

Contemporary Readings in Literacy Education



Marva Cappello
Barbara Moss
Editors

Contemporary
CRS
Readings Series

Contemporary Readings in Literacy Education

Marva Cappello

San Diego State University

Barbara Moss

San Diego State University

Editors



Contemporary
CIRS
Readings Series

 **SAGE**

Los Angeles | London | New Delhi
Singapore | Washington DC

Copyright © 2010 by SAGE Publications, Inc.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

For information:



SAGE Publications, Inc.
2455 Teller Road
Thousand Oaks, California 91320
E-mail: order@sagepub.com

SAGE Publications India Pvt. Ltd.
B 1/I 1 Mohan Cooperative Industrial Area
Mathura Road, New Delhi 110 044
India

SAGE Publications Ltd.
1 Oliver's Yard
55 City Road
London EC1Y 1SP
United Kingdom

SAGE Publications Asia-Pacific Pte. Ltd.
33 Pekin Street #02-01
Far East Square
Singapore 048763

Printed in the United States of America

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Contemporary readings in literacy education/edited by Marva Cappello,
Barbara Moss.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-1-4129-6591-0 (pbk.)

1. Reading. 2. Language arts. 3. Literacy. I. Cappello, Marva. II. Moss, Barbara, 1950-

LB1573.C55624 2010

372.6—dc22

2009029110

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

09 10 11 12 13 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>Acquisitions Editor:</i> | Diane McDaniel |
| <i>Editorial Assistant:</i> | Ashley Conlon |
| <i>Production Editor:</i> | Carla Freeman |
| <i>Typesetter:</i> | C&M (P) Digitals Ltd. |
| <i>Proofreader:</i> | Scott Oney |
| <i>Indexer:</i> | Jeanne R. Busemeyer |
| <i>Cover Designer:</i> | Glenn Vogel |
| <i>Marketing Manager:</i> | Helen Salmon |

ARTICLE ABSTRACTS

Article 1

Pearson, P. D. (2004). The Reading Wars. *Educational Policy*, 18(1), 216–252.

This article's fundamental argument is that the reading instruction and reading research have been shaped by political forces desiring to privilege particular approaches to instruction or particular combinations of methodological and epistemological perspectives on research. The swings in both dominant pedagogies and dominant research paradigms are analyzed in terms of these determining forces. The article concludes by championing balance and compatibility across both instructional approaches and research methods in hopes of arresting the pendulum swings that have characterized the field for too many decades.

Article 2

Powell, R., McIntyre, E., & Rightmyer, E. (2006). Johnny Won't Read and Susie Won't Either: Reading Instruction and Student Resistance. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, 6(1), 5–31.

Why are children off task? What is going on in classrooms where a majority of children are off task? In this study, the authors analyzed primary-grade classroom literacy instruction in which there was considerable off-task behavior. Using Turner and Paris's frame for understanding student motivation in the classroom, 73 activity settings were analyzed in which students were off task at least 25% of the time for instructional characteristics positively associated with student motivation: choice, challenge, control, collaboration, constructing meaning, and consequences. Student off-task behavior was prevalent in classrooms where few of these six variables were present and instructional tasks were characterized as "closed," that is, where the products and processes were predetermined. Where there was indication of a high degree of off-task behavior, a disproportionately high number (23 of the 28 data sets) were from classrooms that used scripted literacy instructional programs. Findings are interpreted using both psychological and critical frameworks.

Article 3

Fisher, D., & Frey, N. (2008). Releasing Responsibility. *Educational Leadership*, 66(3), 32–37.

We must transfer responsibility for learning to our students gradually—and offer support at every step. There is no shortage of teachers assigning students responsibility for their own learning. But these "busywork" examples are not exemplars of true independent learning, which is a major goal of education. How can we set students on a path to true independent learning? According to Fisher and Frey, one way is to purposefully yet gradually release responsibility for learning from teacher to student. To make this transfer of responsibility, we must give students supports that they can hold on to as they take the lead—not just push them onto the path and hope they find their way. These supports include models of the kind of thinking students will need to do, access to academic language, peer collaboration, and guided instruction.

Article 4

Guskey, T. R. (2003). How Classroom Assessments Improve Learning. *Educational Leadership*, 60(5), 6–11.

