayi, L. J. (2005). A sociocultural perspective: Language arts framework, vocabulary activities and English language learners in a second grade mixed classroom. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 32*(3), 180-195.

Alley, M., & Orehovec, B. (2003). *Revisiting the reading workshop: Management, mini-lessons, & strategies*. New York: Scholastic, Inc.

Alvermann, D., Young, J.P., Weaver, D., Hinchman, K., Moore, D.W., Phelps, S.F., Thrash, E.C. & Zalewski, P. (1996). Middle and high school students' perceptions of how they experience textbased discussions: A multicase study. *Reading Research Quarterly, 31*(3), 244-267.

Anderson, R., & Freebody, P. (1979). Vocabulary Knowledge. (ERIC Document Reproduction   Service No. ED 177 480(Tech. Rep. No. 135). Urbana: University of Illinois, Center for the Study of Reading.

Armbruster, B. (1984). Structures of explanations in history textbooks or so what if Governor Stanford missed the spike and hit the rail? *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *16*(2), 181-194.

August, D., & Hakuta, K. (Eds.). (1998). Educating language minority children. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

Aukerman, M. (2007). The Calpable CALP: Rethinking the conversational/academic language proficiency distinction in early literacy instruction, *Reading Teacher, 60*(7), 1-26.

Bailey, A. (2007). *The language demands of school.* Los Angeles, CA: Yale University Press.

Baker, M. I. (2002). Effect of print exposure on reading ability: A title recognition task study. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Virginia, United States -- Virginia. Retrieved January 21, 2010, from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text.(Publication No. AAT 3056820).

Baker, S., Gersten, R., Haager, D. & Dingle, M. (2006). Teaching practice and reading growth of first-grade English learners: validation of an observation instrument. *The Elementary School Journal, 107*(2),199-218.

Beck, I. L., Kucan, L., & Mckeown, M. G. (2002). *Bringing words to life: Robust vocabulary instruction*. New York: The Guilford Press.

Bloom, B.S., Krathworth, D.R. (1970). *Taxonomy of educational bjectives: The classification of educational goal handbook*. New York: David Mckay Company, Inc.

Boscardin, C. K., Aguirre-Munoz, Z., Chinen, M., Leon, S., & Shin, H. S. (2004). *Consequences and Validity of Performance Assessment for English Learners: Assessing Opportunity to Learn (OTL) in Grade 6 Language Arts.* (CSE Report 635). Los Angeles, CA: University of California, Los Angeles, Center for Research on Evaluation Standards and Student Testing (CRESST).

Boscardin, C.K. & Aguirre-Munoz, Z. (2006). *Consequences and validity of performance assessment for English language learners: integrating academic language and ELL instructional needs into opportunity to learn measures.* (CSE 678). Los Angeles, CA: University of California, Los Angeles, National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST).

Brown, H. D. (2007). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy (3rd Edition).* London: Pearson ESL.

Butler, F., Bailey, A.L., Stevens, R. & Huang, B. (2004). *Academic English in fifth-grade mathematics, science, and social studies textbooks.* Los Angeles, CA: Univeristy of California, Los Angeles, Center for Research on Evaluation Standards and Student Testing (CRESST).

Callahan, R.M. (2006). The intersection of accountability and language: Can reading intervention replace English language development? *Bilingual Research Journal, 30*(1), 1-23.

Cardenas-Hagan, E., Carlson, C.D. & Pollard-Durodola, S.D. (July, 2007). The cross-linguistic transfer of early literacy skills: The role of initial L1 and L2 skills and language of instruction. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, 249-

259.

Chall, J.S., Jacobs, V.A. & Luke, E.B. (1990). *The reading crisis*. Cambridge: Harvard

University Press.

Chamot, A. (1992). Learning and problem solving strategies of ESL students. *Bilingual

Research Journal. 16*(3-4), 1-34.

