

**The *Journeys* Program:**  
A Research-Based Approach

**Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Publishers**

## **Contents**

A Research-Based Approach .....	0
Introduction.....	2
Strand 1: Building Vocabulary .....	3
Strand 2: Supporting Comprehension.....	11
Strand 3: Using Effective Instructional Approaches .....	22
Strand 4: Teaching with Effective Texts .....	35
Strand 5: Connecting Writing and Reading.....	42
Strand 6: Meeting All Students’ Needs through Differentiation and Strategic Intervention.....	50
Bibliography .....	58

## Introduction

The Houghton Mifflin Harcourt *Journeys* program is a core reading program designed to meet the diverse needs of all students, from Kindergarten through grade 6. It includes the key elements of reading instruction, from comprehension to decodable readers. The components of the program and the activities and strategies presented throughout are based on current research and best instructional practice advocated by classroom teachers, administrators, teacher educators, and policymakers alike. The *Journeys* program provides students with the skills they need to succeed, preparing them ultimately for the high literacy demands of college and the workplace. In the program, students develop reading comprehension skills as well as developing their skills as critical thinkers, writers, speakers, listeners, and communicators.

The purpose of this document is to demonstrate clearly and explicitly the scientific research base on which the program is built. The program is built around what we know about effective reading instruction—strategies for vocabulary instruction, reading comprehension instruction, and differentiation to meet the needs of all learners. The *Journeys* program integrates each of these research strands into a program that research suggests will benefit students and prepare them to meet the demands of school and work.

To help readers make the connections between the research strands and the *Journeys* program, the following sections are used within each strand:

- **Defining the Strand.** This section summarizes the terminology and provides an overview of the research related to the strand.
- **Research that Guided the Development of *Journeys*.** This section identifies subtopics within each strand and provides excerpts from and summaries of relevant research on each subtopic.
- **From Research to Practice.** This section explains how the research data is exemplified in the *Journeys* program.

The combination of the major research recommendations and the related features of the *Journeys* program will help readers better understand how the program incorporates research into its instructional design.

A complete bibliography of works cited is provided at the end of this document.

## Strand 1: Building Vocabulary

*The findings on vocabulary yielded several specific implications for teaching reading. First, vocabulary should be taught both directly and indirectly. Repetition and multiple exposures to vocabulary items are important. Learning in rich contexts, incidental learning, and use of computer technology all enhance the acquisition of vocabulary.*

—National Reading Panel, 2000, p. 14

### Defining the Strand

The primary goal of reading instruction is to develop students' skills and knowledge so that they can comprehend and critically analyze increasingly complex texts independently. Research has long established the connection between vocabulary knowledge and reading comprehension (Baumann & Kame'enui, 1991; Stahl & Fairbanks, 1986). So, developing students' vocabulary knowledge and skills is a fundamental element of effective reading instruction. Vocabulary is essential to early reading development (National Reading Panel, 2000) and in later grades, as the demands of content-area reading require high-level vocabulary skills. Vocabulary is emphasized at all grades of the Common Core Standards (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2010a).

Effective instruction must help students acquire the depth and breadth of vocabulary knowledge required for access to the texts they will encounter. Research shows that while words can be learned incidentally, explicit instruction plays an important role in achievement (McKeown & Beck, 1988; National Reading Panel, 2000). For struggling readers, socioeconomically disadvantaged students, and for ELLs, such instruction is imperative (Baker, Simmons, & Kame'enui, 1995a; Francis, Rivera, Lesaux, Kieffer, & Rivera, 2006a; Sedita, 2005). A number of other instructional strategies have been shown by research to be particularly effective:

- Direct and indirect instruction (Baumann & Kame-enuei, 1991; Graves, 2006; Nagy, 1988; National Reading Panel, 2000; Stahl, 1986);
- Multiple and varied exposures (Baumann & Kame-enuei, 1991; Beck, McKeown, & Kucan, 2002; Blachowicz & Fisher, 2000; Graves, 2006; Kolich, 1988; National Reading Panel, 2000; Stahl & Fairbanks, 1986; Stahl, 1986);
- Frequent instruction (Beck, McKeown, & Kucan, 2002; National Reading Panel, 2000; Stahl & Fairbanks, 1986; Topping & Paul, 1999); and
- Instruction in word morphology, or structure (Aronoff, 1994; Kieffer & Lesaux, 2007).

For a reading program to be comprehensive and effective at developing students' vocabulary skills and knowledge, it must take a systematic, purposeful, and engaging approach. The *Journeys* program focuses on three major purposes for teaching vocabulary: (1) To facilitate comprehension; (2) To build academic vocabulary; and (3) To teach about words, including the elements that contribute to independent word learning. To accomplish these goals, the program supports students through multiple exposures, explicit vocabulary instruction, strategies for acquiring new vocabulary, and instruction in word morphology.

## Research that Guided the Development of the *Journeys* program

### *Explicit Instruction*

Research suggests that explicit instruction in vocabulary skills and strategies—*how* to understand new words—is essential to effective vocabulary instruction. Explicit instruction plays an important role in students’ achievement (National Reading Panel, 2000) and is more effective and efficient than incidental learning for acquiring specific words (McKeown & Beck, 1988).

While all students benefit from explicit vocabulary instruction, certain students must be taught vocabulary explicitly. Research has documented the disparity between the vocabularies of socioeconomically advantaged and disadvantaged student populations (Chall, Jacobs, & Baldwin, 1990; Snow, Burns, & Griffin, 1998). Without intentional and meaningful intervention, the disparity in vocabulary knowledge between these groups only increases over time (Baker, Simmons, & Kame’enui, 1995b). English language learners also benefit a great deal from explicit vocabulary instruction. While English language learners tend to acquire social language vocabulary and skills through incidental social interactions and conversations, the acquisition of an academic vocabulary requires explicit vocabulary instruction (Francis, Rivera, Lesaux, Kieffer, & Rivera, 2006a). A third group that benefits a great deal from explicit vocabulary instruction is struggling readers. Struggling readers make larger and faster achievement gains with the help of explicit vocabulary instruction (Sedita, 2005).

To be effective, explicit instruction must meet several criteria. Rather than simply referencing a skill or giving a definition, teachers model or provide direct explanation. Teachers then provide opportunities for practice. And, finally, teachers encourage the application of skills and strategies to new contexts (Pearson & Dole, 1987).

### *Reinforcement and Multiple Exposures*

One of the consistent findings across research on vocabulary acquisition is the need for multiple exposures to words. Words must be encountered a number of times before true learning occurs (Beck, McKeown, & Kucan, 2002; Blachowicz & Fisher, 2000; Graves, 2006; Kolich, 1988; Stahl & Fairbanks, 1986). In a review of the literature on vocabulary instruction, Dixon-Krauss (2001) concluded that “the most effective vocabulary instruction includes multiple exposures to words in a variety of oral and written contexts...” (p. 312). Stahl’s findings (1986) supported multiple exposures as a fundamental principle of effective vocabulary instruction, as did the findings of other researchers (Baumann & Kame’enui, 1991; National Reading Panel, 2000). Providing multiple exposures allows for a deeper understanding of words—their multiple meanings, uses, and connotations (Beck & McKeown, 1991; McKeown & Beck, 1988).

A study conducted by Jenkins, Stein, & Wysocki (1984) suggests that a combination of informal teaching, which involves exposing students to the words before beginning explicit instruction on the words’ meanings, followed by more than one contextual presentation of the word, strongly affects vocabulary learning. The research of Beck, McKeown, & Kucan (2002) supports these

findings. Their study compared students who received rich, varied instruction in vocabulary with students who had been provided no vocabulary instruction and students who had been provided only traditional instruction based on definitions alone; “the pattern of results was that students who received rich, frequent instruction did better on a variety of measures” (77-78).

Different approaches to vocabulary learning have been demonstrated to be effective, and using these varied instructional strategies in concert enables students to develop deep understandings of words. According to Graves (2006), effective vocabulary instruction involves students in active and deep processing of the word. Instruction should allow students to engage in activities that lead them to consider the word’s meaning, relate that meaning to information stored in memory, and work with the word in creative ways.

In addition to teaching words in different ways, the frequency of instruction in vocabulary is important (National Reading Panel, 2000; Beck, McKeown, & Kucan, 2002). Providing many opportunities for practice has been shown to be an effective instructional technique to support word learning, particularly among students with learning disabilities (Swanson, 1999; Swanson & Hoskyn, 2001; Vaughn et al., 2000).

For English language learners, providing multiple exposures in varied instructional contexts is essential. For these students, it is particularly important that vocabulary instruction incorporate oral, reading, and writing activities (Francis, Rivera, Lesaux, Kieffer, & Rivera, 2006a).

### *Vocabulary Acquisition Strategies*

As Nagy and Anderson (1984) point out, the total number of words which students must learn is so vast that educators cannot hope to directly instruct students in each individual word. Rather, teachers can teach students *about* words (Nagy, 2007). When educators can focus on explicitly teaching students the skills and strategies they can apply to learn unfamiliar words they provide students with a framework for learning other new words which sets them up for academic success in K-12 and beyond. The *Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects* include vocabulary expectations for each grade; “The vocabulary standards focus on understanding words and phrases, their relationships, and their nuances and on acquiring new vocabulary, particularly general academic and domain-specific words and phrases.” (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2010a, 8)

### *Making Connections*

To integrate new words into a working vocabulary, students need to understand how words “fit” with the words that they already know. This instructional strategy is supported by the influential work of Ausubel (1963) who described how learners connect new ideas to established schema.

Schema theory supports the notion that for students to fully understand and retain words, they must be able to place those words within a structure of the words that they already understand

(Kauchak & Eggen, 2006). In their work, Griswold, Gelzheiser, and Shepherd (1987) found that students who had richer vocabularies were able to acquire words more efficiently than those students with poorer vocabularies. This research supports a teacher's explicit attention to making associations between words to help students activate the prior knowledge needed to gain new vocabulary. Teachers can do this by helping students make connections by showing how new words connect to other words the students know (Durkin, 2003) and by systematically basing new word understandings on the understandings of previously learned words (Baker, Simmons, & Kame'enui, 1995b).

Vocabulary instruction that helps students build meaningful associations in their knowledge base has been shown to enhance students' comprehension (Baumann, Kame'enui, & Ash, 2003) and increase their academic knowledge (Goodson, Wolf, Bell, Turner, & Finney, 2010).

### *Word Morphology Instruction*

Morphological awareness is the awareness of the morphemic structure of words, or the understanding that words are made up of meaningful parts. Morphological analysis is often used to refer to the understanding and ability to make use of how prefixes, suffixes, bases, and Greek/Latin word roots combine (Templeton, 2004; Anglin, 1993; White, Power, & White, 1989) and can also include understanding compound words and inflectional endings.

Most English words have been created through combining prefixes and suffixes with base words and root words. If learners understand how words are structured, they possess a powerful tool for independent vocabulary growth (Templeton, Bear, Invernizzi, & Johnston, 2010). Most new words students will encounter are morphological derivatives of familiar words (Aronoff, 1994). Students with greater understanding of morphology are more successful at learning academic vocabulary and comprehending text (Kieffer & Lesaux, 2007). A recent meta-analysis analyzed studies that included morphological instruction as a treatment and found that it significantly improved students' literacy achievement and was "particularly effective for children with reading, learning, or speech and language disabilities, English language learners, and struggling readers." (Goodwin & Ahn, 2010, Abstract) Researchers have suggested that the National Reading Panel report should be amended to explicitly highlight the importance of morphological awareness in literacy learning (Berninger, Abbott, Nagy, & Carlisle, 2010).

Research suggests (see Templeton, 2004) that teaching students the meanings of prefixes, suffixes, and root words and building their understanding of how these word parts can be applied can be powerfully effective. In the elementary grades, students should be taught the meaning of common prefixes (*un-*, *re-*, *dis-*). In the middle grades and continuing into the upper grades, instruction should focus on less common, but useful, prefixes and suffixes and their meanings.

Instruction in morphology appears to be equally effective for native speakers, English language learners, and students in urban settings—and correlates with higher reading comprehension scores for all groups (Kieffer & Lesaux, 2007).

