

# **Everything Secondary Administrators Need to Know, but Are Afraid to Ask: Understanding Pragmatic Adolescent Literacy Planning**

**December 2004**

**Gwynne Ellen Ash**

*Texas State University–San Marcos*



1120 East Diehl Road, Suite 200  
Naperville, IL 60563-1486  
800-356-2735 • 630-649-6500  
[www.learningpt.org](http://www.learningpt.org)

Copyright © 2004 Learning Point Associates, sponsored under government contract number ED-01-CO-0011. All rights reserved.

This work was originally produced in whole or in part by the North Central Regional Educational Laboratory with funds from the Institute of Education Sciences (IES), U.S. Department of Education, under contract number ED-01-CO-0011. The content does not necessarily reflect the position or policy of IES or the Department of Education, nor does mention or visual representation of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the federal government.

# Contents

	Page
Introduction.....	1
What Is Pragmatic Literacy Planning? .....	2
What Does “Literacy” Mean in the 21st Century?.....	3
What Categories of Instruction Are Essential to Support Adolescent Literacy Development? .....	5
What Is My Role in Supporting Pragmatic Adolescent Literacy Instruction in My School or District?.....	10
References .....	11
Appendixes	
Appendix A: Comprehension Strategies Recommend by the National Reading Panel.....	15
Appendix B: The 15 Elements of Effective Adolescent Literacy Programs.....	16
Appendix C: What Adolescents Deserve: The International Reading Association Position Statement on Adolescent Literacy.....	17
Appendix D: Checklist for Pragmatic Planning of Adolescent Literacy Instruction .....	18

## Introduction

Although the late 1990s focused on literacy instruction in Grades K–3, which led to the publication of the National Reading Panel Report and the passage of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation, in recent years parents, teachers, researchers, and policymakers have recognized that:

It is clear that getting third graders to read at grade level is an important and challenging task ... and one that needs ongoing attention.... But many excellent third-grade readers will falter or fail in later-grade academic tasks if the teaching of reading is neglected in the middle and secondary grades. (Biancarosa & Snow, 2004, p. 1)

Many researchers (Moje, Young, Readence, & Moore, 2000; Moore, Bean, Birdyshaw, & Rycik, 1999; Vacca, 1997; Vacca, 1998) advocated strongly for adolescents and their literacy needs, recognizing that even if no child was left behind in Grade 3, it was no guarantee that no child would be left behind by Grade 12. As a result, adolescent literacy instruction has finally been put on the front burner; recent federal initiatives (Curtis, 2002) as well as privately funded research groups (Biancarosa & Snow, 2004; Bottoms, Murray, & Phillips, 2004) have demonstrated a growing concern with the literacy instruction of students aged 10–19.

With this acknowledgement that adolescent literacy instruction is essential to the academic success of today's students, schools need to examine their current programs for developing adolescent literacy proficiency. In many schools, this development has been assigned *de facto* to the English teacher, an assignment that might be unfortunate in numerous cases—in most states the English teacher has no more training in reading instruction than the physics teacher or the physical education teacher (Romine, McKenna, & Robinson, 1996). Likewise, the role of school leadership in the development and implementation of schoolwide literacy programs has been highlighted (Biancarosa & Snow, 2004), and many principals feel uncomfortable acting as a literacy leader.

This essay is intended as a primer for secondary school administrators who wish to learn more about adolescent literacy needs, the design of effective literacy programs in middle and high schools, and the professional development and support of teachers in making literacy-centered instructional change. It is organized around the questions administrators might be afraid to ask:

- What is pragmatic literacy planning?
- What does “literacy” mean in the 21st century?
- What categories of instruction are essential to support adolescent literacy development?
- What is my role in supporting pragmatic adolescent literacy instruction in my school or district?

This primer does not meet all of the literacy-learning needs of secondary school administrators. Rather, it is intended to provide enough information to allow principals (and others) to begin asking questions about what kinds of literacy instruction occur at their schools, how that instruction can be adapted to maximize the literacy learning of adolescents, and how they can support such change as effective instructional leaders.

## What Is Pragmatic Literacy Planning?

In my earlier writings on adolescent literacy instruction, pragmatic literacy planning is “based on the students and their needs, not a predetermined instructional sequence applied homogeneously to a heterogeneous class of students” (Ash, 2002). Pragmatism, as an educational philosophy, looks for practical applications of research and pedagogy above and beyond personal theoretical stances. The adolescent literacy planning in this paper, like that in my earlier work, is grounded in the recent reappraisal of pragmatism (Dillon, O’Brien, & Heilman, 2000).