This article describes how to use quizzes, tests, writing assignments, and other assessments to improve instruction and help students learn. It suggests that instead of teaching to the test, teachers test what they teach and follow assessments with corrective instruction. This article also discusses the benefits of assessments.

Article 5

Johnston, P., & Costello, P. (2005). Principles for Literacy Assessment. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 40(2), 256–267.

“What gets assessed is what gets taught” is a common assertion whose meaning is often underestimated. It is not just what gets assessed, but how it is assessed that has implications for what is learned. When a child who is asked the meaning of his report card grades responds, “If I knew that I’d be the teacher,” he is saying something about the relationships of authority learned in the process of assessment. When a teacher wishes out loud that her faculty “could discuss retention and realistic expectations for grade levels without the nastiness and accusations,” she is also reporting on the relational aspect of assessment practices (Johnston, 2003, p. 90). The goal in this article is to offer a framework for understanding literacy assessment that incorporates these dimensions and reminds us of the broader picture of literacy assessment of which we often lose sight.

Article 6

Valencia, S. W., & Riddle Buly, M. (2004). Behind Test Scores: What Struggling Readers *Really* Need. *The Reading Teacher*, 57(6), 520–530.

In this article, we draw from the results of an empirical study of students who failed a typical fourth-grade state reading assessment (see Riddle Buly & Valencia, 2002, for a full description of the study). Specifically, we describe the patterns of performance that distinguish different groups of students who failed to meet standards. We also provide suggestions for what classroom teachers need to know and how they might help these children succeed. These 108 students constituted approximately 10% of failing students in the district. None of them was receiving supplemental special education or English as a Second Language (ESL) services. We wanted to understand the “garden variety” (Stanovich, 1988) test failure—those students typically found in the regular classroom who are experiencing reading difficulty but have not been identified as needing special services or intensive interventions. Classroom teachers, not reading specialists or special education teachers, are solely responsible for the reading instruction of these children and, ultimately, for their achievement.

Article 7

Clark, K. F. (2004). What Can I Say Besides “Sound It Out”? Coaching Word Recognition in Beginning Reading. *The Reading Teacher*, 57(5), 440–449.

Coaching is a highly effective instructional technique in which teachers craft instructional cues that enable students to apply their developing reading skills and knowledge of strategies as they attempt to complete a task. The article describes interactions that illustrate a highly effective instructional technique: coaching. In the interactions, knowledgeable teachers have crafted just the right cues for readers to apply their developing knowledge of word recognition strategies. In doing so, the teachers have incrementally fostered students’ ability to become strategic and independent readers. The purpose of

this article is to describe the technique of coaching word recognition. I review the reading process, elaborate on coaching, present examples of coaching, share elements to consider when preparing to coach, discuss implications for practice, and offer conclusions about the nature of effective coaching.

Article 8

Joseph, L. M. (2002). Helping Children Link Sound to Print. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 37(4), 217–221.

Word boxes and word sorts are two phonic approaches that help children make connections between sound and print by gaining an awareness of the phonological and orthographic features of words. This article provides step-by-step procedures for using these approaches in small-group and whole-class settings. The use of peer tutors is discussed.

Article 9

Manyak, P. (2008). Phonemes in Use: Multiple Activities for a Critical Process. *The Reading Teacher*, 61(8), 659–662.

Several decades of research have established the critical role of phonemic awareness in the development of beginning reading. In particular, phonemic awareness makes early phonics instruction useful for children and facilitates their abilities to blend letter sounds while decoding words, to learn sight words reliably, and to spell phonetically. A key finding in phonemic awareness research is that instruction involving segmenting and blending phonemes combined with a focus on the letters that represent those phonemes contributes greatly to success in beginning reading and spelling. The author found that students benefit greatly from a variety of activities combining phoneme segmenting and blending with letter-sound instruction. This variety allows children to develop a robust ability to apply phonemic awareness to tasks of reading and writing and supports students who may struggle with this critical process. In this article, the author describes five “phonemes-in-use” activities and practical ideas for implementing them in the classroom.

Article 10

Graham, S., et al. (2008). Teaching Spelling in the Primary Grades: A National Survey of Instructional Practices and Adaptations. *American Educational Research Journal*, 45(3), 796–825.