## From Research to Practice

### *Explicit Instruction in Journeys*

In *Journeys*, each lesson follows a consistent format which begins with the **Opening Routines**. As part of the opener, students are introduced to the **Target Vocabulary** words, which are identified in each lesson, and are given their **Daily Vocabulary Boost** in which these words are previewed, defined, and discussed. These same **Target Vocabulary** words are reinforced further in the **Vocabulary in Context Cards**, which offer students the opportunity to preview and discuss the target words.

<<Insert screen shot of bottom half of page in Grade 3, Unit 3, Lesson 11, page T13 – Daily Vocabulary Boost>>

On Day 1 of the lesson, teachers **Introduce Vocabulary**. Students are taught the vocabulary through activities that have the objective of students understanding and using the target words.

<<Insert screen shot of Grade 3, Unit 3, Lesson 11, pages T16-17.>>

All of this explicit instruction occurs before students engage in reading the main reading selection. By the time they are engaged in reading, students are ready for the concepts of the text because they have acquired the necessary vocabulary to comprehend.

In addition, **Vocabulary Strategies** lessons are provided for each week of instruction. Explicitly teaching students strategies for acquiring vocabulary supports their word learning. (Note that vocabulary acquisition strategies are discussed more in the following pages.)

<<Insert screen shot of Grade 6, Unit 6, Lesson 28, Teacher’s Edition pages T122-123.>>

### *Reinforcement and Multiple Exposures in Journeys*

Each Unit in *Journeys* is organized into five lessons. Each lesson focuses on specific vocabulary words, a target skill and a target strategy.

In *Journeys*, throughout each lesson, students receive the reinforcement and multiple exposures research suggests is necessary for deep vocabulary learning. Target vocabulary words are identified and repeated throughout the lesson and follow the student through the **Leveled Readers** program. Students hear the word in a beginning teacher read-aloud, they see images that represent all target vocabulary words as they are presented in context, and they apply the word meanings through routines built on the research of Isabel Beck while reading the **Student Book** selections and the **Leveled Vocabulary Readers**. These **Vocabulary Readers** introduce students to the **Target Vocabulary** in context.

See this Grade 2 example of how vocabulary is introduced in the **Opening Routines “Daily Vocabulary Boost”** part of a lesson.

<<insert screen shot of Grade 2, Unit 1, Lesson 1, Day 1 Teacher’s Edition – bottom of the page only – Daily Vocabulary Boost.>>

**Vocabulary in Context Cards** reinforce the vocabulary in the lesson. The corresponding routine activities provided in the TE are optional.

**Leveled Vocabulary Readers**, available in both print and online formats, enable readers to practice and apply vocabulary at each grade level, K through 6.

**Curious About Words** provides oral vocabulary support for grades K-3 students with two read-alouds each week.

The *Journeys* **Ready-Made Work Stations** link to the week’s literature and skills and provide additional opportunities for word study.

### *Vocabulary Acquisition Strategies in Journeys*

In *Journeys*, vocabulary strategy lessons are provided for each week of instruction. **Vocabulary Strategies** help students develop strategies to learn vocabulary words in the lesson.

In Kindergarten, vocabulary strategies include:

- Action Words
- Antonyms/Synonyms
- Classification/Categorization
- Color Words
- Context Clues
- Describing Words
- Environmental Print
- Figurative Language Words
- Multiple-Meaning Words
- Science Words
- Sensory Words
- Shape Words
- Similes

In Grade 3, vocabulary strategies include:

- Analogies
- Antonyms/Synonyms
- Categorize and Classify
- Compound Words
- Context Clues
- Dictionary/Glossary
- Homophones/Homographs
- Idioms
- Multiple-Meaning Words
- Using a Thesaurus
- Words from Other Languages

In Grade 6, vocabulary strategies include:

- Analogies
- Denotation and Connotation
- Dictionary/Glossary
- Homophones, Homographs, and Homonyms
- Idioms
- Multiple-Meaning Words
- Synonyms
- Using Context
- Word Families
- Words Often Confused
- Word Origins

The **Vocabulary in Context Cards** for each lesson reinforce high-frequency words used in the week's literature and help students in acquiring the skill of using context to understand the meanings of new words. On the back of each card, a student-friendly explanation of the word and activities are provided to help students think about how the word can be used in various contexts.

### *Making Connections*

Research has repeatedly pointed to the impact of shared reading on students' vocabulary acquisition and the value of linking vocabulary instruction with overall comprehension instruction (Coyne, Simmons, Kame'enui, & Stoolmiller, 2004; Fisher, Frey, & Lapp, 2008; McKeown & Beck, 2006). The *Journeys* program continuously connects vocabulary instruction with comprehension instruction so that neither is taught in isolation but always in the context of meaningful literacy activities.

The **Develop Background** sections of the *Journeys* lessons provide the opportunity for students to make connections between the vocabulary they are learning and the concepts they are reading about in the program selections.

<<Insert screen shot of Grade 3, Unit 3, Lesson 11, pages T24-25 – Develop Background/Target Vocabulary>>

Other elements of vocabulary instruction in *Journeys* that support students making connections to other words, to words in context, and to other concepts and topics include **Academic Language, Daily Vocabulary Boost, Oral Vocabulary, Selection Vocabulary, and Vocabulary in Context.**

### *Word Morphology Instruction in Journeys*

In the *Journeys* program, students engage in activities to increase their awareness of the meaningful parts which make up words. As described above, this understanding is an important tool for their ongoing vocabulary growth.

In Grade 3, for example, instruction in word morphology includes attention to:

- Base Words and Endings
- Base Words and Prefix *non-*
- Compound Words
- Prefixes
- Suffixes
- Word Roots

See below for an example of how morphology instruction is provided in the **Vocabulary Strategies** component of *Journeys*. Note how the program follows a Teach/Model, Guided Practice, and Apply instructional model to support students at every stage to independence.

<<Insert screen shot of Grade 3, Unit 3, Lesson 11, Page T54-T55>>

Instruction in word morphology is introduced at the earliest grade level in *Journeys* and continues through grade 6, as in this list from grade 6 and instructional example from a grade 6 lesson.

In Grade 6, word morphology instruction includes attention to the following:

- Greek and Latin Word Roots
- Greek Roots and Affixes
- Latin Roots and Affixes
- Prefixes *con-*, *com-*, *pre-*, *pro-*, *de-*, *trans-*, *dis-*, *ex-*, *inter-*, *non-*, *en-*, *ad-*, *un-*, *re-*, *in-*, *im-*, *ir-*, *il-*
- Suffixes *-able*, *-ible*, *-ent*, *-ant*, *-ence*, *-ance*, *-er*, *-or*, *-ar*, *-ist*, *ian*, *-ent*, *-ful*, *-less*, *-ly*, *-ness*, *-ment*, *-ship*, *-ion*, *-ation*, *-ize-*, *-ify*, *-ive*, *-ity*, *-ous*, *-ic*, *-ure*
- Word Origins

<<Insert screen shots from Grade 6, Unit 1, Lesson 1, Teacher’s Edition pages T40-41 on “Vocabulary Strategies: Prefixes *dis-*, *ex-*, *inter-*, *non-*”>>

## Strand 2: Supporting Comprehension

*Given that comprehension is such a complex cognitive endeavor and is affected by, at least, the reader, the text, and the context, comprehension research has considered many features as contributing to student outcomes.*

(McKeown, Beck, & Blake, 2009, 218)

### Defining the Strand

Reading comprehension is a complex cognitive activity which involves many, varied skills and strategies. While some students learn to read—and continue to comprehend texts with greater difficulty—without explicit instruction, most students benefit from instruction in reading comprehension processes and strategies. Students today will face increasing literacy demands in school, at work, and at home. To meet these demands, students must become critical comprehenders, able to deeply understand what they read. Effective reading instruction can help students meet these challenges.

In addition to the ability to decode words quickly and effortlessly, reading comprehension depends on background knowledge, the ability to make inferences and think critically about what is read, and the ability to choose and use appropriate strategies for decoding and comprehension. Comprehension requires that students actively make meaning of what they read.

Connecting to students' background knowledge has been shown by research to be effective as an instructional strategy; how well students comprehend is influenced by the background knowledge students bring to reading. Focusing on the content of what is read, and asking students to make critical responses to that content, has been shown to be particularly effective in enhancing students' comprehension (McKeown, Beck, & Blake, 2009).

To comprehend and make sense of what they read, readers must use various comprehension strategies—such as drawing conclusions or making connections. Readers who struggle with comprehension also struggle with using these strategies (Dole, Duffy, Roehler, & Pearson, 1991). For these struggling readers, explicit strategy instruction is particularly helpful.

The primary goal of any core reading program is to develop students' abilities in reading and comprehending texts of varied genres and increasing complexity. To meet this goal, an effective reading program will engage students by connecting with their prior experiences and background knowledge; explicitly instruct students on successful comprehension strategies; make connections with what is read; encourage critical responses to texts; ensure that students have the basic skills needed to decode texts; and foster students' reading fluency. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt's *Journeys* program employs each of these research-based elements into its program—to meet the challenge of engaging all students in becoming high-achieving readers. By employing an I Do, We Do, You Do model of instruction, the program supports teachers who are expert readers in transferring their skills and knowledge to students who are building their skills.

## Research that Guided the Development of the *Journeys* program

### *Connecting to Students' Background Knowledge*

Research on cognition shows that for new information to be learned and retained it must be integrated with existing information. New learning occurs when learners connect new concepts and ideas to those they already know and understand. In their principles for brain-based learning, Caine and Caine (1997a) refer to this as patterning; the brain/mind looks for patterns in the familiar and the new. Effective instruction must give learners a chance to make these patterns.

Educators have known for some time that for learners to make sense of new information, they must be able to connect it with their prior knowledge and experiences (Afflerbach, 1986; Chiesi, Spilich, & Voss, 1979; Pressley, 2000; Snow & Sweet, 2003; Spires & Donley, 1998).

Activating students' prior knowledge is one of the nine most effective instructional strategies identified by Marzano (2003). Concepts to which students are introduced in school must be both relevant and familiar enough to them that they are able to make those essential connections.

Research attests to the benefits of making effective connections to students' background knowledge, skills, and experiences. Students who learned from instruction designed to monitor and integrate their prior knowledge outperformed students who received traditional instruction (Dole & Smith, 1989). Additionally, connecting new information to prior knowledge has been found to positively impact the learning of students with learning disabilities (Swanson & Hoskyn, 2001). Benefits of building on student's background knowledge, interests, and experiences include increased interest, increased motivation, increased concentration and focus, and increased learning (Williams, Papierno, Makel, & Ceci, 2004).

### *Explicit Strategy Instruction*

The Report of the National Reading Panel (2000) agreed with what reading teachers have known for years; "the instruction of cognitive strategies improves reading comprehension in readers with a range of abilities." (4-47) According to the Panel, over two decades of research support the "enthusiastic advocacy of instruction of reading strategies." (4-46)

Whether they read or listen to texts, or do both at the same time, readers must use a variety of reading strategies—such as making inferences, asking and answering questions, visualizing, determining main ideas and details, and so on—in order to make sense of what they read. The rationale for teaching these types of strategies is clear. Teaching students specific strategies provides them with tools to use when they are not comprehending what they read. While some readers acquire these strategies informally, explicit instruction, modeling, and practice using these strategies enhances understanding for all students. Research shows that to be most effective, reading comprehension instruction must support students, directly and explicitly, with how to use the strategies needed to comprehend a text (Cantrell, Almasi, Carter, Rintamaa, & Madden, 2010; National Reading Panel, 2000; Hollingsworth & Woodward, 1993).

Struggling readers often have trouble using such strategies (Dole, Duffy, Roehler, & Pearson, 1991) so for these students, explicit instruction in reading is particularly important (Nelson & Manset-Williamson, 2006). However, all students benefit from this type of instruction—poor and high achievers alike, as well as native speakers and non-native speakers of English (Alfassi, 2004; Baumann, 1984; Francis, Rivera, Lesaux, Kieffer, & Rivera, 2006a, 2006b; Klingner & Vaughn, 2004; Nokes & Dole, 2004; Rosenshine, Meister, & Chapman, 1996; Van Keer & Verhaeghe, 2005).