Chamot, A.U., Barnhardt, S., El-Dinary, P. Robbins, J. (1993) Methods for teaching learning

strategies in the foreign language classroom and assessment of language skills for

instruction. Final report. Georgetown University. Washington, D.C.

Coady, J. (1997). L2 vocabulary acquisition through extensive reading. In J. Coady & T.

Huckin (Eds.) *Second language vocabulary acquisition: A rationale for pedagogy*

(pp. 225-237). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Coffin, C. (2006). *Historical discourse*. London: Continuum.

Corson, D. (1997). The Learning and use of academic English words. *Language Learning,

47*(4),   671-718.

Cox, B.E., Shanahan, T. & Sulzby, E. (1990). Good and poor elementary readers' use of

cohesion in writing. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *25*(1), 47-56.

Cummins, J. (1981). The role of primary language development in promoting educational

success for language minority students. In C.F.Leyba (Ed.), *Schooling and language

minority students: A theoretical framework.* (pp. 3-49). Los Angeles: California State

University at Los Angeles, Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center.

Cunningham, A.E., & Stanovich, K.E. (1997). Early reading acquisition and its relation to

reading experience and ability ten years later. *Developmental Psychology*, *33*(6), 934-945.

Dole, J.A., Brown, K.J. & Trathen, W. (1996). The effects of strategy instruction on the comprehension performance of at-risk students. *Reading Research Quarterly,* 31(1), 62-88.

Dorn, L. J., & Soffos, C. (2005). *Teaching for deep comprehension: A reading workshop approach*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse Publishers.

Echevarria, J., Short, D. J., & Vogt, M. (2007). *Making content comprehensible for English learners:The SIOP model (3rd Edition)*. Boston: Allyn &Amp, Bacon.Ellis, L., &

Marsh, J. (2007). *Getting started: The reading-writing workshop, grades 4-8*. Chicago: Heinemann.

Expeditionary Learning Outward Bound (2004). Expeditionary Learning. Retrieved 10/22/09 from http://www.elob.org.

Freeman, Y. & Freeman, D. (2003). Helping middle and high school age English language learners achieve academic success. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice,* 1(1), 110-122.

Furth, H.G. (1970). *Píaget for teachers.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Gebhard, M., Harman, R. & Seger, W. (2007). Reclaiming recess: Learning the language of persuasion. *Language Arts, 84*(5), 419-430.

Ghiaciuc, S. R. (2003). Diverse subjectivities: Investigating bilingual Latino children's literacy practices. Ph.D. dissertation, University of

Louisville, Kentucky, United States. Retrieved January 21, 2010, from

Dissertations & Theses: Full Text.(Publication No. AAT 3120062).

Hawkins, M.R. (2004). Researching English language and literacy development in schools. *Educational Researcher, 33*(3), 14-25.

Hoover, W.A. & Gough, P.B. (1990). The simple view of reading and writing. *An Interdisciplinary Journal, 2*, 127-160.

Hyland, K. (2004). *Genre and second language writing*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Iwai, Y. (2008). The perceptions of Japanese students toward academic English reading.*Multicultural Education, 15*(4), 45-50.

James, M.A. (2006). Transfer of learning from a university content-based EAP course. *TESOL Quarterly*, *40*(4), 783-806.

Jìmenez, R.T., Garcia, G.E. & Pearson, P.D. (1996). The reading strategies of Bilingual Latina/o students who are successful English readers: Opportunities and obstacles. *Reading Research Quarterly, 31*(1), 90-112.

Johnson, P. (1982). Effects on reading comprehension of building background knowledge. *TESOL Quarterly, 16*(4), 503-515.

Keene, E. O., & Zimmermann, S. (1997). *Mosaic of thought: Teaching comprehension in a reader's workshop*. Chicago: Heinemann.

Krashen, S. & Brown, C.L. (2007). What is academic language proficiency? *Singapore Tertiary English Teachers Society,* 1-4.