Primary grade teachers randomly selected from across the United States completed a survey ($N = 168$) that examined their instructional practices in spelling and the types of adaptations they made for struggling spellers. Almost every teacher surveyed reported teaching spelling, and the vast majority of respondents implemented a complex and multifaceted instructional program that applied a variety of research-supported procedures. Although some teachers were sensitive to the instructional needs of weaker spellers and reported making many different adaptations for these students, a sizable minority of teachers (42%) indicated they made few or no adaptations. In addition, the teachers indicated that 27% of their students experienced difficulty with spelling, calling into question the effectiveness of their instruction with these children.

Article 11

Pikulski, J. J., & Chard, D. J. (2005). Fluency: Bridge Between Decoding and Reading Comprehension. *The Reading Teacher*, 58(6), 510–519.

Fluency has sometimes been viewed as essentially an oral reading phenomenon. The National Reading Panel defined reading fluency as “the ability to read text quickly, accurately, and with proper expression” (National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 2000, p. 3–5). Definitions that emphasize the oral aspect of fluency may, at least in part, account for why fluency has not historically

received much attention. The importance of oral reading pales dramatically in comparison to that of silent reading comprehension. Most readers spend a minuscule amount of time doing oral reading as compared to silent reading. A definition of fluency needs to encompass more than oral reading. *The Literacy Dictionary: The Vocabulary of Reading and Writing* defined fluency as “freedom from word identification problems that might hinder comprehension” (Harris & Hodges, 1995, p. 85). This definition enlarges our understanding of reading fluency to include comprehension. Samuels (2002), a pioneer in research and theory in reading fluency, cited this expanded definition as a major force in elevating the importance of fluency in the field of reading.

Article 12

Therrien, W. J., & Kubina, R. M., Jr. (2006). Developing Reading Fluency With Repeated Reading. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 41(3), 156–160.

Repeated reading has gained popularity as a technique for helping students achieve reading fluency. It is widely implemented and can be used for students with and without disabilities. Repeated reading has several components that make it more efficient. This article shares those components and provides a framework for setting up and using repeated reading in the classroom.

Article 13

Kuhn, M., & Stahl, S. (2003). Fluency: A Review of Developmental and Remedial Practices. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 95(1), 3–21.

The authors review theory and research relating to fluency instruction and development. They found that fluency instruction is generally effective; assisted approaches seem to be more effective than unassisted approaches; repetitive approaches do not seem to hold a clear advantage over nonrepetitive approaches; and effective fluency instruction moves beyond automatic word recognition to include rhythm and expression.

Article 14

Bromley, K. (2007). Nine Things Every Teacher Should Know About Words and Vocabulary Instruction. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 50(7), 528–537.

Vocabulary knowledge contributes to comprehension, fluency, and student achievement. The goal of vocabulary instruction should be to build students' independent word-learning strategies. This article provides research and theory in support of nine key ideas about words and vocabulary instruction. These ideas are important for middle and secondary teachers to know and understand in order to provide sound vocabulary teaching across the content areas. Topics discussed include (1) the English language and the consistency of its rules, (2) how language competence grows from oral to written, (3) how words are learned, (4) multiple meanings, (5) multisyllabic words, and (6) the importance of teachers' modeling word consciousness, and their own excitement about learning new words. For each key idea, the author provides several practical suggestions for classroom instruction, including strategies for individuals, small groups, and the whole class. Several websites for developing vocabulary as well as professional resources for teachers are suggested.

Article 15

Yopp, R., & Yopp, H. (2007). Ten Important Words Plus: A Strategy for Building Word Knowledge. *The Reading Teacher*, 61(2), 157–160.

In this strategy, students individually select and record 10 important words on self-adhesive notes as they read a text. Then, students build a group bar graph displaying their choices, write a sentence that

summarizes the content, and respond to prompts that ask them to think about words in powerful ways. Several prompts are suggested, each emphasizing the meaning, manipulation, or application of selected words in various contexts. This strategy is based on principles of effective vocabulary instruction, as it involves repeated exposure to words, active engagement with words, and study of words with instructional potential. This strategy fosters word knowledge as well as comprehension of text with its focus on word meanings and important ideas in text.