Effective strategy instruction guides readers in what strategies to use, and why, when, and how to use them. Typical steps include:

- *Direct explanation.* The teacher explains the strategy and when to apply it.
- *Modeling.* The teacher models application of the strategy.
- *Guided practice.* The teacher guides and assists students as they learn to apply the strategy.
- *Application.* The teacher provides practice opportunities until readers are able to apply strategies independently (Center for the Improvement of Early Reading, 2003).

### *Critically Responding*

The high literacy demands placed on today's students mean that basic comprehension is insufficient; readers must engage in higher-order thinking. Researchers have begun to focus on how to develop this higher-order literacy. Critically responding to a text means asking and answering questions about *why*, *how*, and *what-if* rather than basic questions of *who*, *what*, *when*, and *where*. Research supports instruction in critical thinking, finding improved achievement and transfer with improved critical thinking skills (Adey & Shayer, 1993; Haywood, 2004).

While research into the effectiveness of specific instructional approaches for promoting higher-level comprehension and reflection is still in its early stages, a body of research is beginning to emerge supporting some strategies. In a study of journal writing, in which students made connections between what they read and other knowledge and experience, the findings showed that experimental-group students outperformed students who did not engage in this type of writing (Connor-Greene, 2000). Asking students good questions—and teaching students how to ask their own good questions—promotes deeper comprehension of what is read (Craig, Sullins, Witherspoon, & Gholson, 2006; Graesser & Person, 1994; King, 1994; Pressley et al., 1992; Rosenshine, Meister, & Chapman, 1996). In a study looking at the role of metacognitive strategies in critical thinking, Ku and Ho (2010) found that good critical thinkers engaged in more metacognitive activities, suggesting a relationship between instruction that expects critical thinking and instructions that provides support for metacognition.

## *Decoding*

Students' ability to comprehend is dependent on their ability to quickly and automatically decode the words on the page. Without sufficient skills in phonics and phonemic awareness, students cannot achieve this goal.

Systematic instruction in phonics and phonemic awareness in the early grades has been shown to be significantly more effective than other approaches (National Reading Panel, 2000). Decoding must be included in any framework for early reading instruction (Kendeou, van den Broek, White, & Lynch, 2009) and for older, struggling readers, instruction with decoding is an essential element of a comprehensive program (Chard, Pikulski, & McDonagh, 2006; Moats, 2001).

Regular assessment—and subsequent tailored instruction—is necessary for these fundamental skills: “Because the ability to obtain meaning from print depends so strongly on the development of word recognition accuracy and reading fluency, both of the latter should be regularly assessed in the classroom, permitting timely and effective instructional response where difficulty or delay is apparent.” (Snow, Burns, & Griffin, 1998)

## *Fluency*

Part of the process of learning to read fluently is the movement from laboriously attending to each letter in a word to sound out the individual phonemes that make whole words, to more proficiently recognizing word parts, word families, irregular or exception words, and high-frequency words so that the process of decoding can become rapid reading without conscious attention to individual letters and sounds. Recognizing words is linked to understanding words (Pulido, 2007), which is why decoding and fluency are so essential to comprehension.

The ability to read fluently—to read smoothly, at a good pace, with expression, appropriate phrasing, and understanding—reflects a reader's ability to construct meaning from text. Fluency improves as automaticity—automatic and accurate word recognition—improves. Fluent readers spend less energy decoding texts and therefore have more cognitive energy to focus on vocabulary and comprehension.

The connection between fluency and comprehension is well documented (Allington, 2001). In a study of grade 5 students, researchers found that students who had the highest performances in comprehension also were able to quickly recognize isolated words, process phrases and sentences as units while reading silently, and use appropriate expression when reading text aloud (Klauda & Guthrie, 2008).

Research suggests that instruction in fluency should be part of a complete reading program for all readers (Shanahan, 2006; Chard, Pikulski, & McDonagh, 2006). Fluency instruction may involve increasing the amount of reading students do (Samuels, 2002) and engaging in repeated oral readings (Pressley, Gaskins, & Fingeret, 2006; Samuels, 2002).

## From Research to Practice

### *Connecting to Students' Background Knowledge in Journeys*

The authors of the *Journeys* program recognize the importance of background knowledge to comprehension and the importance of making connections – from the text to self, text to text, and text to world.

The first page of the grades K through 3 **Opening Routines** serves to generate students' thinking on a topic or theme. The **Develop Background** component of the *Journeys* Teacher's Edition lessons provides a passage for students to read to be introduced to ideas from the upcoming course selection. The **Build Background** section of the eight-page leveled reader lesson plans serves to activate and develop students' prior knowledge.

Within every lesson in the *Journeys* program, students are provided with texts and teachers are provided with tips for activating prior knowledge before reading. For example, before reading *Please, Puppy, Please* (in Grade K, Unit 1, Lesson 3) students engage in a discussion to activate their prior knowledge about the topic and genre of the book.

<<Insert screen shot of Grade K, Unit 1, Lesson 3, Teacher's Edition, page T186 – can just include main part of the page, not sidebar text.>>

The previewing and introduction to the each lesson's vocabulary words also play a role in activating students' prior knowledge, as in this grade 3 lesson.

<<Insert screen shot of Grade 3, Unit 3, Lesson 11, page T24>>

At grade 3, Online Lesson 14 suggests:

#### **Build Background**

Help students use their knowledge of dogs and their abilities. Build interest by asking questions such as the following: *Have you ever seen a person with a guide dog? How can the guide dog help the person?* Read the title and author and talk about the cover photo. Tell students that this book is informational text, so the words and photos will give factual information about the topic.

After reading the main selection and the **Paired Selections**, students are encouraged to make connections between what they have read and other texts, content areas, and ideas. The **Making Connections** component provides students with prompts to encourage them to connect from text to self, text to text, and text to world. This **After Reading** activity in the Grade 6 Teacher's Edition shows how the program connects to and builds on students' background knowledge:

<<insert screen shot of page T114 from Unit 1, Lesson 2, Grade 6 print Teacher's Edition – "Read to Connect" box>>

<<insert screen shots of pages T16-T17 in Grade 6, Unit 1, Lesson 1 Teacher’s Edition on “Develop Background”>>

In addition, each unit’s magazines give students in grades 3 through 6 the change to apply what they have learned to “real-world” situations—thereby making connections between what is learned in class and real-life reading topics.

Finally, the program provides ideas for activities that will help students make connections between what they are reading and discussing and other content areas through the *Journeys* **Science Connection** and **Social Studies Connection** pages.

### *Explicit Strategy Instruction in Journeys*

Each unit in *Journeys* is organized into five lessons. Each lesson focuses on specific vocabulary words, a target skill and a target strategy. Developing students’ comprehension skills and strategies is a primary focus of the *Journeys* program.

The **Introduce Comprehension** component of each lesson introduces students to the comprehension strategy and skill that will serve as the focus for the upcoming lesson and week’s instruction.

The table below provides an overview of the comprehension skills and strategies emphasized through instruction in the *Journeys* program with increasingly complex texts from K to grade 6, and with texts for readers of varying levels at each grade.

<b>Explicit Comprehension Skills and Strategy Instruction in <i>Journeys</i></b>
<b>Target Skills</b>
• Author’s Purpose
• Cause and Effect
• Character(s)
• Compare and Contrast
• Conclusions
• Details
• Main Idea and Details
• Sequence of Events
• Story Structure
• Text and Graphic Features
<b>Target Strategies</b>
• Analyze/Evaluate
• Infer/Predict
• Monitor/Clarify
• Question
• Summarize
• Visualize

For example, see how this grade 3 lesson introduces the comprehension strategy and skill of analyzing/evaluating and comparing/contrasting:

<<insert screen shot of Grade 3, Unit 3, Lesson 13 T202-203 – Introduce Comprehension>>

As another example, see this grade 3, Online Lesson 14, which focuses on the skill of Author’s Purpose, as shown here:

### **Target Comprehension Skill**

**Author’s Purpose** Remind students that they can think about the author’s purpose by using text details to tell why an author writes a book. Model the skill, using a “Think Aloud” like the one below:

#### **Think Aloud**

*What do you think the author’s purpose was for writing Good Dogs, Guide Dogs? Think about the details in the book. Many of the details tell about a guide dog’s tasks and how the dog behaves. For example, a guide dog keeps its partner safe, stays calm, and obeys commands. I think the author wrote the book to explain what a guide dog does.*

### **Practice the Skill**

Ask students to think of another nonfiction book they have read about animals. Have them tell why they think the author wrote the book.

As students read the main selection in each lesson, they answer **Stop and Think Questions** that reinforce the comprehension skills and strategies being taught.

The *Journeys* **Ready-Made Work Stations** link to the week’s literature and skills and provide additional opportunities for students to build comprehension strategies. The student **Practice Books** offer additional opportunities for practice for building reading skills.

### *Critically Responding in Journeys*

The *Journeys* program was designed to develop the kind of critical thinking skills that will prepare students to be ready for college- and career-ready coursework in the upper grade levels.

Each of the over 600 readers throughout the program is accompanied by an eight-page **Leveled Reader Teaching Plan** designed to support readers in a small-group setting. Within each plan, *Journeys* provides teachers with essential information useful for planning instruction around each text. Included are **Critical Thinking** questions, provided as a blackline master for ease of classroom use. These **Critical Thinking** questions encourage students to think within, beyond, and about the text and to make connections with what they read.

<<insert screen shot of critical thinking questions on redwood forest BLM included online – page 7 of 8 of this PDF: [http://hmeducation.com/journeys/pdfs/LR\\_lesson.pdf](http://hmeducation.com/journeys/pdfs/LR_lesson.pdf)>>

In addition, to ensure that all students engage in critical response, regardless of their reading levels, **Critical Thinking** questions are provided for different levels – Struggling Readers, On Level Readers, Advanced Readers, and English Language Learners.

<<insert screen shot of Critical Thinking paragraphs with corresponding blackline masters from Grade 3, Unit 3, Lesson 11, Teacher’s Edition, pages T80, T81, T82, T83 – don’t need whole pages from TE – just bottom sections on Critical Thinking only – with corresponding blackline masters if possible.>>

Students at work in the *Journeys* program are able to answer basic *who, what, where, and when* questions as well as higher-level *how, why, and what-if* questions.

Students in *Journeys* further develop their critical response skills by writing about what they read, as detailed later in this report. The **Your Turn** feature – the students’ opportunity to respond to the activity after the main selection has been read – allows for more critical thinking. And, in addition, *Journeys* develops students’ metacognitive skills, or ability to think about their own thinking, which has been shown to relate to their critical thinking abilities.

Finally, the *Journeys* program develops students’ research skills, a key element in the *Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects* (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2010a). In Kindergarten, this focus on **Research** is shown through activities in which students develop their abilities to gather and record information, ask questions, record and publish, and identify sources. By grade 6, students have developed their skills in **Research** and engage in such critical thinking activities as identifying and analyzing propaganda, developing ideas, formulating questions, generating research plans, analyzing media design techniques, narrowing topics, assessing the reliability of sources, and synthesizing information from various sources, including experts, surveys, and visuals.

### *Decoding in Journeys*

The *Journeys* program supports teachers in planning decoding instruction for their students. As background, teachers are provided with research on decoding instruction.