Martin, J.R. & Rose, D. (2005). Designing literacy pedagogy: Scaffolding democracy in the classroom. In Hasan, R., Matthiessen, C.M.I.M. & Webster, J. (Eds). *Continuing discourse on language*. London: Equinox.

Min, Hui-Tzu. (2008). EFL Vocabulary Acquisition and retention: Reading plus vocabulary enhancement activities and narrow reading. *Language Learning, 58*(1), 73-115.

Nation, I.S.P. (1990). *Teaching and learning vocabulary.* New York: Newbury House.

Nation, I.S.P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nation, I.S.P. (2006). How large a vocabulary is needed for reading and listening? *The Canadian Modern Language Review/La Revve canadianne des lagues vivantes, 63*(1), 59-82.

Netten, A., Droop, M., Verhoeven, L. (2010). Predictors of reading literacy for first and second language learners. *Reading and Writing*. Published on-line by Springer Netherlands. DOI 10.1007/s11145-010-9234-2.Retrieved July 14, 2010 from http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11145-010-9234-2.

O'Donnell, M. E. (2009). Finding middle ground in second language reading: Pedagogic modifications that increase comprehensibility and vocabulary acquisition while preserving authentic text features. *The Modern Language Journal*, *93*(iv), 512-533.

Palinscar, A.S. & Brown, A.L. (1984). Reciprocal teaching of comprehension-fostering and comprehension-monitoring activities. *Cognition and Instruction, 1*(2), 117-175.

Pease-Alvarez, L. (1991). Effective instruction for language minority students: An early childhood case study. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly 6*(3), 347-361.

Preciado, J.A., Horner, R.H. & Baker, S. (2009). Using a function-based approach to

decrease problem behaviors and increase academic engagement for Latino Language

Learners. *Journal of Special Education, 42*(4), 227-240.

Pretorius, E.J. (2006). The comprehension of logical relations in expository texts by students

Who study through the medium of ESL. *Science Direct, 34*, 432-450.

Proctor, C.P., August, D., Carlo, M. & Snow, C. (2005). Native Spanish-speaking

children reading in English: Toward a model of comprehension. *Journal of
Educational Psychology, 97*(2), 246-256.

Proctor, C.P., Carlos, M.S., August, D. & Snow, C. (2006). The intriguing role of Spanish

language vocabulary knowledge in predicting English reading comprehension.
Journal of Educational Psychology, 98(1), 159-169.

Rubinstein-Álvila. (2004). Conversing with   Miguel: An adolescent English language

learner struggling with later literacy development. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult
Literacy, 47*(4), 290-301.

Saunders, W.M., Foorman, B.R. & Carlson, C.D. (2006). Is a separate block of time for oral

English language development in programs for English learners needed? *The
Elementary School Journal, 107*(2),181-197.

Scarcella, R. (2003) *Academic English: A conceptual framework*. University of California,

Irvine. Retrieved 9/22/09 from http://lmri.ucsb.edu/publications/03_scarcella.pdf

Schleppegrell, M.J. (2001) Linguistic features of the language of schooling. *Linguistics and
Education, 12*(4), 431-459.

Schleppegrell, M.J. (2004) *The language of schooling.* New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum

Asociates, Inc.

Schleppegrell, M. J. (2005). *Helping content area teachers work with academic language: Promoting English Language learners' literacy in history* (Final report: Individual Research Grant Award #03-03CY-061G-D). Santa Barbara, CA: UC Linguistic Minority Research Institute.

Schleppegrell, M., & Achugar, M. (2003). Learning language and learning history: A functional linguistics approach. *TESOL Journal*, *12*(2), 21-27.

Schleppegrell, M., Greer, S., & Taylor, S. (2008). Literacy in history: Language and meaning. *Australian Journal of Language and Literacy*, *31*(2), 174-187.

Schleppegrell, M. & de Oliveira, L.C. (2006) An integrated language and content approach for history teachers. *Journal for Academic Purposes, 5*, 254-268.