Article 16

Pearson, P. D., Hiebert, E. H., & Kamil, M. L. (2007). Vocabulary Assessment: What We Know and What We Need to Learn. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 42(2), 282–296.

The authors assert that in order to teach vocabulary more effectively and better understand its relation to comprehension, we need first to address how vocabulary knowledge and growth are assessed. They argue that “vocabulary assessment is grossly undernourished, both in its theoretical and practical aspects—that it has been driven by tradition, convenience, psychometric standards, and a quest for economy of effort rather than a clear conceptualization of its nature and relation to other aspects of reading expertise, most notably comprehension.”

Article 17

Zwiers, J. (2007). Teacher Practices and Perspectives for Developing Academic Language. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 17(1), 93–116.

This study investigates the ways in which middle school teachers in the United States develop academic language in intermediate-level English learners who attend mainstream content classes. Analysis of field notes, transcripts, and student work show that (a) academic language and higher-order thinking skills are closely linked, and (b) classroom discourse patterns and activities both develop and impede language growth. The teachers used four principle communication strategies: questioning, gestures, connecting to background knowledge with examples and analogies, and personifying. The results suggest that students, despite growth in certain dimensions of cognition and language, also learn counterproductive “rules of school.” This research is intended to benefit the millions of “non-mainstream” students worldwide who struggle in schools that have been created and shaped to serve mainstream purposes.

Article 18

Pardo, L. S. (2004). What Every Teacher Needs to Know About Comprehension. *The Reading Teacher*, 58(3), 272–280.

This article presents a model of comprehension to support classroom teachers as they engage their students in making meaning from text. Four areas contribute to the comprehension process: the reader, the context, the text, and the transaction, which is described as the intersection of the reader and text situated within a specific context. This model is used to describe research-based, practical applications for teachers as they provide support for comprehension in grades K–6. Teachers support the reader by teaching decoding skills, helping children build fluency, building and activating students’ background knowledge, teaching vocabulary skills, motivating students, and engaging students in personal response to text. Teachers support the text by teaching text structures, modeling appropriate text selection, and providing regular independent reading time. Teachers create and support a sociocultural context that values reading and writing, contains a wide variety of texts, allows students to take risks, and provides time for reading aloud independently. Teachers support transaction by providing explicit instruction of comprehension strategies, teaching children to monitor and repair, using multiple strategy approaches, scaffolding support, and making reading and writing connections visible to students.

Article 19

Clark, K. F., & Graves, M. F. (2005). Scaffolding Students' Comprehension of Text. *The Reading Teacher*, 58(6), 570–580.

In this article, the authors explore the concept of instructional scaffolding as it applies to facilitating students' reading comprehension. They argue that scaffolding is a highly flexible and adaptable model of instruction that supports students as they acquire both basic skills and higher order thinking processes, allows for explicit instruction within authentic contexts of reading and writing, and enables teachers to differentiate instruction for students of diverse needs. The authors hope to help professionals gain a broader perspective of the different roles they can play in using various forms of scaffolding in the reading program, so that they will employ scaffolding more frequently in their classrooms and thereby improve their students' reading comprehension. Several definitions of scaffolding are considered, foundations of the scaffolding concept are reviewed, and reasons that scaffolding is an effective technique are discussed. Three general types of scaffolding are addressed: moment-to-moment scaffolding, instructional frameworks that foster content learning, and instructional procedures for teaching reading comprehension strategies. For each type, the authors provide two examples of instruction. Finally, they discuss things to consider when making decisions about scaffolding.

Article 20

Moss, B. (2004). Teaching Expository Text Structures Through Information Trade Book Retellings. *The Reading Teacher*, 57(8), 710–718.

While most teachers are very familiar with the power of narrative retellings to improve student comprehension, they are less experienced with expository retellings. Involving students in retelling information trade books represents a promising means not only for engaging students with outstanding literature but also for improving their understanding of expository text. This article describes how teachers can use information trade book retellings to improve student comprehension of expository text structures. First, the author provides background information about retellings, expository text structure, and teaching these text patterns through information trade books. The second part of the article describes instructional strategies and procedures for teaching the various text structures through large-group, small-group, and paired retellings. The final section of the article describes how teachers can assess individual student retellings.