<<Insert screen shot of page xx Unit X from Grade 2, Unit 1 Teachers’ Edition – *A Word from our Authors – How Do Children Learn to Decode Print?*>>

To aid in planning instruction that incorporates a focus on decoding, the **Planning and Pacing** guides for the early grades include instruction in **Phonics** and **High-Frequency Words** within each unit. For example, Grade 2, Unit 1, Lessons 1 through 5 have the following focus:

<b>Grade 2, Unit 1</b>	<b>Phonics</b>	<b>High-Frequency Words</b>
<b>Lesson 1</b>	Short vowels <i>a, i</i> ; CVC syllable pattern	<i>High-Frequency Words</i>

		<i>Decodable Readers</i>
<b>Lesson 2</b>	Short vowels <i>o, u, e</i> ; CVC syllable pattern	<i>High-Frequency Words</i> <i>Decodable Readers</i>
<b>Lesson 3</b>	Long vowels <i>a, i</i> ; Sounds for <i>c</i>	<i>High-Frequency Words</i> <i>Decodable Readers</i>
<b>Lesson 4</b>	Long vowels <i>o, u, e</i> ; Sounds for <i>g</i>	<i>High-Frequency Words</i> <i>Decodable Readers</i>
<b>Lesson 5</b>	Consonant blends with <i>r, l, s</i>	<i>High-Frequency Words</i> <i>Decodable Readers</i>

The **Suggested Weekly Plan** includes daily instruction in phonics, phonemic awareness, and high-frequency words:

<b>Grade 2, Unit 1, Lesson 1</b>	<b>Phonics</b>	<b>High-Frequency Words</b>
<b>Day 1</b>	Phonemic Awareness T18; Short vowels <i>a, i</i> T18-T20	T13
<b>Day 2</b>	Phonemic Awareness, T25 Short vowels <i>a, i</i> T26-T27	T25
<b>Day 3</b>	Phonemic Awareness T44 CVC syllable pattern T44-T45	T43
<b>Day 4</b>	Phonemic Awareness T54, T55 Phonics Review T54-T55	T53
<b>Day 5</b>		T63

In the early grades, decoding is also part of the daily **Opening Routines** which begin each lesson.

<<insert screen shot of Grade 2, Unit 1, Lesson 1, Day 1, T13 – Opening Routines – if possible, just include **Daily Phonemic Awareness** and **Daily High-Frequency Words**. Do not need to include vocabulary boost section.>>

Students in grades K through 2 are able to take advantage of the *Journeys* **Decodable Texts**. And, for additional practice, the *Journey's* **Ready-Made Work Stations** provide tools for students to work independently on various literacy skills—including decoding.

<<Insert screen shot of right side of the page in Grade 2, Unit 1, Lesson 1, T10 – Word Study Read-Made Work Stations.>>

Additional *Journeys* program components support students' early reading skills. These include the **Alphafriend/Alphamigos Cards and Music** for Kindergarten students' phonics development. **Write-On/Wipe-Off Boards** give Kindergarten students a place to build and blend words.

Finally, for students in the later grades who can still benefit from decoding instruction, *Journeys* provides instructional support. At grade 6, instruction in decoding focuses on higher-level skills, as is evidenced this example:

<<Insert screen shot from Grade 6, Unit 1, Lesson 1, Teacher’s Edition page T39 on “Decoding: VCCV Syllable Pattern”>>

### *Fluency in Journeys*

In the *Journeys* program, fluency instruction is supported in many ways and is integrated into weekly instruction. The program’s **Interactive Read-Alouds** and **Shared Reading** serve to provide students with daily models of fluent reading. Through instruction, all aspects of fluency are developed. Note how in the **Planning and Pacing** chart for Grade 2, below, different aspects of fluency—from word recognition to intonation and phrasing—are emphasized in daily instruction.

<<Insert grade 2, Unit 1 Planning and Pacing Chart – pages xii and xiii in the Teacher’s Edition.>>

The *Journeys* **Ready-Made Work Stations** link to the week’s literature and skills and provide additional opportunities for students to build their fluency skills.

<<Insert screen shot of left side of the page in Grade 2, Unit 1, Lesson 1, T10 – Comprehension and Fluency Read-Made Work Stations.>>

In addition, the **Student Book Audiotext CD** provides an effective way to have children listen to models of fluent reading.

Instruction on fluency continues through all grade levels of the *Journeys* program. At grade K, small-group fluency instruction might look like this:

<<Insert screen shot from Grade K, Unit 1, Lesson 5, Teachers’ Edition, page T391.>>

At grade 6, the focus of instruction builds as appropriate with the grade-level and ability-level of the students, such as in this example from grade 6:

<<Insert screen shot from Grade 6, Unit 1, Lesson 1, Teacher’s Edition page T38 on “Fluency: Accuracy”>>

Finally, support for fluency is provided throughout the Teacher’s Editions of the program. The **Choices for Further Support** features often offer suggestions for improving students’ fluency or suggest opportunities for fluency practice, such as this one at grade 4 (from the **Lesson Plan** for the **Leveled Reader** *Arthropods Rule!*):

<<Note – text below retrieved online at [http://hmheducation.com/tx/journeys/programs\\_1.php](http://hmheducation.com/tx/journeys/programs_1.php)>>

**Choices for Further Support**

- **Fluency** Invite students to choral read a passage from the text and demonstrate phased fluent reading. Remind them to pause and to properly pronounce the words included in parentheses. Remind them to make brief pauses at commas, and full pauses after periods, question marks, and exclamations.

### Strand 3: Using Effective Instructional Approaches

*A high-quality reading program that is based on scientifically based research must include instructional content based on the five essential components of reading instruction integrated into a coherent instructional design. A coherent design includes explicit instructional strategies that address students' specific strengths and weaknesses, coordinated instructional sequences, ample practice opportunities, and aligned student materials, and ... the use of targeted, scientifically based instructional strategies as appropriate...In-class groupings strategies are in use, including small-group instruction as appropriate to meet student needs...There is active student engagement in a variety of reading-based activities...*

(U.S. Department of Education, 2002, 6)

#### Defining the Strand

Good teaching matters. Effective teachers are those who use effective instructional techniques to support all students in improving their learning and skills. Studies have shown that classroom teachers' instructional strategies have a direct impact on students' reading proficiency (Pennington Whitaker, Gambrell, & Morrow, 2004). To be effective, teachers must select strategies for instruction that accomplish their instructional goals and best meet the learning needs of their students.

A large body of research has focused on what instructional strategies are most effective in the classroom. The research of the RAND Reading Study Group (Snow, 2002) identified elements of effective instruction in the reading classroom. Among their findings were that cooperative learning and graphic organizers were two of the instructional strategies with a solid scientific basis; that motivation is essential to reading comprehension; and that successful reading depends on students' capacity with written and oral language. Studies like that of the RAND study group have identified a number of approaches that show positive and measurable effects on student learning and performance. Some of these approaches include use of and focus on:

- Scaffolding
- Graphic Organizers
- Predictable Routines
- Collaborative Learning
- Whole-Group and Small-Group Instruction
- Varied Forms of Communication
- Engagement and Motivation

An effective instructional program uses approaches that have been proven effective by research. The *Journeys* program was designed to support students as they develop as readers and writers. Lessons are organized in a systematic way and suggestions are given for providing instruction to the whole group and small groups. Ideas are presented visually to support students' connections. Throughout the program, scaffolds exist to help students solidify what they know in order to build on it. The types and topics of the texts—and the activities that students do around them—have all been designed for maximum student engagement and motivation.

## Research that Guided the Development of the *Journeys* Program

### *Scaffolding*

Scaffolding is an instructional technique that involves providing support to students as they learn and reach competence, and gradually decreasing the amount of support provided until students are able to work independently. According to Vygotsky, scaffolding can be defined as the “role of teachers and others in supporting the learner’s development and providing support structures to get to that next stage or level” (Raymond, 2000, p. 176). Providing embedded scaffolds is an essential part of transitioning students to independence and “has repeatedly been identified as one of the most effective instructional techniques available” (Graves & Avery, 1997, p. 138). Numerous studies have shown that scaffolding can lead to improved student outcomes—including enhanced inquiry and higher achievement (Kim & White, 2008; Simons & Klein, 2007; Fretz, Wu, Zhang, Davis, Krajcik, & Soloway, 2002; Rosenshine & Meister, 1992) and improved reading comprehension (Clark & Graves, 2008; Lutz, Guthrie, & Davis, 2006).

Instruction that scaffolds students’ learning includes these elements: a logical structure, carefully sequenced models and examples that reveal essential characteristics, progression from easier to more difficult content and from easier to more difficult tasks, additional information/elaboration as needed, peer-mediated instruction, and materials the guide students, such as key words, think sheets, and graphic organizers (Hillocks, 1993). The final element of scaffolding is independent work—scaffolding is removed and students apply what they have learned to new situations.

Scaffolding encompasses many different instructional strategies. Varying scaffolds can be used; what is important is that they consistently provide adequate support as needed. Research (Schunk, Pintrich, & Meece, 2008; Stone, 1998) suggests that scaffolds such as the following will support student independence: activating prior knowledge; reviewing previously learned material; modeling and thinking aloud; providing models and different representations; questioning; using cues or tools; and providing useful feedback.

### *Graphic Organizers*

In its review of the literature on effective strategies for teaching reading comprehension, the National Reading Panel found graphic organizers an important strategy for improving students’ comprehension (National Reading Panel, 2000). Numerous studies have come to this same conclusion (Dickson, Simmons, & Kame’enui, 1996; Pearson & Fielding, 1991) and have found positive effects with all students, including those with learning disabilities (Kim, Vaughn, Wanzek, & Wei, 2004)

What makes graphic organizers so effective? Combining text with visuals engages students’ multiple pathways to learning, as described in Paivio’s (1979, 1983, 1986) dual-coding theory. A number of studies have demonstrated that students learn better when both pictures and words are used, than with text alone (Mayer, 2001; Mayer & Gallini, 1990; Levin, Anglin, & Carney, 1987;

Levie & Lentz, 1982). Nonlinguistic representations are one of the nine most effective instructional strategies identified by Marzano (2003) and have been shown to help students better understand informational text (Center for Improvement of Early Reading, 2003).

Graphic organizers are particularly effective at helping students to focus on the structure of text and the relationship of ideas within text (Center for the Improvement of Early Reading, 2003; Robinson & Kiewra, 1995). The use of graphic organizers to graphically depict the relationships of ideas in texts has been shown to improve both students' comprehension of the text—and their recall of key ideas (Snow, 2002; National Reading Panel, 2000).

### *Predictable Routines*

Predictability in well-organized, consistent classroom routines facilitates learning in a number of ways. Regular routines with consistent cues help smooth the transitions between one activity to another (Mace, Shapiro, & Mace, 1998) and reduce problem behaviors. When students can predict the routines of their school day, they develop a sense of security (Holdaway, 1984). Not only does student behavior improve, but students also show greater engagement with learning and achieve at higher levels (Kern & Clemens, 2007).

Teachers can increase predictability in their classrooms in many ways. Providing information about the content and duration of events and activities and visually displaying schedules have been shown to be effective (Kern & Clemens, 2007). Alternating the interactive settings—whole class, small group, individual—in a predictable way to best meet students' needs has been shown to be particularly effective (Reutzel, 2003).

This type of predictability in the instructional routine has been demonstrated to be particularly effective for struggling students and those with learning disabilities (Flannery & O'Neill, 1995; Tustin, 1995).

### *Collaborative Learning*

Learning together in collaborative and cooperative groups benefits students (Cotton, 1995; Johnson & Johnson, 1990) and was one of the nine most effective instruction strategies identified by Marzano in his meta-analysis (2003). How does collaborative learning increase learning? Learning is “profoundly influenced by the nature of the social relationships within which people find themselves.” (Caine & Caine, 1997a, p. 105) Research and cognitive theory suggest that when students work in groups toward a common goal, they support one another, model strategies, and provide context-appropriate explanations and immediate feedback (Slavin, 2002).

Among the benefits of collaborative learning for students are increased:

- Understanding and application of concepts;
- Use of critical thinking;
- Sense of self-efficacy, or confidence in their ability to learn;

- Positive attitudes towards others (Vermette, 1988).

Research has also demonstrated the positive impact cooperative learning strategies have on teaching students reading-comprehension strategies (Stevens, Slavin, & Farnish, 1991). Having peers interact over the use of reading strategies was demonstrated in research to increase student learning of strategies, encourage discussion, and increase comprehension (National Reading Panel, 2000).

### *Whole-Group and Small-Group Instruction*

Effective instructors employ whole-group, small-group and independent learning activities to meet the needs of all of their students (McNamara & Waugh, 1993). According to Kapusnick and Hauslein (2001), “Students learn better and more easily when teachers use a variety of delivery methods, providing students with learning experiences that maximize their strengths.” (p. 156) This regular differentiation of instructional format allows for the broad dissemination of shared information, as well as opportunities to discuss and tailor instruction to small groups and individual students. Effective teachers use whole-group instruction to introduce new skills and concepts and smaller groups to ensure thorough learning (Cotton, 1995).