*New pragmatism* suggests there is an ethical component to problem solving. Schools need to approach problems—like the design of adolescent literacy programs—for which there are no easy solutions with the idea of working for the good of the students. New pragmatism looks for the input of teachers and other stakeholders in instructional planning. In the search for practical applications that might help resolve problems, new pragmatism values the synthesis of varied, and sometimes conflicting, ideas into useful new theories and practices.

For example, many of the tutoring practices that serve as the basis for the recommended instructional elements are already a part of effective instructional organizations on the elementary level. However, a similar coordinated framework of practices has not been proposed for middle and high school readers. Furthermore, researchers have noted that the literacy demands on young adolescents have changed dramatically, and middle school literacy instruction needs to reflect those demands (Moje et al., 2000).

Although much of the literature in secondary school literacy instruction recommends a largely individualized, reading-workshop approach toward literacy instruction (Atwell, 1998; Ivey & Broadus, 2000; Rief, 1992), many teachers find the workshop approach overwhelming. Many secondary English and language arts teachers have concerns that they are not meeting the students’ direct instructional needs through the workshop (Ash, 2000). Teachers with whom I have worked alongside often ask for more structure to make sure they are satisfying both the students’ needs and the district’s or state’s requirements. In combining these varying perspectives, the framework presented here suggests a structure for pragmatic literacy planning in secondary schools.

To be pragmatic, planning needs to take into account:

- Students and their needs.
- Teachers’ (and other stakeholders’) input.
- Creative (usually site-based) solutions to unaddressed difficulties.
- Seemingly conflicting strategies and practices that actually help form solutions.

In other words, working with a supportive administration and data based on their students, “teachers, as informed decision makers, can create their own instructional activities and time distribution that work for them and their students” (Ash, 2002). Through this application of what has been called “ecological validity” (Moje et al., 2000) schools can develop adolescent literacy programs that make sense for their students, in their settings, and with their needs.

## What Does “Literacy” Mean in the 21st Century?

In the 21st century, successful readers and writers read more than textbooks and create more than teacher-directed essays. Unfortunately, views of what constitutes secondary literacy instruction are often antiquated. The U.S. History teacher fears that he will be asked to teach students how to decode words; the floriculture teacher is concerned there is no text in her class because she primarily uses diagrams and flow charts to guide her students’ learning. The math teacher is convinced that all the reading and writing has nothing to do with her geometry instruction. However, the view that literacy instruction in middle and high schools consists only of reading words or textbooks is narrower than current expectations for literacy development.

To illustrate the necessary inclusion of literacy skills, Freebody and Luke (1990), proponents of critical literacy, have argued that there are four essential but not sufficient aspects of reading; these aspects, shown in detail in Table 1, have been described as the four reader roles: code breaker, meaning maker, text user, and text analyst.

**Table 1. Four Reader Roles**

Reader Roles	Good Readers Fulfill the Reader Role When They ...
<b>Code Breaker</b> —Decoding the words in the text and their meanings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understand how print works.</li> <li>• Use many strategies to read unknown words and find the meanings of unknown words.</li> <li>• Clarify the meaning of difficult words and phrases.</li> <li>• Use varied strategies to make sense of difficult ideas and concepts.</li> </ul>
<b>Meaning Maker</b> —Interacting with the text to make meaning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use personal and background knowledge to make text connections (to themselves, other texts, and the world).</li> <li>• Make predictions and revise them as they read.</li> <li>• Read “between the lines” and make inferences.</li> <li>• Ask questions while they read.</li> <li>• Summarize the text and synthesize ideas and information within it with other ideas and information.</li> <li>• Monitor comprehension and repair it when it goes awry.</li> </ul>
<b>Text User</b> —Deciding how to use the text and the meaning made with the text	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Set a clear purpose for reading (e.g., to find information, to evaluate arguments, to be entertained).</li> <li>• Create or identify a method of expressing what they have learned, interpreted, or constructed while reading.</li> <li>• Understand that different kinds of reading and expression are called for in different reading situations.</li> </ul>
<b>Text Analyst</b> —Analyzing the text with a “critical eye”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify the author’s purpose. Why did he or she write the work?</li> <li>• Identify the author’s point of view toward the story or topic.</li> <li>• Identify other possible points of view toward the story or topic.</li> <li>• Infer if the author expects the reader to hold certain beliefs or viewpoints about the story or topic or the world at large.</li> <li>• Accept or resist the author’s implied message or the author’s expectations for the reader’s beliefs or viewpoints.</li> </ul>

These four roles are practiced simultaneously by good readers. Therefore, a good reader understands not only how a text works (code breaker), but also the purpose for reading it (text

user), its literal meaning (meaning maker), and the point of view of the author (text analyst). Literacy instruction in the middle and high school grades should consider the four reader roles and this broader conception of what it means to read text. Critical literacy development, such as that discussed here, has been described as “crucial to an understanding of successful reading in our culture” (Freebody & Luke, 1990). When planning for instruction, the pragmatic planning suggests that teachers consider not only the classroom practices they are using, but also how those classroom practices address (or do not address) the four reader roles.