Article 21

Wood, K. D. (2003). New Dimensions of Content Area Literacy: Not Just for Secondary Teachers Anymore. *California Reader*, 36, 12–17.

The promotion of content area reading, helping students comprehend the textbooks for their courses, has been taking place for decades. However, in recent years, the term *content area reading* has been supplanted by the term *content area literacy*. This new concept involves integrating the communication process (of reading, writing, listening, speaking, and viewing) across all subject areas. This article discusses the broader range of emphasis that comes with the new terminology.

Article 22

Blanton, W. E., Wood, K. D., & Taylor, D. B. (2007). Rethinking Middle School Reading Instruction: A Basic Literacy Activity. *Reading Psychology*, 28(1), 75–95.

Research on subject matter instruction across the 20th century (e.g., Bellack, 1966; Gall, 1970; Hoetker & Ahlbrand, 1969; Langer, 1999; Mehan, 1979; Nystrom, 1997; Stevens, 1912) reveals a preponderance

of teacher-directed lecture, recitation, and round-robin reading of text in place of instruction that focuses on reading-to-learn, thinking, and transforming information into meaning and understanding (Blanton & Moorman, 1990; Durkin, 1978–1979; Langer, 1999; Wood & Muth, 1991). This kind of instruction persists despite the fact that observations of higher-performing schools have indicated the tendency to organize instruction around meaningful learning communities with extensive interactive discussion of material read (Langer, 1999; Myers, 1996; Wenglinsky, 2000, 2004). The purpose of this essay is twofold: (1) to argue that a great deal of reading instruction fails to meet the multiple and complex literacy needs of most middle school students, and (2) to propose a new orientation for thinking about middle school reading instruction. The authors begin with a discussion of research findings on classroom reading instruction, followed by an exploration of issues central to the problem. Next is proposed what the authors have titled the *basic literacy activity*, a conceptual tool for thinking about and arranging middle school reading instruction. The article ends with an overview of selected instructional strategies that exemplify the characteristics of basic literacy activity.

Article 23

Fisher, D., & Ivey, G. (2006). Evaluating the Interventions for Struggling Adolescent Readers. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 50(3), 180–189.

Struggling adolescent readers need interventions that provide them with opportunities to read more and to read better. The authors examine two case studies of interventions at work and propose criteria on which to evaluate intervention programs. Their review of the evidence on these programs for struggling adolescent readers suggests that at least five factors must be present for the intervention to matter: (1) The teacher should play a critical role in assessment and instruction; (2) the intervention should reflect a comprehensive approach to reading and writing; (3) reading and writing in the intervention should be engaging; (4) interventions should be driven by useful and relevant assessments; and (5) interventions should include significant opportunities for authentic reading and writing.

Article 24

Cappello, M. (2005). Supporting Independent Writing: A Continuum of Writing Instruction. *California Reader*, 39(2), 38–46.

Every teacher knows the ultimate goal of education is student independence. Contemporary understandings of the teaching and learning process highlight the multiple roles teachers enact in their classrooms to support their students' journey toward independence (e.g., coach, facilitator, model, informant). This article presents a structure to help teachers promote the writing independence of their students. The framework presented organizes classroom writing instruction to meet individual needs using varying degrees of teacher support.

Article 25

Whitney, A., et al. (2008). Beyond Strategies: Teacher Practice, Writing Process, and the Influence of Inquiry. *English Education*, 40(3), 201–232.

With respect to the writing process in particular, a now well-established body of research demonstrates that process-oriented writing instruction benefits student achievement in writing. Process-oriented terms and concepts have entered the material environment of America's schools, in textbooks and curricula even where the theoretical bases underlying those materials might appear to conflict with it, such as materials in which priority is placed on rhetorical modes, form, or grammatical correctness. Even in settings where no one would explicitly claim to embrace a "process pedagogy," classrooms exhibit some of its markers: Students and teachers use words like "drafts," "pre-writing," and "revision" in commonplace speech. Yet,