For teachers of reading, beginning reading instruction with a whole-group shared read-aloud, as in the *Journeys* program, provides a common foundation for all students (Fountas & Pinnell, 2006), while small-group instruction allows for learning based on specific needs and interests. Pressley, Yokoi, Rankin, Wharton-McDonald, and Mistretta (1997) found a correlation between effective instruction in reading and writing and the use of diverse activities—whole-group, small-group and independent reading. The National Reading Panel (2000) supported these findings about the benefits of employing whole-group and small-group learning; “Having peers ... interact over the use of reading strategies leads to an increase in the learning of strategies, promotes intellectual discussion, and increases reading comprehension.” (4-45)

Placement in small groups for instruction has been shown to benefit *all* students—those with low, medium, and high abilities (Abrami, Lou, Chambers, Poulsen, Spence, & Abrami, 2000).

### *Varied Forms of Communication*

Integrating skills is particularly important in English language arts classrooms because of the interconnectedness of reading and writing, speaking and listening, and viewing. Instruction is more readily learned and retained when skills are integrated, allowing students to create pathways of learning and remembering in their minds. Research suggests that a balanced literacy program will include many varied reading, writing, speaking, listening, and viewing activities (Snow, Burns, & Griffin, 1998; Lyon & Moats, 1997).

In a study of an instructional program in which teachers provided a wide range of reading materials and the integration of reading, writing, speaking, and listening, 90% of students recommended continuing the integrated-skills approach in the following year (Su, 2007).

This balanced approach to literacy instruction is apparent in the *Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects*, which demonstrate a focus on reading, writing, listening, speaking, and critical viewing for college and career readiness (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2010a).

### *Engagement and Motivation*

The past view of learning as a passive experience has shifted to a much more active view of cognition. Learning is an active process of engagement. If students are interested in what they are learning, they will persist in spending the time and energy needed for learning to occur (Hidi & Boscolo, 2006; Guthrie & Humenick, 2004; Eccles, Wigfield, & Schiefele, 1998). In this way, engagement leads to motivation leads to learning.

Engagement and motivation are particularly important in teaching reading (Stipek, 2002). Student engagement is a “powerful determinant of the effectiveness of any given literacy approach” (Strangman & Dalton, 2006, p. 559). Guthrie, Hoa, Wigfield, Tonks, Humenick, and Littles (2007) found a connection between student interest and increased comprehension and recall. Taylor, Pearson, Peterson, and Rodriguez (2003), too, found a connection between engaged learning and reading comprehension growth in low SES schools. Guthrie and Wigfield (2000) found that engaging reading instruction must:

- Teach and encourage use of strategies
- Increase students’ conceptual knowledge;
- Foster social interaction; and
- Foster student motivation.

Motivation is the process by which a student engages in a task and persists towards completion. Cognitive science shows us that humans are innately motivated to search for meaning (Caine & Caine, 1997b). The most effective instructional approaches are those that harness this natural inclination, and are motivating and engaging to the learners. The level of a student’s motivation to read has been shown to predict growth in reading comprehension (Guthrie, Hoa, Wigfield, Tonks, Humenick, & Littles, 2007).

To motivate their students, reading teachers should construct lessons that are interesting, match activities to students’ abilities, and connect reading and writing and content-area learning (Bohn, Roehrig, & Pressley, 2004) In addition, the use of strategies also increases students’ motivation to learn—because successful strategy use helps students to see that they have the ability to learn (Schunk, Pintrich, & Meece, 2008).

## From Research to Practice

### *Scaffolding in Journeys*

The *Journeys* program provides specific support for teachers seeking to scaffold instruction for their students to ensure that all students acquire the reading skills and strategies they need to continue to read more challenging texts and that all English Language Learners in their classrooms acquire social and academic language proficiency. Scaffolding is provided in many ways, through **Language Support Cards, Leveled Readers, Vocabulary in Context Cards**, and notes throughout the Teacher’s Edition.

<<insert screen shot of Grade 2, Unit 1, Teacher’s Edition, page T5>>

The teaching model employed throughout the program – **I Do It, We Do It, You Do It** – provides scaffolding for all students to move towards independent application of the strategies and skills learned.

In addition, for English Language Learners who need additional support to master the skills and strategies taught in the classroom, specific tips – **English Language Learners Scaffold** – are provided as sidebars throughout the *Journeys* Teacher’s Editions.

<<Show examples of these sidebar tips here – such as this one from Grade K, Unit 1, Lesson 5, page T364 or this one from Grade 6, Unit 6, Lesson 27, page T54>>

### *Graphic Organizers in Journeys*

Graphic organizers are used throughout the *Journeys* program to provide a framework for improving students’ comprehension and the opportunity to structure their ideas about texts.

Graphic organizers included at various levels of the program are shown below:

<b>Graphic Organizers in Journeys</b>						
<b>Grade K</b>	<b>Grade 1</b>	<b>Grade 2</b>	<b>Grade 3</b>	<b>Grade 4</b>	<b>Grade 5</b>	<b>Grade 6</b>
Flow Chart	Bar Graph	Bar Graph	Bar Graph	Flow Chart	Column Chart	Column Chart
Inference Map	Chart	Column Chart	Column Chart	Idea-Support Map	Feature Map	Flow Chart
Story Map	Checklist	Diagram	Diagram	Inference Map	Flow Chart	Idea-Support Map
T-Map	Diagram	Flow Chart	Flow Chart	Story Map	Four-Square Map	Inference Map
Venn Diagram	Graph	Idea-Support Map	Idea-Support Map	Three-Column Chart	Idea-Support Map	Story Map
Web Map	Timeline	Inference Map	Inference Map	T-Map	Inference Map	T-Map
		K-W-L	K-W-L	Venn	Story Map	Venn

		Chart	Chart	Diagram		Diagram
		Main Idea and Details Chart	Main Idea and Details Chart	Web	T-Map	Web
		Opinion Chart	Story Map		Venn Diagram	
		Story Map	T-Map		Web	
		T-Map	Venn Diagram			
		Timeline	Web			
		Venn Diagram				
		Web				

<<Insert screen shots of Grade 5, Unit 5, Lesson 21, Student Edition page 533 (flow chart/sequence); Grade 2, Unit 2, Lesson 9, Student Edition page 257 (3-column chart); Grade 4, Unit 4, Lesson 19, Student Edition page 477 (idea-support chart)>>

In addition, in *Journeys*, students are provided with opportunities to analyze the graphic features they encounter in texts. Considering how model texts employ graphics can help students think metacognitively about the value of using graphic organizers in their own planning, studying, thinking, and writing.

<<Insert screen shot of mini-lesson on Text and Graphic Features from online Lesson 14 Grade 4 -- [http://hnheducation.com/tx/journeys/pdf/02\\_4099\\_JOU\\_Comp-Lit-Guide-G4-HR-FF.pdf](http://hnheducation.com/tx/journeys/pdf/02_4099_JOU_Comp-Lit-Guide-G4-HR-FF.pdf)>>

### ***Predictable Routines in Journeys***

The *Journeys* program provides the predictable structure that research shows that learners need. Research has identified establishing predictable routines from the beginning of the year as one of the characteristics of highly effective teachers (Bohn, Roehrig, & Pressley, 2004) and the consistent structure of the *Journeys* program allows for teachers to do just that—establish effective, predictable routines from Day 1.

The work of Rosenshine and Stevens (1986) revealed that effective teachers in well-organized classrooms tend to follow similar predictable routines. They:

- Begin with a short review and statement of goals;
- Present new material in small steps;
- Give clear and detailed instructions and explanations;
- Provide time for guided and independent practice;
- Ask questions;
- Provide systematic feedback.

Each of these steps is clearly supported by the organization and components of the *Journeys* instructional program.

The **Suggested Weekly Focus** provides guidance for teachers in planning instruction that is predictably organized around whole-group, small-group, and independent learning. For example, see the suggestions for Grade 1, Lesson 1 below:

<<insert screen shot of Lesson 1 on page 9 from online PDF of grade 1  
<http://hnheducation.com/journeys/pdfs/Gr1CLLG.pdf> page 12 of 132>>

Note that this structure is followed in all subsequent lessons:

- Interactive Read-Aloud/Shared Reading
- Whole-Group Links
- Reading Minilessons
- Guided Reading
- Small-Group Links
- Literature Discussion
- Options for Independent Work
- Writing About Reading

The **Weekly Focus Wall** posters, one for each week of instruction, available on-line, in the Teacher’s Edition, and as full-size posters, provide a blueprint for weekly instruction and a weekly classroom look at the literature and skills that provide the focus for each week. The **Planning and Pacing Charts** ensure that instruction is organized around the kinds of predictable routines that research has shown are important for student learning.

In addition, the **Opening Routines** of each lesson are consistent so that students can anticipate what is coming next. In Kindergarten, the **Opening Routines** of each lesson include:

- Connect to the Essential Question
- Daily High-Frequency Words
- Daily Phonemic Awareness
- Daily Vocabulary Boost

In Grade 3, the **Opening Routines** of each lesson include:

- Connect to the Essential Question
- Daily Phonics
- Daily Vocabulary Boost

### *Collaborative Learning in Journeys*

Small-Group activities help students develop as readers based on their needs, challenges, and preferences. In *Journeys*, Small-Group Lessons include **Guided Reading** and **Literature**

**Discussions.** The **Leveled Readers** allow teachers to work with small groups who will benefit from teaching at a specific instructional level. In **Literature Discussion**, teachers bring together a small group of children, grouped not by ability but by interest in a topic, genre, or author.

Small-Group activities are an important part of the *Journeys* program. In the *Journeys Suggested Weekly Focus*, Small-Group Teaching occurs three to four days of every week. The *Journeys Teacher's Edition* has outlined **Ready-Made Work Stations** leveled activities and **Leveled Readers** that facilitate teachers' planning for Small-Group Teaching.

### *Whole-Group and Small-Group Instruction in Journeys*

The six different **Teacher's Editions** at each level of the *Journeys* program offer comprehensive instruction support in three different instructional contexts: Whole-Group Teaching, Small-Group Teaching, and Independent Literacy Work. Each *Journeys* lesson is organized around Whole-Group Lessons, Small-Group activities, and Independent activities.

<<insert graphic of W-G, S-G, and Ind. Learning from page 1 of the *Comprehensive Language and Literacy Guide* – see <http://hmheducation.com/journeys/pdfs/Gr1CLLG.pdf> and graphic is on page 4 of 132 of the pdf.>>

Whole-Group activities include **Interactive Read-Alouds** and **Reading Minilessons**. These activities lay the foundation for the day's instruction and give children the tools they need to apply what they learn in other contexts, including Small-Group and Independent learning activities. *Journeys* resources for Whole-Group Teaching include the **Student Book** and the **Teacher's Edition Read-Alouds**. The Whole-Group read-alouds allow for a shared foundation for all students (Fountas & Pinnel, 2006) while the minilessons provide the opportunity for focused instruction on a specific skill (Fountas & Pinnell, 2001).

Small-Group activities help students develop as readers based on their needs, challenges, and preferences. In *Journeys*, Small-Group Lessons include **Guided Reading** and **Literature Discussions**. The **Leveled Readers** allow teachers to work with small groups who will benefit from teaching at a specific instructional level and guide them by supporting their ability to use a variety of reading strategies (Fountas & Pinell, 1996, 2001). In **Literature Discussion**, teachers bring together a small group of children, grouped not by ability but by interest in a topic, genre, or author.

Small-Group activities are an important part of the *Journeys* program. In the *Journeys Suggested Weekly Focus*, Small-Group Teaching occurs three to four days of every week. The *Journeys Teacher's Edition* has outlined **Ready-Made Work Stations** leveled activities and **Leveled Readers** that facilitate teachers' planning for Small-Group Teaching.