In addition to a broader conception of what good readers do, middle and high school teachers and administrators might consider reexamining their definitions of *text*. Good readers use the four reader roles to read visual texts (e.g., art, political posters), multimedia texts (e.g., films, Web pages), and print-based texts (e.g., novels, floral-design diagrams). Reviews of research suggest that some students are more proficient at reading digital texts than they are at reading traditional school-based texts; reviews also indicate that nontraditional texts are more engaging for students, even though they are difficult to find in middle and high school classrooms (Alvermann, 2001; Ash, 2004). The changing nature of what constitutes text should be discussed in schools, so teachers might begin to identify different kinds of texts and the difficulties that these types of text might cause for readers. When a broader view of texts is embraced by schools, many teachers may see the application of content area literacy strategies as more pertinent to their teaching and their content, and adolescents may see the content area teaching as more pertinent to their lives (Alvermann, 2001).

## What Categories of Instruction Are Essential to Support Adolescent Literacy Development?

In my recommendations for pragmatic planning in the middle school language arts classroom (Ash, 2002), I suggested five essential elements:

- Daily oral or shared reading
- Teacher-directed guided reading
- Word study
- Self-directed reading and writing
- Comprehension strategy instruction

I have slightly modified these elements to fit both language arts and content area classrooms for Grades 6–12. The modification resulted in six essential elements—guided reading of text, direct instruction of comprehension strategies, peer-led discussion of text, word study, purposeful oral reading and text production, and inquiry learning—which are shown in Table 2.

**Table 2. Six Essential Elements for Adolescent Literacy Instruction**

<b>Essential Element</b>	<b>Example Strategies, Activities, and Applications</b>
<b>Guided Reading of Text</b> (teacher-led)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Directed Reading-Thinking Activity–DRTA (Stauffer, 1969)</li> <li>• Anticipation Guides (Readence, Bean, &amp; Baldwin, 1995)</li> <li>• I-Charts (Hoffman, 1992; Randall, 1996)</li> </ul>
<b>Direct Instruction of Comprehension Strategies</b> (appropriate to content area demands)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Asking Questions (Harvey &amp; Goudvis, 2000)</li> <li>• Question-Answer Relationships–QARs (Raphael, 1982; Raphael, 1984)</li> <li>• Generating Interactions Between Schemata and Texts–GIST (Cunningham, 1982)</li> </ul>
<b>Peer-Led Discussion of Text</b> (pairs or small groups)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reciprocal Teaching Plus (Ash, 2002—adapted from Palinscar &amp; Brown, 1984)</li> <li>• Literature Circles (Daniels, 2001)</li> <li>• Jigsaw (Aronson, Blaney, Stephan, Rosenfield, &amp; Sikes, 1977; Aronson, Blaney, Stephin, Sikes, &amp; Snapp, 1978)</li> </ul>
<b>Word Study</b> (appropriate to content area demands)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PreReading Plan–PreP (Langer, 1982; Langer, 1984)</li> <li>• List-Group-Label (Taba, 1967)</li> <li>• Vocabulary From Context (Allen, 2004—adapted from Baumann, Kammeenui, &amp; Ash, 2003)</li> </ul>
<b>Purposeful Oral Reading and Text Production</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Readers’ Theatre (Martinez, Roser, &amp; Strecker, 1998)</li> <li>• Role, Audience, Format, Topic–RAFT (Holston &amp; Santa, 1985)</li> <li>• Mathematics Autobiographies (Rose, 1989)</li> </ul>
<b>Inquiry Learning</b> (self-selected reading and writing)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Investigative Reporting (Clark, 1987)</li> <li>• Multimedia Literacy Projects (O’Brien, 1998; O’Brien 2001)</li> <li>• Media Clubs (Alvermann, Hagood, Heron, Hughes, Williams, &amp; Jun, 2000)</li> </ul>

Although all of these elements are necessary for literacy development, none of them alone is sufficient. The items identified here complement those recommended by the National Reading Panel (Appendix A), the Carnegie Foundation (Appendix B), and the International Reading Association (Appendix C). Teachers must work together with their administrators, peers, and students to develop the recipe that works for them and their students (Ash, 2002; Biancarosa & Snow, 2004). Developing that recipe is a key part of creating and providing effective professional development to support changes in literacy instruction.