though it is now difficult to imagine any language arts teacher at any grade level not knowing about “the writing process,” many teaching practices employed in classrooms in the name of “the writing process” suggest that teachers may have different understandings about what the writing process entails as a model of writing and learning to write, conceptually or epistemologically. What “pre-writing” means in classrooms, for example, may differ. Most teachers know about different strategies for pre-writing, but differences appear in how teachers and school programs construct their own understanding of what pre-writing means. This article presents and discusses case studies of two teachers, drawn from a larger study, who represent different ways of envisioning and enacting a process-influenced pedagogy, one who worked with the South Coast Writing Project in an inquiry-oriented inservice program and one who did not. These two teachers work in similar school settings with similar kinds of students and similar (in some instances identical) district-provided writing curricula, yet their differing approaches to the “same” classroom strategies suggest how National Writing Project (NWP)-influenced professional development might continue to influence even basic practice in the teaching of writing.

Article 26

Juzwik, M. M., et al. (2006). Writing Into the 21st Century: An Overview of Research on Writing, 1999 to 2004. *Written Communication*, 23(4), 451–476.

This study charts the terrain of research on writing during the 6-year period from 1999 to 2004, asking “What are current trends and foci in research on writing?” In examining a cross-section of writing research, the authors focus on four issues: (1) What are the general problems being investigated by contemporary writing researchers? Which of the various problems dominate recent writing research, and which are not as prominent? (2) What population age groups are prominent in recent writing research? (3) What is the relationship between population age groups and problems under investigation? and (4) What methodologies are being used in research on writing? Based on a body of refereed journal articles ($N = 1,502$) reporting studies about writing and composition instruction that were located using three databases, the authors characterize various lines of inquiry currently undertaken. Social context and writing practices, bi- or multilingualism and writing, and writing instruction are the most actively studied problems during this period, whereas writing and technologies, writing assessment and evaluation, and relationships among literacy modalities are the least studied problems. Undergraduate, adult, and other postsecondary populations are the most prominently studied population age group, whereas preschool-aged children and middle and high school students are least studied. Research on instruction within the preschool through 12th grade (PreK–12) age group is prominent, whereas research on genre, assessment, and bi- or multilingualism is scarce within this population. The majority of articles employ interpretive methods. This indicator of current writing research should be useful to researchers, policymakers, and funding agencies, as well as to writing teachers and teacher educators.

Article 27

Krashen, S. (2008). Language Education: Past, Present, and Future. *RELJ Journal*, 39(2), 178–187.

The recent past in language teaching has been dominated by the Skill-Building Hypothesis, the view that we learn language by first learning about it, and then practicing the rules we learned in output. The present is marked by the emergence of the Comprehension Hypothesis, the view that we acquire language when we understand messages, and is also characterized by the beginning stages of its applications: comprehensible-input-based teaching methods, sheltered subject matter teaching, and the use of extensive reading for intermediate language students. The author’s hope is that the future will see a clearer understanding of the Comprehension Hypothesis, and the profession taking more advantage of it.

Article 28

Goldenberg, C. N. (2008). Teaching English Language Learners: What the Research Does—and Does Not—Say. *American Educator*, 32(2), 8–42.

It's time to move beyond charged debates and all-too-certain answers. What students need is for educators and policymakers to take a more in-depth look, starting with what existing research does—and does not—say. In this article, Claude Goldenberg walks us through the major findings of two recent reviews of the research on educating ELLs. Given all the strong opinions one sees in newspaper op-eds, readers may be surprised to discover how little is actually known. What is certain is that if we conducted more research with ELLs, and paid more attention to the research that exists, we would be in a much better position.

Article 29

Manyak, P. C. (2007). A Framework for Robust Literacy Instruction for English Learners. *The Reading Teacher*, 61(2), 197–199.

This column from the English Learners department outlines a framework for robust literacy instruction for English learners—instruction that addresses the cognitive challenges of acquiring literacy, accounts for English learners' special language needs and abilities, and includes their unique cultural experiences. The framework consists of four complementary elements: explicit code and comprehension instruction, language-rich instruction, socioculturally informed instruction, and additive-literacy instruction. Drawing on key research findings and successful classroom interventions, the author provides a brief rationale for each of these elements.

Article 30

Verdugo, R. R., & Flores, B. (2007). English Learners: Key Issues. *Education and Urban Society*, 39(2), 167–193.