Independent work includes meaningful and productive activities for students to do while the teacher is engaged in Small-Group Teaching. In the *Journeys* program, ideas for independent

reading and literacy work are provided in the **Suggested Weekly Focus**. For example, a prompt to link to the week’s reading is provided each week for students to work in their **Reader’s Notebooks**. The **Listening Center** provides an opportunity for individual students to listen to models of fluent reading. **Independent Reading** is also part of the *Journeys* program and has been shown to be the best way for students to develop reading skills. Resources that support Independent Learning in the *Journeys* program include the **Student Book Audiotext CD**, **Vocabulary in Context Cards**, and **Read-Made Work Stations**. The **Vocabulary in Context Cards** contain high-frequency words used in the week’s literature and student-friendly explanation and activities around these words. The *Journeys* **Ready-Made Work Stations** link to the week’s literature and skill in three strands of literacy instruction: comprehension and fluency, word study, and writing. Three different activities are provided on each card, providing children with multiple opportunities to practice the skill.

<<Insert screen shots of Grade 6, Unit 1, Teacher’s Edition (print) pages T10-T11 Unit 1 Lesson 1 – Ready-Made Work Stations here>>

### *Varied Forms of Communication in Journeys*

The *Journeys* program develops students’ skills and abilities in speaking, listening, reading, writing, and viewing. The previous sections of this report have thoroughly documented the ways in which reading is taught in the *Journeys* program. Speaking, listening, writing, and viewing are all developed in many ways throughout the levels of the program.

The **Reading-Writing Workshop** helps students develop their skills in planning, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing. The *Journeys* program guides students through all stages of the writing process – brainstorming, drafting, guided writing, independent writing, and shared writing. In addition, students develop in their abilities to write in different modes – to describe, to express, to inform, to narrate, to persuade, to respond. They develop their skills with the traits of effective writing – ideas, organization, voice, word choice, sentence fluency, and conventions.

Students gain practice with various forms of writing at every level of *Journeys*:

<b>Writing Forms in Journeys</b>						
<b>Grade K</b>	<b>Grade 1</b>	<b>Grade 2</b>	<b>Grade 3</b>	<b>Grade 4</b>	<b>Grade 5</b>	<b>Grade 6</b>
Captions	Captions	Compare/Contrast Paragraph	Autobiography	Cause-and-Effect Paragraph	Cause-and-Effect Paragraph	Book Review
Class Story	Descriptions	Description	Compare/Contrast Paragraph	Descriptive Paragraph	Character Description	Cause-and-Effect Paragraph
Descriptions	Dialogue	Descriptive Paragraph	Descriptive Paragraph	Dialogue	Compare-Contrast Paragraph	Commercial Script
Fictional Narrative	Labels	E-mail Message	Dialogue	Fictional Narrative	Descriptive Narrative	Compare-Contrast Paragraph

Invitation	Letters	Fictional Story	Fictional Narrative	Friendly Letter	Dialogue	Descriptive Paragraph
Labels	Opinion Paragraph	Friendly Letter	Friendly Letter	Journal Entry	Fictional Narrative	Dialogue
Lists	Personal Narrative	Informational Paragraph	Humorous Poem	Narrative Composition	Friendly Letter	Fictional Narrative
Personal Narratives	Poetry	Instructions	Instructions	Opinion Paragraph	Journal Entry	Fieldnotes
Poetry	Report	Opinion Paragraph	Narrative Poem	Personal Narrative	Narrative Paragraph	Friendly Letter
Report	Sentences	Persuasive Essay	Opinion Paragraph	Persuasive Essay	Opinion Paragraph	Informational Essay
Response to Literature	Stories	Persuasive Letter	Personal Narrative Paragraph	Persuasive Letter	Personal Narrative	Opinion Essay
Sentences	Summary	Persuasive Paragraph	Personal Narrative	Persuasive Paragraph	Personal Narrative Paragraph	Opinion Paragraph
	Thank-You Notes	Problem/Solution Paragraph	Persuasive Essay	Poetry	Persuasive Essay	Personal Narrative
		Research Report	Persuasive Letter	Prewrite	Persuasive Letter	Personal Narrative Paragraph
		Response Paragraph	Problem/Solution Paragraph	Problem-Solution Composition	Persuasive Paragraph	Persuasive Essay
		Response Poem	Research Report	Procedural Composition	Poem	Persuasive Letter
		Response to Literature	Response Paragraph	Public Service Announcement	Problem-Solution Paragraph	Poetry
		Story	Response to Literature	Research Report	Procedural Paragraph	Problem-Solution Paragraph
		Summary Paragraph	Story	Response to a Selection	Research Report	Research Report
		True Story	Summary Paragraph	Story	Response Essay	Story Scene
				Summary	Summary	Summary Paragraph

The *Journeys* **Read Alouds** (Day 1 of every lesson) provide regular opportunities for students to develop their listening comprehension skills. **Listening, Speaking, and Viewing** are further developed in varying ways at different levels in *Journeys*.

**Grade K Share Ideas and Share Information:** K-1: T297, T377 K-2: T57, T137, T217, T297, T377 K-3: T137, T217, T297, T377 K-4: T57, T137, T297, T377 K-5: T57, T137, T217, T297, T379 K-6: T57, T137, T217, T297, T379

In Grade 3, **Listening, Speaking, and Viewing** instruction focuses on:

- Compare and Contrast Media Messages
- Computer: Use the Internet
- Computer: Dictionary and Encyclopedia
- Computer: Review Internet Strategies
- Computer: Review of the Basics
- Follow and Give Directions
- Give a Speech
- Hold a Conversation or Discussion
- Interpret Poems
- Interview
- Listen Critically
- Listen for and Retell (Paraphrase) Main Ideas
- Listen to Compare and Contrast
- Listening for a Purpose
- Monitor Understanding and Ask Questions
- Organize Ideas for a Speech
- Presenting a Report
- Respond to Questions
- Retell a Story
- Use Nonverbal Cues
- Using Visuals

In Grade 6, **Listening, Speaking, and Viewing** instruction focuses on:

- Analyze and Evaluate Presentations
- Analyze Media Sources and Message
- Ask and Answer Questions
- Brainstorm Problems and Solutions
- Compare Print and Nonprint Information
- Conduct an Interview
- Create Visuals for Oral Presentation
- Deliver Oral Summaries
- Describe a Personal Experience
- Dramatize a Story
- Give and Follow Directions
- Give a Persuasive Speech
- Hold a Literature Discussion
- Hold a Debate
- Interpret Poetry
- Listen Critically: Persuasive Techniques
- Listen (for Information, for a Purpose, to Summarize)
- Make a Multimedia Presentation
- Organize Ideas for a Speech
- Prepare Interview Questions

- Viewing Symbols and Images

### *Engagement and Motivation in Journeys*

The *Journeys* program engages and motivates students by ensuring that all students will be interested in the texts and activities in the program and will proceed at their own levels so that they can all experience success in the program. Research supports the fact that highly effective teachers focus on supporting students' engagement and motivation in reading (Dolezal, Welsh, Pressley, & Vincent, 2003).

The many program features described in detail throughout this report contribute to students' engagement and motivation. Differentiated instruction, scaffolding for English language learners, the **I Do-We Do-You Do** scaffolded instruction, explicit strategies instruction, the combination of **Whole-Group**, **Small-Group**, and **Independent** learning activities, and the **Leveled Readers** all work together to ensure that students build a sense of self-efficacy as they work through the activities in the program. This sense of confidence ensures that students have the motivation to persist in learning.

In addition, high-interest texts, topics, and themes serve to engage readers throughout each level of the *Journeys* program.

## Strand 4: Teaching with Effective Texts

*It is essential to match readers with texts that support their learning at a particular point in time.  
A high-quality leveled book is your best tool for meeting readers where they are and moving  
them forward.*

(Fountas, 2010)

### Defining the Strand

The selection of appropriate, engaging, and varied texts is at the core of any reading program. For students to be engaged in reading—and motivated to persist in reading—the texts that teachers share with them must be at an appropriate instructional level and about an engaging topic and theme. In addition, the inclusion of varied genres exposes students to the different texts they will encounter in and out of school and develops their reading skills with multiple genres.

Leveled texts are an important tool for reading teachers. Texts that are too difficult will prove frustrating. An effective instructional program will match readers to engaging and age-appropriate texts that are written at the appropriate level for challenge without frustration. Students who believe they can learn persist in learning, and as a result learn more than peers who lack this sense of self-efficacy. Leveled texts can support this building of readers' confidence.

The use of engaging texts, too, is essential. Texts that are inappropriate or uninteresting for students will disengage them from the comprehension process. High-interest books will engage and motivate students.

Varied genres are another essential in an effective reading program. Genre instruction is a powerful tool for helping children develop the competencies of effective readers and writers. An effective program will include a wide variety of text genres to broaden students' abilities to enjoy, comprehend, and respond to varied texts. In addition, exposure to varied texts will prepare students for the kinds of reading they will need to be able to do to be college and career ready. The *Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects* do not focus just on requirements for English language arts, but also pay attention to the kinds of literacy skills and understandings students need for success in multiple disciplines. Among these is reading across genres (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2010a).

Through the *Journeys* Big Books (K-1), Leveled Readers, Decodable Readers (K-2), Core Readers (1-2), Trade Books, Magazines (3+), and Student Anthology (3+) the *Journeys* program provides leveled texts in varied genres and with topics and themes designed to engage and motivate all readers.

## Research that Guided the Development of the *Journeys* program

### *Leveled Texts*

Matching instructional demand with students' levels of skill and ability is crucial to student engagement, motivation, and learning. Matching the instructional activity with the learner's level has sometimes been referred to as the Goldilocks principle—activities should be not too hard or not too easy, but just right for learning to occur (VanLehn, Graesser, Jackson, Jordan, Olney, & Rose, 2007; Metcalfe & Kornell, 2005; Wolfe, Schreiner, Rehder, Laham, Foltz, Kintsch, & Landauer, 1998; Morris, Blanton, Blanton, Nowacek, & Perney, 1995). This match is particularly important for students with learning difficulties (Baker, Clark, Maier, & Viger, 1981) and for ELL students (Short & Fitzsimmons, 2007).

Cognitive science shows that the brain learns optimally when people are challenged, but shuts down when it perceives that the task or goal is impossible to meet (Caine & Caine, 1997a). In reading instruction, leveled texts can mean the difference between learners shutting down versus learners perceiving the challenge as appropriate. Leveling the difficulty of texts assists students in learning to read (Clay, 1991). According to Snow, Burns, and Griffin (1998) “regardless of a child’s reading ability, if too many of the words of a text are problematic, both comprehension and reading growth itself are impeded” (p. 213). Finely leveled texts can also provide the scaffolding struggling readers need to achieve step-by-step success and build their confidence.

### *Varied Genres*

Research suggests that the approaches students take to reading and comprehending fiction and nonfiction texts differ, and that students need experiences with and instruction in reading both kinds of texts. A majority of reading that students will do in school and in work is nonfiction. In an effective literacy program, students need exposure to high-quality fiction *and* nonfiction texts. “Part of the motivation behind the interdisciplinary approach to literacy promulgated by the Standards is extensive research establishing the need for college and career ready students to be proficient in reading complex informational text ... The Standards are not alone in calling for a special emphasis on informational text. The 2009 reading framework of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) requires a high and increasing proportion of informational text on its assessment as students advance through the grades.” (Common Core Standards Initiative, 2010a, p. 4)

Because classrooms today incorporate an expanded variety of texts, students need to be supported in learning how to read across multiple texts.” (Ogle & Blachowicz, 2002, p. 270) Content-area teachers lack the expertise to effectively teach reading, therefore, the responsibility to teach content-area reading skills and strategies often falls to the English teacher—who can use support him or herself in teaching reading of these kinds of texts (ACT, 2007)

Because the structures of content-area texts differ from narrative texts, comprehension strategies for one do not necessarily transfer to the other. For this reason, explicit instruction in multiple genres is helpful. Williams (2005) conducted a series of studies and found that at-risk students were able to transfer what they learned to new texts when they were given explicit instruction with a focus on text structure.