### **Guided Reading of Text**

A teacher-led modeling of the things that good readers do, guided reading allows teachers to help move students through the four reader roles by scaffolding their learning. Teachers can guide student learning through frameworks, graphic organizers, or discussion guides. Guided reading:

- Makes sure students have their prior knowledge activated before they read.
- Helps build students' prior knowledge as necessary.
- Creates a purpose for reading.
- Supports students as they read, encouraging them to monitor their comprehension.
- Helps students summarize and synthesize their learning after they read.

Research indicates that most students learn their content from what has been called *teacher telling*. The transmission model, in which teachers give students all they need to learn, seems to result in students who are less able to learn independently with text (Alvermann & Moore, 1991; Hinchman & Zalewski, 1996). Research suggests that students who are taught *how* to learn from text, rather than explicitly being taught *what* to learn from text, are more proficient at monitoring their own comprehension and making sense of text on their own (Schoenbach, Greenleaf, Cziko, & Hurwitz, 1999).

### **Direct Instruction of Comprehension Strategies**

This offers a chance for teachers to teach students individual strategies they might be able to apply on their own. For example, although Anticipation Guides are one possibility for guided reading, they are unlikely to be applied by a student reading outside of class. But the strategies that Anticipation Guides mimic—activating prior knowledge, setting a purpose for reading, and revisiting prior knowledge after reading—are strategies that students can use independently. These practices, which mirror what good readers do during reading, help students integrate their strategy knowledge into reading as a thought process (Pearson, Roehler, Dole, & Duffy, 1992).

When teachers are given support in learning how to teach strategies:

Teachers can be taught to teach comprehension strategies effectively; after such instruction, their proficiency is greater, and this leads to improved performance on the part of their students on awareness and use of the strategies, to improved performance on commonly used comprehension measures and, sometimes, to higher scores on standardized reading tests. (Williams, 2002, p. 255)

Strategic learning in students develops along three levels: declarative knowledge, being able to describe a strategy; procedural knowledge, being able to use a strategy on demand; and conditional knowledge, being able to select and apply a strategy as appropriate (Garner, 1990). In addition to providing a framework for student strategy use through guided reading, teachers need to model strategies for students, ask students to apply strategies in guided practice, and, eventually, ask students to try out these strategies on their own with feedback from the teacher or their peers. It is through this process that students acquire conditional knowledge.

### **Peer-Led Discussion of Text**

This is an opportunity for students to apply strategic reading in small groups. In the cooperative groups in Literature Circles (Daniels, 2001) or Jigsaw (Aronson et al., 1977; Aronson et al., 1978), students are responsible for their own learning, but they also have the opportunity to construct meaning socially with their peers. Like teacher-led guided reading, instructional organizations for structuring small-group work allow students the opportunity to mimic what good readers do; however, they also allow students to go one step further and practice strategy use in a supportive environment.

One such instructional organization is Reciprocal Teaching Plus (Ash, 2002), developed based on the Reciprocal Teaching activity (Palinscar & Brown, 1984). Reciprocal Teaching is a strategy that focuses students on four aspects of their reading: making and revising predictions, asking questions, clarifying difficult points and vocabulary, and summarizing the material. In the beginning, the teacher models Reciprocal Teaching with the students, demonstrating how to use the four parts of the strategy, and eventually moving students toward using the strategy in peer-led small groups or pairs.

My adaptation takes this very effective strategy and incorporates critical literacy perspectives. In addition to the four aspects, Reciprocal Teaching Plus asks students to address a fifth element: evaluating a text critically by identifying the author's perspective and analyzing what points of view are left out of the current text. Prompts that teachers can use to help students with the fifth element include:

- Identify the perspective(s) of the author. Whose story is being told?
- Evaluate the author's identification of his or her own perspective. Is the author consciously representing a particular world view? Is this disclosed openly to the reader?
- Describe what other perspectives there might be on this text. Whose story is not being told? Why?

Reciprocal Teaching Plus models how students can practice being simultaneous code breakers, meaning makers, text users, and text analysts amid guidance and feedback from their peers and their teacher.