Schunk, D.H. & Rice, J.M. (1993). Strategy fading and progress feedback: Effects on self-efficacy and comprehension among students receiving remedial reading services. *Journal of Special Education, 27*(3), 257-276.

Serafini, F. (2004). *Lessons in comprehension: Explicit instruction in the reading workshop*. Chicago: Heinemann.

Serafini, F. (2001). *The reading workshop: Creating space for readers*. Chicago: Heinemann.

Sheorey, R. & Mokhtari, K. (2001). Differences in the metacognitive awareness of reading strategies among native and non-native readers. *System, 29*(4), 431-49.

Stanovich, K.E. (1986). Matthew effects in reading: Some consequences of individual differences in the acquisition of literacy. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *21*, 360-407.

Thomas, W.P. & Collier, V.P. (2002). *A national study of school effectiveness for language minority students' long-tem academic achievement.* Santa Cruz, CA: Center for Research on Education, Diversity and Excellence. Retrieved 10/1/01 from http://repositories.cdlib.org/crede/finalrpts/1_1_final

Tovani, C. (2002). *Thoughtful reading: Teaching comprehension to adolescents* [VHS]. Portland, ME: Stenhouse Publishers.

Uchikoshi, Y. (2005). Narrative development in bilingual kindergarteners: Can Arthur help? *Developmental Psychology*, *41*(3), 464-478.

Van den Broek, D. (1997). Discovering the cement of the universe: The development of event comprehension from childhood to adulthood. In: Van den Broek, P., Bauer, P.J., & Bourg, T. (Eds.) *Developmental spans in event comprehension and representation* (pp.321-342). Mahway, NJ.: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.

Vaughn, S., Cirino, P.T., Linan-Thompson, S., Mathes, P.G., Carlson, C.D., Cardenas-Hagan, E., Pollard-Durodola, S.D., Fletcher, J.M., & Francis, D.J. (2006a). Effectiveness of an English intervention for first-grade English language learners at risk for reading problems. *The Elementary School Journal. 107*(2), 153-179.

Vaughn, S., Cirino, P.T., Lina -Thompson, S., Mathes, P.G., Carlson, C.D., Cardenas-Hagan, E., Pollard-Durodola, S.D., Fletcher, J.M., & Francis., D.J. (2006b). Effectiveness of a Spanish intervention and an English intervention for English-language learners at risk for reading problems. *American Educational Research Journal. 43*(3), 449-487.

Vaughn, S., Cirino, P.T., Linan-Thompson, S., Cardenas-Hagan, E., Fletcher, J.M., &
    Francis, D.J. (2009). One-year follow-up outcomes of Spanish and English
    interventions for English language learners at risk for reading problems. *American
    Educational Research Journal. 46*(3), 744-781.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in Society: Development of higher psychological processes*
    (14th   ed.). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Warschauer, M., Grant, D., Del Real, G. & Rousseau, M., (2004). Promoting academic
    literacy with technology: Successful laptop programs in K-12 schools, *System 32*,
    525-537.

Webb, S.A. (2009). The effects of pre-learning vocabulary on reading comprehension and
    writing. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 65*(3), 441-470.

Appendix A

An ESL Academic English Reading Course Syllabus delivered through Readers Workshop

Course: ESL with a concentration in Reading and content	**Subject:** English and other core subjects	**Grade:** 7th
Instructors: Peggy Linsmeier, co-teacher 　　　　　　Subject matter teacher		

Standards:
I.D.2: Student will demonstrate knowledge of how the principles of the American Revolution became the foundation of a new
　　　　nation
I.E.1: Student will demonstrate knowledge of western expansion, conflict, and reform in America.
I.B :   The student will apply a variety of strategies to expand vocabulary.
I.C.1 : The student will monitor comprehension and know when and how to use strategies to clarify the understanding of a
　　　　selection.

Goals
Students will interpret these grammatical categories functionally, focusing on the meanings.
Students will interpret text for meaning through discussion and writing.
Students will use a variety of strategies to access meaning.
Students will make a claim and support it with evidence.