### *Engaging Topics and Themes*

Texts used in the classroom should engage students' interest and motivate them to continue reading. Studies have shown a high correlation between personal interest and text learning—and these findings hold up “for both short and long text, narratives and expository text, younger and older students, and students with high or low reading ability.” (Schiefele, 1999, p. 265) Students who are interested in what they are reading are mentally engaged (Hidi & Boscolo, 2006); in their study, Guthrie, Hoa, Wigfield, Tonks, Humenick, and Littles (2007) found that “interest and positive affect for reading invariably were associated with high cognitive recall and comprehension of text.” (p. 306) The use of interesting texts has been shown to increase students' generalized motivation for learning (Guthrie, Hoa, Wigfield, Tonks, & Perencevich, 2006)

Well-written nonfiction texts on topics of interest and fiction with interesting characters, exciting plots, and familiar themes will engage readers. Other properties of texts that have been shown to increase student interest include interesting topics (Schiefele, 1999; Fountas & Pinnell, 1996, 2001, 2006), appealing format (Schraw, Bruning, & Svobada, 1995), relevance (Schraw & Dennison, 1994), and appropriate language and complexity (Fountas & Pinnell, 1996, 2001, 2006).

## From Research to Practice

### *Leveled Texts in Journeys*

The **Leveled Readers** form an essential core of the *Journeys* program. The opportunity for teachers to provide this type of leveled support for students reading on, below, or above grade level is critical to the effectiveness of the *Journeys* instructional program.

These **Leveled Readers**:

- Were created and leveled by Irene Fountas.
- Are leveled by Guided Reading, DRA, and Lexile levels.
- Are packaged by Struggling Reader, On-Level, or Challenge Strands, or by Guided Reading Level.
- Contain 75% nonfiction and informational text.
- Provide running records.

Using the *Journeys* **Leveled Readers Database**, teachers can search among these **Leveled Readers** for those which best meet the needs of their students—by guided reading level, by topic, by skill, or by content area.

Each of the over 600 readers throughout the program is accompanied by an eight-page **Leveled Reader Teacher’s Guide**. These guides are designed to support these readers in a small-group setting and to promote:

- Thinking Within the Text
- Thinking Beyond the Text
- Thinking About the Text
- Writing About Reading
- English Language Development
- Phrased, Fluent Reading

These guides include essential information to facilitate instruction, including a selection summary, an overview of the text, a suggestion for activating students’ background knowledge, target vocabulary and definitions, and suggestions for discussing the text to get students to think within, beyond, and about the text. In addition, the plans include writing prompts, instructional strategies for ELL students, and suggestions for generating critical responses to the texts.

<<Insert screen shot of Leveled Readers Teacher’s Guides – include multiple pages from one guide to show different components.>>

Online, these **Leveled Readers** can become part of the individualized or small-group instructional plans through the on-line **Things To Do** feature. In addition, students can take advantage of the option to listen to readers orally as they follow along with the print in the online version. This ability to listen to a text read orally while following along with the print text is

supported by research; presenting words orally allows students to process “text” through their auditory channel as they process the print text through their visual channel. This finding that students learn better from visuals plus narration is termed the Modality Principle and has been supported through numerous studies of multimedia learning (Mayer, 2001).

### *Varied Genres in Journeys*

Genre instruction is an important element of the *Journeys* program. The program includes texts in varied genres at each level as shown here:

<b>Genres in Journeys</b>						
<b>Grade K</b>	<b>Grade 1</b>	<b>Grade 2</b>	<b>Grade 3</b>	<b>Grade 4</b>	<b>Grade 5</b>	<b>Grade 6</b>
Fable	Biography	Article	Animal Fantasy	Advertisement	Article	Autobiography
Fairy Tale	Fable	Biography	Biography	Biography	Autobiography	Biography
Fantasy	Fantasy	Fable	Fable	Expository Nonfiction	Biography	Fantasy
Informational Text	Folktale	Fantasy	Fairy Tale	Fable	Expository Nonfiction	Folktale
Poetry	Informational Text	Fiction	Fantasy	Fairy Tale	Historical Fiction	Historical Fiction
Realistic Fiction	Mystery	Folktale and Traditional Literature	Fiction	Fantasy	Humorous Fiction	Informational Text
Trickster Tales	Narrative Nonfiction	Humorous Fiction	Folktale	Folktale	Informational Text	Myth
	Poetry	Informational Text	Historical Fiction	Historical Fiction	Mystery	Mystery
	Realistic Fiction	Narrative Nonfiction	Humorous Fiction	Informational Text	Myth	Narrative Nonfiction
		Play	Informational Text	Mystery	Narrative Nonfiction	Opinion Essay
		Poetry	Legend	Narrative Nonfiction	Persuasive Speech	Play
		Readers' Theater	Myth	Persuasion	Persuasive Text	Poetry
		Realistic Fiction	Plays	Photo Essay	Play	Readers' Theater
			Poetry	Play	Poetry	Realistic Fiction
			Readers' Theater	Poetry	Readers' Theater	Science Fiction
			Realistic Fiction	Readers' Theater	Realistic Fiction	
			Traditional Tales	Realistic Fiction	Science Fiction	
				Science Fiction		
				Tall Tale		
				Traditional Tale		
				Trickster Tale		

The program provides instruction for students on genre characteristics and provides in the **Teacher’s Edition**, teaching points, questions, and materials to assist teachers in teaching about genre. The questions and teaching points provided can be used over and over across the year as students encounter different genres and increasingly difficult texts within a certain genre.

<<Insert screen shots of pages 101 through 111 in the *Journeys Comprehensive Language and Literacy Guide* (pages 104 – 114 in the PDF):

<http://hmeducation.com/journeys/pdfs/Gr1CLLG.pdf>>>

Research has shown that explicitly teaching the structures of a text—in this study, story structures—improves students’ comprehension and recall (Stevens, Van Meter, & Warcholak, 2010). For an example of how genre instruction is modeled in specific lessons in the *Journeys* program, see these examples of fable and of poetry from Lesson 1 in the Grade 1 **Whole-Group Lessons**.

<<insert screen shot of grade 1 page 41 from online pdf of the *Journeys Comprehensive Language and Literacy Guide*: <http://hmeducation.com/journeys/pdfs/Gr1CLLG.pdf> page 44 of 132.>>

And these examples informational text and folktale from Lesson 15 in the Grade 6 **Whole-Group Lessons**.

<<insert screen shot of grade 6, pdf page 14 of 16 from the online version of the *Journeys Comprehensive Language and Literacy Guide*:

<http://hmeducation.com/journeys/pdfs/clg/Gr6CLGsampler.pdf>>>

The *Journeys* program also comes with **Suggested Trade Book Titles** for each grade level – Kindergarten through grade 6. Each list includes an annotated bibliography organized by genre, including such genres as biography, fantasy, historical fiction, informational text, mystery, poetry, realistic fiction, science fiction, and traditional tales. In addition, each list also includes icons for easy identification to point out which texts are considered classic texts and which texts would be particularly effective for teaching science, social studies, music, math, or art.

<<Include sample pages from grades K, 3, and 6 – see

[http://hmeducation.com/journeys/pdfs/Journeys\\_CLLG\\_Trade\\_Titles\\_K.pdf](http://hmeducation.com/journeys/pdfs/Journeys_CLLG_Trade_Titles_K.pdf);

[http://hmeducation.com/journeys/pdfs/Journeys\\_CLLG\\_Trade\\_Titles\\_3.pdf](http://hmeducation.com/journeys/pdfs/Journeys_CLLG_Trade_Titles_3.pdf);

[http://hmeducation.com/journeys/pdfs/Journeys\\_CLLG\\_Trade\\_Titles\\_6.pdf](http://hmeducation.com/journeys/pdfs/Journeys_CLLG_Trade_Titles_6.pdf)>>

This attention to varied genres—and to literacy in the content areas—is an emphasis of the *Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects* (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2010a) and is reinforced in different ways through the *Journeys* program.

### *Engaging Topics and Themes in Journeys*

The reading selections and books in *Journeys* were selected and written with the purpose of engaging young readers. The fiction and nonfiction texts tell engaging stories and inform students about interesting topics.

In Kindergarten, students are engaged through the *Journeys* **Big Books, Leveled Readers, Decodable Books**, and suggested **Trade Books**. In grades 1 and 2, students read **Core Readers, Decodable Readers, Leveled Readers, Big Books, and Trade Books**. In grades 3 through 6, the **Student Anthology/Core Readers, Leveled Readers, Adventure Unit Magazines, and Trade Books** engage students and spark their curiosity to learn more.

The final unit for grades 3 through 6 is called the *Journeys* **Adventure Unit**. This unit serves as an end-of-year review of the major comprehension skills and strategies and the vocabulary essential for growth in the coming year. The **Adventure Unit** is a student magazine designed to be high-interest and engaging for students at these grade levels.

Each of the eight-page lessons plans, provided for each of the leveled readers, provides additional details about the **Characteristics of the Text** that can aid teachers in selecting texts that will be particularly engaging to their students. This **Characteristics of the Text** table provides details about the genre, structure, content, themes and ideas, and complexity of the text.

<<Could include screen shot here of the covers of Leveled Readers – fanned across each other (don't need full shot of cover separately) from various grade levels to give sense of engaging topics/themes and engaging age-appropriate graphics used>>

## Strand 5: Connecting Writing and Reading

*We have long known that the amount of reading and writing children do is directly related to how well they read and write. Classrooms in which all the students learned to read and write are classrooms in which the teachers gave more than ‘lip service’ to the importance of actually engaging in reading and writing. They planned their time so that children did a lot of reading and writing throughout the day—not just in the 100 minutes set aside for reading and language arts.*

(Cunningham & Allington, 2007, 7)

### Defining the Strand

Reading and writing are connected—at the word level (word recognition, spelling) and at the text level (comprehension, composition) (Berninger, Abbott, Abbott, Graham, & Richards, 2002). Reading and writing share a bidirectional relationship; writing instruction improves reading comprehension and reading instruction improves composition (Shanahan, 2006). Students who write about what they read show more evidence of critical thinking and students who read show improved composition (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006). Integrating reading and writing has been shown to increase word learning (Baker, Simmons, & Kame’enui, 1995b; Klesius & Searls, 1991); support ELL students (Francis, Rivera, Lesaux, Kieffer, & Rivera, 2006a); improve revision (MacArthur, 2007); and positively impact the quality of students’ independent writing (Corden, 2007). This integrated model of literacy is apparent in the *Common Core Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects*; “although the Standards are divided into ... strands for conceptual clarity, the processes of communication are closely connected...[and require] that students be able to write about what they read.” (Common Core Standards Initiative, 2010a, 4)

Effective integrated reading-writing instruction incorporates several components. First, students study language at the sentence level and study grammar. In grammar study, connections to the context of authentic writing help students better write and edit their own work (Hillocks, 1986; Weaver, 1997). Second, students write for purposes that are relevant and meaningful. And, third, students write in multiple genres that mirror the genres to which they are exposed in reading. In genre study, students who are exposed to different genres are able to analyze these examples and “to emulate the critical elements, patterns, and forms embodied in the models in their own writing.” (Graham & Perin, 2007, p. 20) Because all genres are not equally familiar, instruction in varied genres is important (Downing, 1995; Lenski & Johns, 2000).

The National Commission on Writing (2003) found that most students do not possess the writing skills they need and that writing must take a central place in instruction. The *Journeys* program effectively integrates reading and writing instruction throughout each level of the program to develop these much-needed skills in writing. In *Journeys*, grammar and writing instruction occur every day.

## Research that Guided the Development of the *Journeys* program

### *Grammar Instruction*

While regular writing improves overall writing ability (Ball, 2006), instruction in the varied elements of quality writing, including grammar, must take place if students are going to be competent and effective communicators. Such instruction is most beneficial and effective when presented as part of writing assignments and activities that are meaningful to students (Fearn & Farnan, 2005; Hillocks, 1986; Polette, 2008; Weaver, 1997). Students who are taught grammar when working on a specific piece of writing show a greater application than do those students taught grammar as a separate activity (Calkins, 1994; Spandel, 2001).

Some specific instructional techniques have been shown by research to be particularly effective in improving students' writing. In *Writing Next*, Graham and Perin (2007) identified sentence combining as one of the 11 effective, research-based elements or strategies. The sentence-combining approach has been shown to be effective with elementary school students (Saddler & Graham, 2005) and English language learners (Francis, Rivera, Lesaux, Kieffer, & Rivera, 2006b).