## **Word Study**

Word study is a way of thinking about vocabulary instruction beyond the memorization of definitions. Word study recognizes that words are learned in degrees of meaning (Baumann, Kameenui, & Ash, 2003); some words need to be learned at deep levels of knowledge in order to understand text whereas others only require the reader to have a passing knowledge of them. Furthermore, word study recognizes that “the number of difficult words in a text is the most powerful predictor of its difficulty” (Anderson & Freebody, 1981). That is, most vocabulary instruction aims to improve students’ vocabulary.

Good word-study instruction focuses on independent word learning—teaching students how words are related in meaning (morphology), how the text provides clues to the words’ meanings (context), and how to use resources to check their interpretations (definition). Good word-study instruction also tries to have students use the words they are learning in different contexts and modes. Strategies such as List-Group-Label (Taba, 1967) serve to raise students’ knowledge of content-related words before reading, allow for comparisons among words learned during reading, and provide a basis for relating the meaning of words to conceptual categories. Finally, word study provides an opportunity for teachers to teach the specific words that are necessary to understand content area discourse (ways of talking and writing about a particular subject area). These words that will vary from content area to content area.

## **Purposeful Oral Reading and Text Production**

These elements allow students various contexts in which to share their content learning. Although most oral reading in secondary content classrooms is the instructionally vapid Round Robin Reading, oral reading can have a purpose. For example, students in an English class reading a play aloud in the Readers’ Theatre format or students in a science class constructing a Readers’ Theatre with different parts of an animal cell as characters are sharing both their knowledge of content and their knowledge of content area discourse.

Likewise content-oriented writing activities, such as Holston and Santa’s (1985) Role, Audience, Format, Topic (RAFT), give students an opportunity to share their knowledge of content and their understanding of perspective. In RAFT, teachers create a scenario that allows students to describe their learning from an unusual point of view. For example, in a math class a student might be assigned the following role, audience, format, and topic:

- Role of a hypotenuse in a right triangle.
- Audience of a carpenter, hoping to build a shelf support.
- Format of a do-it-yourself television-show script.
- Topic of an explanation of the Pythagorean Theorem.

In response, the student would construct a script that shared his knowledge yet kept the audience and his own role in mind. Creative assignments like this ask students to apply high-level thinking skills to both content and literacy learning.

## **Inquiry Learning**

Inquiry learning gives students a chance to select the topic or subject of their own learning. It has been suggested that inquiry-based, project-oriented learning engages many young adolescents, who otherwise would not be engaged, in school-based content area learning (Moje et al., 2000; Alvermann et al., 2000; Alvermann, 2001). Inquiry learning, in which students are the driving force in the learning, also provides more opportunities for students to apply literacy strategies they have learned in other aspects of instruction.

While some teachers have concerns about allowing students to be the instructional leaders—and other teachers would prefer that all instruction be student-led—it seems that most researchers agree that a balance of teacher-led and student-led instruction may provide the best of both worlds (Alvermann, 2001).

## **What Is My Role in Supporting Pragmatic Adolescent Literacy Instruction in My School or District?**

After such a whirlwind introduction to literacy teaching and learning with adolescents, you might be asking yourself, “What am I to do with this information?” You will need to:

- Build your knowledge.
- Assess your schools’ needs.
- Share school data and set goals.
- Plan and support instructional change.

To guide your implementation of pragmatic literacy planning, Appendix D includes a checklist to follow; this checklist will be elaborated in future instructional essays.

Most research and theory suggests that instructional leaders have the greatest impact on instructional change when they demonstrate a commitment to learning about, and implementing, the instructional change themselves:

It is critical that a principal assumes the role of an instructional leader who demonstrates commitment and participates in the school community. This leadership role includes a principal building his or her own personal knowledge of how young people learn and struggle with reading and writing and how they differ in their needs. (Biancarosa & Snow, 2004, p. 30)

By that definition, you have already begun instructional change at your school by reading this essay and adding to your growing knowledge of adolescents and their literacy development.

In addition to building your own knowledge base, it is significant that you share your vision of change with the school—not as an already-built plan, but as a proposal for the future. Just as you have built your knowledge, the school should strive to assess its own needs. You may act as the collector of this data or the organizer of its collection, but it is essential that the teachers feel as if they have a role in shaping the changes that will occur and selecting the professional development they will attend (Ash, 2003).