Objectives:
Given academic text, the student will identify:
- temporal terms including adverbs, prepositional phrases, and conjunctions.
-verbs and verb tenses.
- noun phrases.
-vocabulary and resources used for cohesion.
-vocabulary and resources for comparison and contrast.
-vocabulary and resources for reasons and results.
-vocabulary and resources for presenting point of view.
-vocabulary and resources for stance.
-vocabulary and resources for modality.
Students will categorize linguistic elements.
Students will relate verbs to events.
Students will relate noun phrases to participants.
Students will relate linguistic elements to textual organization.
Students will use a variety of strategies to monitor comprehension
Students will analyze text to identify unknown vocabulary

Students will use a variety of strategies to develop academic vocabulary.
Materials: An assortment of authentic materials will be available based upon the genre under consideration. Content textbooks (This paper uses *A More Perfect Union Teacher's Edition 21st Century Edition* (Teacher's ed., 21st century ed   ed.). (1999). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Assessment:
Subject matter testing will occur as determined by the core subject requirements. English grades will be determined as required by school requirements and supported with alternative assessments collected regularly.
•   30%   Reading logs/journals due daily, collected weekly
•   10%   Retellings (or other genre models as directed) due within a week of finishing your book. A minimum of
     one/genre, with a written retell daily of the previous day's reading
•   30%   Individual conferences will be held weekly. Students will be prepared to discuss what they are
     presently reading, any problems or successes, report on guidance recommendations concerning strategy
     or skill use.
•   5%   Checklists, anecdotal records, running records
•   25%   School subject matter requirements

Schedule options follow.

Schedule

Month	School Activities	Genre study	Collaborating content class	Topics
Aug. Sept.	-WMLS-R Student -interviews -Send out ELL/program rights information	Procedural	Science	❖ Experiments ❖ Lab reports
Oct. Nov.		Historical genres	Social studies	❖ Historical fiction ❖ History textbooks ➢ Recount ▪ Personal stories/journal ▪ Learning Logs ▪ Biography/ memoirs/diary

Dec. Jan. Feb. Mar. Apr. May	 -TEAE testing/SOLOM Observation forms given to teachers -MTELL -MCA testing -NWEA testing -SRI testing (reading level)	 Description Report	Science	➤ Historical account (primary source) ▪ Book jacket ▪ Travel brochure ▪ Compare/contrast ❖ Textbook ❖ Science fiction ❖ Research paper/multi-genre project

Appendix B

Example text and sentence chunking

Jefferson's Foreign Policy is Challenged (p. 154, *A More Perfect Union)*

As President of a neutral nation during a period of European wars in early 1800s, Jefferson had struggled to defend American freedom of the seas. He knew that overseas markets for agricultural exports were crucial: the prosperity of American farmers depended upon them. At the same time, manufactured goods from Europe were also important. The United States was then mostly a farming nation, unable to supply its own manufactured goods.

Caught in the Middle Again

America's struggle to maintain neutrality, the state of being a non-participant in war, was not a new issue. During Washington's presidency, the French Revolution had put the United States in an awkward position with its old friend. Toward the end of the Adams administration, France's violations of American neutral rights had forced America into an undeclared war.

So when war between Great Britain and France resumed in 1803, American neutrality faced familiar challenges. Thanks to its powerful navy, Great Britain ruled the seas. French armies quickly took control of the European continent. As a new country with little diplomatic or military power, the united Sates gained little respect from either side.

To keep its enemies from receiving goods by ship, Great Britain began a blockade of the European coast. In a blockade, hostile ships keep all other ships, usually neutrals, from going into our out of enemy ports. "Sometimes only ships carrying war supplies are kept out. Ships caught in the British blockade were often taken for use by the British Navy. The French responded by blockading the British Isles. The French also seized neutral ships. Further restrictions from both Great Britain and France made it impossible for American ships to trade safely with either side. If American ships obeyed the wishes of one nation they were subject to seizure by the other. By 1812, Great Britain had taken nearly 1,000 American ships; France had taken about 500.