Since its inception, America's system of public education has faced many challenges. One of its more important challenges has been how to teach children from diverse backgrounds and cultures. As a society that prides itself on a democratic ideology, cultural diversity and schooling are not trivial issues. One of the more significant diversity topics has been the presence of English-language learners (ELL) in American public schools. This article introduces the topic of ELL students and the education and education-related issues surrounding ELL students. For researchers and policymakers deeply steeped in the issues surrounding ELL students, the issues and concerns raised in this article are familiar. However, for the vast majority of other researchers and policymakers, these issues are not familiar and may have an important impact on their own research agendas.

Article 31

Tomlinson, C. A. (2000). Reconcilable Differences? Standards-Based Teaching and Differentiation. *Educational Leadership*, 58(1), 6–11.

For many teachers, curriculum has become a prescribed set of academic standards, instructional pacing has become a race against the clock to cover the standards, and the sole goal of teaching has been reduced to raising student test scores on a single test. Teachers are admonished to attend to students' differences, but they must ensure that every student becomes competent in the same subject matter. To examine the dichotomy between standards-based teaching and differentiation—the philosophy that student differences impact what they need in order to learn—this article asks questions about how

standards influence the quality of teaching and learning. It assesses ways in which standards-based approaches can make an impact on students whose abilities are outside the usual norms of achievement.

Article 32

Hoover, J. J., & Patton, J. R. (2004). Differentiating Standards-Based Education for Students With Diverse Needs. *Remedial and Special Education*, 25(2), 74–78.

The need to differentiate or adapt curriculum and instruction to meet special needs continues to challenge educators of students with high-incidence disabilities. The current emphasis on teaching and assessing standards requires knowledge and skills to differentiate standards-based education to successfully meet diverse needs in the classroom.

Article 33

Knobel, M., & Lankshear, C. (2006). Discussing New Literacies. *Language Arts*, 84(1), 78–86.

The authors' research explores and analyzes youth practices with new media, and their vision of new literacies offers educators and researchers unprecedented pathways for thinking about texts, media, youth, and relations of power in the 21st century. The format for this article grew out of a set of questions posed to Colin and Michele via e-mail. The editors asked them to:

- Describe the ideas that have informed their thinking over the past decade
- Elaborate on their definition of new literacies
- Discuss tensions between new media experimentation and learning contexts
- Address the concerns adults and youth might have about the content and potentially predatory nature of online voices and images
- Walk readers through an example of the social networking possibilities of meaning making with new media

Article 34

Hassett, D. D., & Schieble, M. B. (2007). Finding Space and Time for the Visual in K–12 Literacy Instruction. *English Journal*, 97(1), 62–68.

Dawnene D. Hassett and Melissa B. Schieble contend that literacy instruction must include attention to the multiple ways in which print and visual images work together. They propose ways to update accepted reading strategies “with visual texts and new literacies in mind.” Using examples from picture books and graphic novels, they expand our understanding of how readers extend three cueing systems—graphophonic, semantic, and syntactic—to negotiate multiple levels of meaning in visual texts.

Article 35

Cappello, M., & Hollingsworth, S. (2008). Literacy Inquiry and Pedagogy Through a Photographic Lens. *Language Arts*, 85(6), 442–449.

This paper explores the potential of photography for teaching, learning, and studying literacy in elementary school classrooms. The authors examine the ways shifting between communication systems (photography, oral language, and writing) impact students' abilities to problem solve and create rich texts. Specifically, they explore the roles photography plays in mediating and representing meaning and find

that photography can be used as an effective tool for inquiry in education—and for the pedagogy of writing instruction.

Article 36

Jewitt, C. (2008). Multimodality and Literacy in School Classrooms. *Review of Research in Education*, 32, 241–267.