After collecting data on your school and its needs, your primary role will be in acting as a facilitator, helping content areas set their goals for learning, and planning for professional development to support those goals. When you plan the professional development, you can help support instructional change by attending the instruction yourself—both to build your own knowledge and telegraph your value of the information shared (Biancarosa & Snow, 2004). Finally, you need to provide support and feedback to teachers who are making instructional changes. Incremental changes are still difficult, and teachers need to be recognized for their efforts even when they are less than successful (Ash, 2003). Just like students, teachers and principals learn by trying and getting feedback to make their next attempt more successful.

## References

- Allen, J. (2004). *Tools for teaching content literacy*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse.
- Alvermann, D. E. (2001). *Effective literacy instruction for adolescents*. Executive Summary and Paper commissioned by the National Reading Conference. Chicago: National Reading Conference. Retrieved December 28, 2004, from <http://www.nrconline.org/publications/alverwhite2.pdf>
- Alvermann, D. E., Hagood, M. C., Heron, A. H., Hughes, P., Williams, K. B., & Jun, Y. (2000). *After-school media clubs for reluctant adolescent readers* (Final report of Grant #199900278). Chicago: The Spencer Foundation.
- Alvermann, D. E., & Moore, D. W. (1991). Secondary school reading. In R. Barr, M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, & P. D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 2, pp. 951–983). New York: Longman.
- Anderson, R. C., & Freebody, P. (1981). Vocabulary knowledge. In J. Guthrie (Ed.), *Comprehension and teaching: Research reviews* (pp. 77–117). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Aronson, E., Blaney, N., Stephin, G., Sikes, J., & Snapp, M. (1978). *The jigsaw classroom*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Aronson, E., Blaney, N. T., Stephan, C., Rosenfield, R., & Sikes, J. (1977). Interdependence in the classroom: A field study. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 69, 121–128.
- Ash, G. E. (2004). Why students don't read and what schools can do about it. In G. Bottoms, R. Murray, & I. Phillips (Eds.), *Literacy across the curriculum: Setting and implementing goals for grades six through 12* (pp. 19–29). Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board.
- Ash, G. E. (2003, December). *Progress as potential: The evaluation of a long-term literacy professional development program for middle school teachers*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Reading Conference, Scottsdale, AZ.
- Ash, G.E. (2002). Teaching readers who struggle: A pragmatic middle school framework. *Reading Online*, 5(7). Retrieved December 28, 2004, from [http://www.readingonline.org/articles/art\\_index.asp?HREF=ash/index.html](http://www.readingonline.org/articles/art_index.asp?HREF=ash/index.html)
- Ash, G. E. (2000). Middle school literacy teachers' ethical stances and role perceptions. (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Georgia, Athens). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 61(08), 3105.
- Atwell, N. (1998). *In the middle: New understandings about writing, reading, and learning* (2nd ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

- Baumann, J. F., Kameenui, E. J., & Ash, G. E. (2003). Research on vocabulary instruction: Voltaire redux. In J. Flood, J. M. Jensen, D. Lapp, & J. R. Squire (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching English language arts* (2nd ed., pp. 752–785). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Biancarosa, G., and Snow, C. E. (2004). *Reading next: A vision for action and research in middle and high school literacy, a report from Carnegie Corporation of New York*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education. Retrieved December 28, 2004, from <http://www.all4ed.org/publications/ReadingNext/>
- Bottoms, G., Murray, R., & Phillips, I. (Eds.). (2004). *Literacy across the curriculum: Setting and implementing goals for grades six through 12*. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board.
- Clark, R. P. (1987). *Free to write: A journalist teaches young writers*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Cunningham, J. (1982). Generating interactions between schemata and texts. In J. Niles & L. Harris (Eds.), *New inquiries in reading research and instruction. The 31st yearbook of the National Reading Conference* (pp. 42–47). Washington DC: National Reading Conference.
- Curtis, M. E. (2002, May). *Adolescent reading research since 1990*. Paper presented at Practice Models for Adolescent Literacy Success: The Second Workshop on Adolescent Literacy, Baltimore, MD.
- Daniels, H. (2001). *Literature circles: Voice and choice in book clubs and reading groups* (2nd ed.). Portland, ME: Stenhouse.
- Dillon, D. R., O'Brien, D. G., & Heilman, E. E. (2000). Literacy research in the next millennium: From paradigms to pragmatism and practicality. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 35(1), 10–26.
- Freebody, P., & Luke, A. (1990). “Literacies” programs: Debates and demands in cultural context. *Prospect: An Australian Journal of TESOL*, 5(3), 7–16.
- Garner, R. (1990). When children and students do not use learning strategies: Toward a theory of settings. *Review of Educational Research*, 60, 517–529.
- Harvey, S., & Goudvis, A. (2000). *Strategies that work: Teaching comprehension to enhance understanding*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse.
- Hinchman, K. A., & Zalewski, P. (1996). Reading for success in a tenth-grade global-studies class: A qualitative study. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 28(1), 91–106.