The crisis was made worse by the policy of British impressments. This was the taking of American ships of sailors who might have been British deserters. The sailors were mad to serve in the Royal Navy, which needed men to fight France. Although American sailors started to carry certificates of American citizenship with them, they were not safe from British impressments. As long as America was too weak to stop the British the sailors would never be safe.

Appendix C

Agent (Who is doing the acting?)	Action	Receiver of the Action
The French Revolution	had put	United States
France's violations of American neutral rights	had forced	America
Great Britain	ruled	the seas
	gained	US little respect
Great Britain	Began a blockade	the European coast
Hostile ships	keep	all other ships
British	caught	ships
*British blockade	were taken	ships
France	responded by blockading	Britain
France	seized	neutral ships
American ships	obeyed	wishes of 1 nation
*other	were subject to	they
Great Britain	had taken	1000 American ships
France	had taken	500
*Royal navy	were made to serve	sailors
Americans	started to carry	certificates

* passive sentence

Discuss

   -who the participants are and whether they are mostly shown to be actors or receivers and how this discloses the point of view of the author.

-Can a country really act? [Elicit that it is the people in that country doing the acting, not a person, but a group]

-the receiver is sometimes a what. [Elicit that it is actually people that are receiving the action.]

-participants as concrete vs. abstract ideas, using a visual scale. Perhaps using as participants President Jefferson, ship, sailors, France, British blockade, royal navy

- wording processes in a certain way makes <u>actors</u> appear as responsible for what happened, while others appear as <u>victims</u> of what happened, makes you feel sympathy for the victim.

Appendix D

You can't always believe everything anybody tells you. They might have a certain agenda, might be trying to influence your thinking. You have to be a discerning reader. That's why it's important to look at the author's point of view. You can learn about his point of view by looking at the thinking/feeling or saying verbs. By mapping this out, we will be able to answer

-See who is involved in events, what their feelings

-how events are being interpreted (positive, negatively?)

-how is the author showing his bias? Which side is shown, which is not?

-are the participants agreeing about the view or not?

Work together in pairs to see if you find the same thinking/feeling verbs as I do. (Tell how many I found and which line. Note that modal verbs would fall into this category and name some.)

Modals give us an idea of how accurate the information may be. For example,

1. "will" = certainty
2. "would" = probability based on a hypothetical condition
3. "may", "might", "could" = possibility
4. "possibly" = weak

Give time to find verbs, then have pairs work to fill out the rest of the chart.

Participant (Sayer or experiencer)	Thinking/feeling or saying verb	Message
Jefferson	had struggled to defend	He was having a difficult time keeping American ships safe
He	knew	He was aware of the importance of American shipping
American neutrality	faced	There were problems ahead
*crisis	was made worse	The problem intensified
sailors	would never be safe	Conditional: Something had to

		change **if** sailors were to be safe

* Passive sentence

Fill in as a class with guidance from teacher, 1 student filling out class chart, others re-writing in their journals.

Discuss findings- whose side is absent, whose point of view this is. Based on this, make predictions

Appendix E

A text makes sense if meets our expectations and fits with our background knowledge. That's why it's important to look over a text and try to determine its structure. Certain genres carry a common structure, we know what to expect, we look for it while we read, and it all fits and makes sense. There are certain sign-posts that signal a certain kind of organization. Today we are going to look at cohesive devices. Without cohesion, a text doesn't make sense and we forget more easily. Cohesion shows the relationship between participants and events. By looking at connectors we can learn how the author has organized the material. We can look at the verbs, the prepositional phrases and adverbs. (See
http://www2.scholastic.com/content/collateral_resources/pdf/r/reading_bestpractices_nonfiction_fiveTextStructures.pdf).

Give typed-out copies of text with blanks where cohesive devices should be, and a bank of the following cohesive devices. Students should work in pairs to decide where each should be used.