The characteristics of contemporary societies are increasingly theorized as global, fluid, and networked. These conditions underpin the emerging knowledge economy as it is shaped by the societal and technological forces of late capitalism. These shifts and developments have significantly affected the communicational landscape of the 21st century. A key aspect of this is the reconfiguration of the representational and communicational resources of image, action, sound, and so on in new multimodal ensembles. The terrain of communication is changing in profound ways and extends to schools and ubiquitous elements of everyday life, even if these changes are occurring to different degrees and at uneven rates. It is against this backdrop that this critical review explores school multimodality and literacy and asks what these changes mean for being literate in this new landscape of the 21st century. The two key arguments in this article are that it is not possible to think about literacy solely as a linguistic accomplishment and that the time for the habitual conjunction of language, print literacy, and learning is over. This review, organized in three parts, does not provide an exhaustive overview of multimodal literacies in and beyond classrooms. Instead, it sets out to highlight key definitions in an expanded approach to new literacies, then to link these to emergent studies of schooling and classroom practice. The first part outlines the new conditions for literacy and the ways in which this is conceptualized in the current research literature. In particular, it introduces three perspectives: New Literacies Studies, multiliteracies, and multimodality. Contemporary conceptualizations of literacy in the school classroom are explored in the second part of the chapter. This discussion is organized around themes that are central to multimodality and multiliteracies. These include multimodal perspectives on pedagogy, design, decisions about connecting with the literacy worlds of students, and the ways in which representations shape curriculum knowledge and learning. Each theme is discussed in turn, drawing on a range of examples of multimodal research. The third and final part of the article discusses future directions for multiple literacies, curriculum policy, and schooling.

PREFACE

This book was written to support beginning teachers and literacy support providers in understanding contemporary issues in literacy education. This collection of readings and their companion strategies represent a wide range of relevant topics concerning teaching and learning literacy in K–12 classrooms.

We created the sections based on the abundance of ideas that have appeared in recent professional journals, as well as the domains identified on the RICA (Reading Instruction Competence Assessment), the California literacy assessment for multiple subject candidates. The specific articles were selected to provide a balance between readings that focus on key theoretical concerns and readings that suggest classroom applications of those guiding principals.

This text is organized into sections that represent important contemporary literacy concerns that all teachers must familiarize themselves with. Each section leads off with an overview of the topic, which is designed to serve as a pre-reading introduction. We have also included an instructional strategy chosen specifically to help readers negotiate the articles. Just as Fisher and Frey (2008) suggest in their article, we believe we must “transfer responsibility for learning to our students [and readers] gradually and offer support at every step” (Article 3, p. 43). We also agree with Pearson’s (2004) call for a balanced approach to literacy that “would carve out scaffolded instructional activities to spotlight necessary skills and strategies” (Article 1, p. 22).

Therefore, we have designed the text sections to include literacy strategies as scaffolds for reading and understanding the articles in each section. Each strategy was chosen to connect to the topic (e.g., a vocabulary strategy for the vocabulary section) and promote overall comprehension. In addition, we hope you will use these instructional strategies as models that are useful for your own teaching and classrooms.

We close the text with an annotated list of “Internet Resources” to help readers more fully explore the literacy education issues introduced in these pages.

Please note that some of these articles in this reader are located online only. Our goal is to provide as many articles as possible, while keeping the cost and length of the book reasonable. We placed several of the longer journal articles published by SAGE on our website, and they can be easily downloaded at <http://www.sagepub.com/cappello/>.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank the following reviewers for their contributions to the development of *Contemporary Readings in Literacy Education*:

Pat Antonacci
Iona College

Sara Ann Beach
University of Oklahoma

Esther Berkowitz
St. Joseph's College, Brooklyn Campus

Andrew Johnson
Minnesota State University, Mankato

Mary Ellen Levin
Manhattanville College

Michael Moore
Georgia Southern University

Stephen Wellinski
Eastern Michigan University

ADVISORY BOARD

John D. Beach
St. John's University

Brett Elizabeth Blake
St. John's University

Deborah Booth
Gonzaga University

Connie Buskist
Auburn University Montgomery

JoAnn Carter-Wells
California State University Fullerton

Debra Dechert
State University of New York at Buffalo

Bweikia Foster
New York University

Margaret A. Gallego
San Diego State University

Mary Louise Gomez
University of Wisconsin–Madison

Barbara Guzzetti
Arizona State University

Debra M. Hill
Texas Southern University

Annemarie Jay
Widener University

Barbara A. Marinak
Pennsylvania State University Harrisburg

Rosario Ordonez-Jasis
California State University Fullerton

Ruie Jane Pritchard
North Carolina State University

Catherine Ross-Stroud
Cleveland State University

James A. Salzman
Cleveland State University