- Hoffman, J. V. (1992). Critical reading/thinking across the curriculum: Using I-charts to support learning. *Language Arts*, 69(2), 121–127. Retrieved December 28, 2004, from [http://curry.edschool.virginia.edu/go/edis771/reserves/hoffman\\_critical.pdf](http://curry.edschool.virginia.edu/go/edis771/reserves/hoffman_critical.pdf)
- Holston, V., & Santa, C. (1985). A method of writing across the curriculum that works. *Journal of Reading*, 28, 456–457.
- Ivey, G., & Broaddus, K. (2000). Tailoring the fit: Reading instruction and middle school readers. *The Reading Teacher*, 54(1), 68–78.
- Langer, J. A. (1982). Facilitating text processing: The elaboration of prior knowledge. In J. A. Langer & M. T. Burke-Smith (Eds.), *Reader meets author—Bridging the gap: A psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic perspective* (pp. 149–162). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Langer, J. A. (1984). Examining background knowledge and text comprehension. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 19(4), 468–481.
- Martinez, M., Roser, N. L., & Strecker, S. (1998). “I never thought I could be a star”: A readers theatre ticket to fluency. *The Reading Teacher*, 52(4), 326–334.
- Moje, E. B., Young, J. P., Readence, J. E., & Moore, D. W. (2000). Reinventing adolescent literacy for new times: Perennial and millennial issues. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 43 (5), 400-410.
- Moore, D. W., Bean, T. W., Birdyshaw, D., & Rycik, J. A. (1999). *Adolescent literacy: A position statement*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association. Retrieved December 28, 2004, from <http://www.ccsso.org/content/pdfs/APF03AdolescentLiteracyIRA.pdf>
- National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. (2000). *Report of the national reading panel: Teaching children to read*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- O’Brien, D. G. (1998). Multiple literacies in a high school program for “at-risk” adolescents. In D. E. Alvermann, K. A. Hinchman, D. W. Moore, S. F. Phelps, & D. R. Waff (Eds.), *Reconceptualizing the literacies in adolescents’ lives* (pp. 27–49). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- O’Brien, D. G. (2001). “At-risk” adolescents: Redefining competence through the multiliteracies of intermediality, visual arts, and representation. *Reading Online*, 4(11). Retrieved December 28, 2004, from <http://www.readingonline.org/newliteracies/obrien/>
- Palinscar, A. S., & Brown, A. L. (1984). Reciprocal teaching of comprehension-fostering and comprehension-monitoring activities. *Cognition and Instruction*, 1(2), 117–175. Retrieved December 28, 2004, from <http://www.garfield.library.upenn.edu/classics1993/A1993LU43900001.pdf>

- Pearson, P. D., Roehler, L. R. Dole, J. A., & Duffy, G. G. (1992). Developing expertise in reading comprehension. In S. J. Samuels & A. E. Farstrup (Eds.), *What research has to say about reading instruction* (2nd ed., pp. 147–199). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Randall, S. N. (1996). Information charts: A strategy for organizing student research. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 39(7), 536–542.
- Raphael, T. E. (1982). Question-answering strategies for children. *The Reading Teacher*, 36(2), 186–190.
- Raphael, T. E. (1984). Teaching learners about sources of information for answering comprehension questions. *Journal of Reading*, 27(4), 303–311.
- Readence, J. E., Bean, T. W., & Baldwin, R. S. (1995). *Content area reading: An integrated approach* (5th ed.). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.
- Rief, L. (1992). *Seeking diversity: Language arts with adolescents*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Romine, B. G., McKenna, M. C., & Robinson, R. D. (1996). Reading coursework requirements for middle and high school content area teachers: A United States survey. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 40(3), 194–198.
- Rose, B. (1989). Writing and mathematics: Theory and practice. In P. Connolly & T. Vilardi (Eds.), *Writing to learn mathematics and science* (pp. 15–30). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Schoenbach, R., Greenleaf, C., Cziko, C., & Hurwitz, L. (1999). *Reading for understanding*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Stauffer, R. G. (1969). *Directing reading maturity as a cognitive process*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Taba, H. (1967). *Teacher's handbook for elementary social studies*. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.
- Vacca, R. T. (1997). The benign neglect of adolescent literacy. *Reading Today*, 14(4), 3.
- Vacca, R. T. (1998). Let's not marginalize adolescent literacy. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 41(8), 604–609.
- Williams, J. P. (2002). Reading comprehension strategies and teacher preparation. In A. E. Farstrup & S. J. Samuels (Eds.), *What research has to say about reading instruction* (3rd ed., pp. 243–260). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