- In the early 1800's
- At the same time
- During Washington's Presidency
- Toward the end of the Adams administration
- (So-cause/effect) when war between Great Britain and France resumed in 1803
- Ships caught...ships responded (cause/effect)
- By 1812

Discuss findings. Elicit that in history, we expect the organization to be related to time with cause and effect also explained.

Extension:
-make a time line
-Have students fill out BINGO chart with transitional and time markers words and play BINGO.

Appendix F: Reference devices

When writing, an author tries to make his story more interesting by varying his words, using other words to refer back to an idea or person already mentioned or sometimes looking forward, preparing the reader for a noun or noun phrase coming up in the next clause. We call this *reference devices*. Pronouns (I , you, he, she, it, they, we) and demonstratives (this, that, these, those) can refer to other words and ideas. Synonyms can be substituted for other words. This is another way that cohesion is built into a text. Let's work through the text and see where we can find reference devices.

Methods to check comprehension

-Teacher reads text, when coming to a reference device, pause. The students are to put thumbs up if they think they know what it refers to, down if not. Whole class answers .

-wipe off boards/everybody writes what it refers to

- …the prosperity of American farmers dependent upon **them… [**elicit: overseas markets]

- The French revolution had put the United States in an awkward position with **its old friend.** [France]

- Further restrictions from both Great Britain and France made **it** impossible[for American ships to trade safely with either side].

- If American ships obeyed the wishes of one nation, **they** were subject…[American ships]

- By 1812, Great Britain had taken nearly 1,000 American ships; France had taken abut 500 [ships]. * This method was not mentioned in the introduction and will need to be discussed. Ellipses is another method of cohesion.

- **This** was the taking of American ships of sailors . . .[impressments]

- American sailors started to carry certificates of American citizenship with **them, they** were not safe from British impressments. [American sailors]

Have students map out references in a text by underlining the reference device and drawing an arrow to the nouns or noun phrases it refers to.

Appendix G

 Model/THINK ALOUD:

Sometimes history sounds boring and difficult to understand. Why can't they just write it like the story books I love? After all, it's really about people's lives—what happened? Who did it and to whom? What were they circumstances that brought it about and that were also happening? We have looked at the process that participants went through, found in the verbs. We have also looked at mode—how the author organizes the information so that we can make sense of it. If the author wants to depict a chronology, he will use action

processes. If he wants to discuss or debate an event, he will use saying and thinking/feeling processes and verbs. Of course he will use defining/describing verbs for a description and explanation. When I chart out the process and participants, I can see the different frameworks and relationships between clauses—cause and event, for example. So I want to know

-who is acting, the participant, and sometimes this is depicted as an idea, an abstraction. I have looked at how the author uses nominalization to say in a very short, succinct way, something that was already explained, that we are expected to know, so that he can evaluate and discuss it, interpret it, what it means—maybe by telling the results. He introduces his topic first, then presents new information about it. So today I want to put it all together, to see

-what happened

-who did it

-to whom

-under what circumstances (in the prepositional phrases and adverbial adjuncts).

-look at the type of connectors used to see the organization. I know that in history, it's usually time and cause.

Connector	Participant	Process	Participant	Circumstances
(referrers and synonyms)	(Nominal groups)	(verbs)		context (time, place, cause, manner, reason, and so on)
	America's struggle			to maintain neutrality…
		was not	a new issue.	
During Washington's presidency,	the French Revolution	had put	The United States	in an awkward position with its old friend.
Toward the end				of the Adams administration,

	France's violations			of American neutral rights
		had forced	America	into an undeclared war.
So when war between Great Britain and France resumed				in 1803
	American neutrality	faced	familiar challenges.	Thanks to its powerful navy,
	Great Britain	ruled	the seas.	
	French armies			quickly
		Took	control	of the European continent.
				as a new country
				with little diplomatic or military power,
	the United States	gained little	respect	from either side.