## Appendix A

### Comprehension Strategies Recommended by the National Reading Panel

- **Cooperative Learning**—Work with peers in heterogeneous (mixed-ability groups) to learn material.
- **Graphic and Semantic Organizers**—Improve comprehension and organization through the use of visual aids and organizers such as a Venn diagram.
- **Question Generation**—Create questions while reading to support inferential thinking.
- **Question Answering**—Identify question types and develop question-answering strategies.
- **Comprehension Monitoring**—Identify when you are having difficulty reading, and correct that difficulty with a strategy.
- **Summarization**—Identify main ideas and supporting details from a reading.
- **Multiple Strategy Use**—Use multiple strategies as appropriate for the demands of the assignment or the text.

(National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 2000)

## **Appendix B**

### **The 15 Elements of Effective Adolescent Literacy Programs by the Carnegie Foundation**

- Direct, explicit comprehension instruction
- Effective instructional principles embedded in content
- Motivation and self-directed learning
- Text-based collaborative learning
- Strategic tutoring
- Diverse texts
- Intensive writing
- A technology component
- Ongoing formative assessment of students
- Extended time for literacy
- Professional development
- Ongoing summative assessment of students and programs
- Teacher teams
- Leadership
- A comprehensive and coordinated literacy program

(Biancarosa & Snow, 2004)

## Appendix C

### **What Adolescents Deserve: The International Reading Association Position Statement on Adolescent Literacy**

Adolescents deserve:

- Access to a wide variety of reading materials they are interested in reading and are able to read.
- Instruction that improves their proficiency in reading difficult texts and builds their interest in doing so.
- Ongoing, formative assessment that reveals what they do well and identifies areas in which they need more support.
- Teachers who have been provided high-quality professional development that gives them the ability to provide modeling and explicit literacy instruction across the curriculum.
- Reading specialists who support teachers and students who need additional support in becoming proficient readers (especially in areas beyond comprehension).
- Teachers who understand that students are as multifaceted in their literacy learning as they are in their lives.
- Parents, teachers, schools, communities, and a nation that recognize that adolescent literacy learners have specific needs not currently being met in most school settings.

(Moore, Bean, Birdyshaw, & Rycik, 1999)

## Appendix D

### Checklist for Pragmatic Planning of Adolescent Literacy Instruction

#### Building Your Knowledge Base

- Assess your own knowledge of adolescent literacy development.
- Acquire resources to build your knowledge of literacy development and instruction.
- Attend courses or professional development sessions that will help build your knowledge of literacy development and instruction.
- Identify teachers and other peers who can help support your knowledge and shape your agenda for instructional change.

#### Assessing the Current State of Instruction

- Review student assessment data to identify areas of literacy need.
- Survey or interview faculty members (in various content areas) to gather their perceptions of areas of student literacy need.
- Survey or interview students to gather their perceptions of areas of literacy need.
- Survey or interview parents to gather their perceptions of areas of student literacy need.
- Informally observe classrooms to gather data on text use in classes (in various content areas).
- Informally observe classrooms to gather data on literacy instruction in classes (in various content areas).

#### Sharing the Instructional Data and Creating Goals

- Meet with all teachers to share the pragmatic literacy planning framework and your vision for gradual, meaningful instructional change.
- Meet with individual content areas (or content area chairs) to share the content area-specific data.
- Ask content area teachers to review the data and identify three areas they would like to address (within their content area) in the coming year.
- Meet with individual content areas (or content area chairs) to create specific, measurable goals to match the identified areas of literacy need.
- Publicize all content area goals.

## **Preparing for and Supporting Instructional Change**

- \_\_\_ Identify teachers or administrators who might be capable of acting as mentor teachers to support instructional change (reading specialists or lead teachers might be excellent sources for this role).
- \_\_\_ Based on identified areas of literacy need, arrange for ongoing professional development, which will likely be differentiated by content areas.
- \_\_\_ Encourage teachers: Attend the professional development you have arranged to show your commitment and to continue to build your knowledge of literacy instruction.
- \_\_\_ Monitor ongoing attempts at instructional change.
- \_\_\_ Provide feedback and support for teachers attempting instructional change.
- \_\_\_ When goals are met, ask content areas to set new goals for instructional change.