### *Writing for a Purpose*

We write for specific purposes, so it follows that to teach students to write, teachers must embed writing instruction in meaningful and varied purposes. For students to develop the writing skills they will need in their future academic and work experiences, they must learn to write for varied meaningful and useful purposes (Kihara, Graham, & Hawken, 2009; Applebee & Langer, 2006).

Researchers have identified writing to persuade, to inform, to describe, and to convey research findings as essential purposes for writing for success in school and work (ACT, 2005; National Commission on Writing, 2005; National Commission on Writing, 2004). The 2011 NAEP framework (National Assessment Governing Board, 2010) and the Common Core Standards (Common Core Standards Initiative, 2010a) both highlight the need for students to produce texts for varied purposes. In NAEP, at the elementary level, students are asked to write to persuade, to explain, and to convey experience.

### *Distribution of the Communicative Purposes by Grade in the 2011 NAEP Writing Framework*

<b>Grade</b>	<b>To Persuade</b>	<b>To Explain</b>	<b>To Convey Experience</b>
<b>4</b>	30%	35%	35%
<b>8</b>	35%	35%	30%
<b>12</b>	40%	40%	20%

### *Writing in Varied Genres*

Instruction in the varied forms of writing and their structures is important, as students are not equally familiar with all genres of writing (Downing, 1995; Lenski & Johns, 2000). The ability to think and write across disciplines is needed (Atwell, 1989) to meet 21<sup>st</sup> century demands which require that students become proficient writers able to flexibly adapt their writing to varied genres and contexts. The ability to produce various types of writing is an important element of the Common Core standards (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2010a).

In a synthesis of research on effective instructional strategies for teaching writing in the elementary grades, Chapman (2006) concluded that an emphasis on both process *and* product is essential for developing writers with the skills and flexibility to produce varied genres. One essential to effective writing instruction is “directing attention to textual features...to help children develop ‘genre awareness’...” (39)

Writing instruction is particularly effective when teachers sequence the modes of writing according to their connection or immediacy to the writer (Langer, 1986a; Moffet, 1965, 1981, 1983). For this reason, beginning with personal writing—descriptive and narrative—engages students who are then ready to develop informational pieces, which require investigation, and finally to more cognitively challenging persuasive or argumentative writing (Moffett, 1981, 1983). While a thoughtful sequence of instruction supports students with these varied genres, this is not to suggest that all students are not capable of writing in different genres. Research demonstrates that young writers and struggling older writers can learn to write in varied types of genres (Harris, Graham, & Mason, 2006).

Engaging students in a variety of meaningful writing activities has been shown to improve their writing skills. In their analysis of NAEP data, Applebee and Langer (2006) found a correlation between the quality of students writing and the types of writing they had been assigned to do in the classroom.

## From Research to Practice

### *Grammar Instruction in Journeys*

In *Journeys*, grammar instruction is embedded in the context of reading and writing. Students learn concepts and rules of grammar through their own and others' writing.

Grammar instruction follows the same teach, review, connect pattern that is followed elsewhere throughout the *Journeys* program. New concepts are taught, and learned concepts are reviewed to reinforce learning and make connections between what is newly learned and what is being retained.

<<Insert Grade 6, Unit 6, pages T218-T219 – Days 1-5 overview of punctuation.>>

In grades 1 through 6, a two-page spread on grammar is a part of each lesson in the student's **Core Reader**. The left page shows a grammar rule with a graphic organizer and suggestions for applying the skill through a **Turn and Talk** discussion or a **Try This!** activity; the right page connects this grammar rule with a writing application.

<<Insert screen shots of Grade 5 Student Book/Core Reader – pages 554-555 – Grammar lesson on the verbs *be* and *have*>>

**Projectables** and the student **Practice Books** offer an easy way for teachers to introduce grammar concepts and provide the opportunity for students to practice and apply concepts.

<<Insert screen shot of Prepositions projectable from Grade 4 18.6>>

**Daily Proofreading Practice** provides a quick, daily opportunity for students to apply their skills.

<<Insert screen shot of Grade 5, Unit 5, Lesson 22, page T122 – Grammar – Perfect Tenses – if possible circle the Daily Proofreading Practice, but include a small image of the whole page.>>

*Journeys* **Digital, Destination Reading**, offers additional grammar activities aligned with lessons for additional practice.

Throughout the *Journeys* program, students receive comprehensive instruction in all the grammar concepts and skills they need to be clear and effective writers and editors.

<b>Grammar in Journeys</b>						
<b>Grade K</b>	<b>Grade 1</b>	<b>Grade 2</b>	<b>Grade 3</b>	<b>Grade 4</b>	<b>Grade 5</b>	<b>Grade 6</b>
Adjectives	Action Parts of Sentences	Abbreviations	Abbreviations	Abbreviations	Abbreviations	Articles and Demonstratives
Exclamatory Sentences	Adjectives	Action Verbs	Adjectives	Adjectives	Adjectives	Proper Adjectives
Nouns (Singular)	Adverbs	Adjectives	Articles	Adverbs	Adverbs	Appositives

and Plural)						
Prepositions	Contractions	Adverbs	Adverbs	Complete Sentences	Commas	Clauses
Pronouns	Exclamations	Commas (in Series, Dates and Places, and Sentences)	Capitalization	Conjunctions	Comparisons	Coordinating Conjunctions
Proper Nouns	Naming Parts of Sentences	Complete Sentences	Contractions	Contractions	Conjunctions	Subordinating Conjunctions
Punctuation	Nouns (Singular and Plural)	Contractions	Forming the Past Tense	Negatives	Contractions	Contractions
Questions	Prepositions and Prepositional Phrases	Irregular Verbs	Irregular Verbs	Nouns	Direct and Indirect Objects	Making Comparisons
Sentences	Pronouns	Nouns (Singular and Plural, Possessive, Proper)	Nouns (Plural, Possessive, Proper)	Participles	Negatives	Nouns (Common, Proper, Possessive, Singular, Plural)
Subjects and Verbs	Proper Nouns	Prepositions	Prepositions	Prepositions	Nouns (Common and Proper, Possessive, Singular and Plural)	Objects (Direct and Indirect)
Subject-Verb Agreement	Punctuation	Pronouns	Pronouns	Prepositional Phrases	Prepositions and Prepositional Phrases	Phrases
Tenses	Questions	Quotation Marks	Punctuation	Pronouns	Pronouns	Prepositions
Verbs	Sentences	Statements and Questions	Sentence Fragments	Proper Mechanics	Proper Mechanics	Progressive Forms (Past, Present, Future)
	Statements	Subject-Verb Agreement	Sentence Run-Ons	Punctuation	Punctuation	Pronouns (Demonstrative, Indefinite, Interrogative, Possessive, Reflexive, Subject and Object)
	Subjects and Verbs	Subjects and Predicates	Subjects and Predicates	Subjects and Predicates	Quotations	Punctuation (Colons, Commas, End, Semicolons)
	Tenses	Verb <i>to be</i>	Subject-Verb Agreement	Tenses	Sentences (Complete, Complex, Compound)	Sentences (Complete, Complex, Compound, Compound-

						Complex)
	Verb ( <i>to be</i> and other verbs)	Verbs (Past, Present, and Future)	Tenses	Titles	Subjects and Predicates	Interjections
			Verbs	Transitions	Tenses (Past, Perfect, Present, Simple)	Subject-Verb Agreement
				Verbs	Transitions	Subjects and Predicates
					Verbs	Tenses
					Voice (Active and Passive)	Titles and Abbreviations
						Verbs (Action, Linking, Main, Regular and Irregular, Transitive and Intransitive)
						Voice (Active, Passive)

### *Writing for a Purpose in Journeys*

In the **Reading-Writing Workshop** model followed by *Journeys*, weekly writing lessons are based around a purpose for writing – write to narrate, write to inform, write to express, write to persuade, write to respond.

The *Journeys* program includes suggested prompts for each week’s reading on the **Suggested Weekly Focus** page for students to write in a Reader’s Notebook and record their responses to the reading. Each lesson also includes a writing activity, such as the one shown below, in which students write to persuade:

<<insert screen shot of the Grade 6, Unit 6, Lesson 29, Your Turn assignment – preferably Student Edition pages 64-65>>

Each of the over 600 readers throughout the program is accompanied by an eight-page **Leveled Reader Teaching Plan** designed to support readers. Each of these plans includes a section on **Writing about Reading** which provides a Writing Prompt which invites students to write and think about what they have read. Writing about what they have read in this way helps students to expand their thinking, construct knowledge and generate new thinking, and clarify their understandings.

The *Journeys* **Ready-Made Work Stations** link to the week’s literature and skills and provide a weekly writing activity for students.

<<Insert screen shot of left side of the page in Grade 2, Unit 1, Lesson 1, T11 – Think and Write Read-Made Work Stations.>>

To gain additional practice in writing for varying purposes, *Journeys WriteSmart* provides electronic support for grades 2 and up students’ writing through interactive student models, interactive graphic organizers, interactive revision lessons, and editable rubrics for different modes of and purposes for writing.

### *Writing Varied Genres in Journeys*

The **Reading-Writing Workshop** for grades 1 and up introduces writing activities that are done for specific purposes which vary by genre and include spiraled traits for reinforcement as students progress within and across grade levels.

<b>Writing Forms in Journeys</b>						
<b>Grade K</b>	<b>Grade 1</b>	<b>Grade 2</b>	<b>Grade 3</b>	<b>Grade 4</b>	<b>Grade 5</b>	<b>Grade 6</b>
Captions	Captions	Compare/Contrast Paragraph	Autobiography	Cause-and-Effect Paragraph	Cause-and-Effect Paragraph	Book Review
Class Story	Descriptions	Description	Compare/Contrast Paragraph	Descriptive Paragraph	Character Description	Cause-and-Effect Paragraph
Descriptions	Dialogue	Descriptive Paragraph	Descriptive Paragraph	Dialogue	Compare-Contrast Paragraph	Commercial Script
Fictional Narrative	Labels	E-mail Message	Dialogue	Fictional Narrative	Descriptive Narrative	Compare-Contrast Paragraph
Invitation	Letters	Fictional Story	Fictional Narrative	Friendly Letter	Dialogue	Descriptive Paragraph
Labels	Opinion Paragraph	Friendly Letter	Friendly Letter	Journal Entry	Fictional Narrative	Dialogue
Lists	Personal Narrative	Informational Paragraph	Humorous Poem	Narrative Composition	Friendly Letter	Fictional Narrative
Personal Narratives	Poetry	Instructions	Instructions	Opinion Paragraph	Journal Entry	Fieldnotes
Poetry	Report	Opinion Paragraph	Narrative Poem	Personal Narrative	Narrative Paragraph	Friendly Letter
Report	Sentences	Persuasive Essay	Opinion Paragraph	Persuasive Essay	Opinion Paragraph	Informational Essay
Response to Literature	Stories	Persuasive Letter	Personal Narrative Paragraph	Persuasive Letter	Personal Narrative	Opinion Essay
Sentences	Summary	Persuasive Paragraph	Personal Narrative	Persuasive Paragraph	Personal Narrative Paragraph	Opinion Paragraph
	Thank-You Notes	Problem/Solution Paragraph	Persuasive Essay	Poetry	Persuasive Essay	Personal Narrative
		Research Report	Persuasive Letter	Prewrite	Persuasive Letter	Personal Narrative Paragraph

		Response Paragraph	Problem/Solution Paragraph	Problem-Solution Composition	Persuasive Paragraph	Persuasive Essay
		Response Poem	Research Report	Procedural Composition	Poem	Persuasive Letter
		Response to Literature	Response Paragraph	Public Service Announcement	Problem-Solution Paragraph	Poetry
		Story	Response to Literature	Research Report	Procedural Paragraph	Problem-Solution Paragraph
		Summary Paragraph	Story	Response to a Selection	Research Report	Research Report
		True Story	Summary Paragraph	Story	Response Essay	Story Scene
				Summary	Summary	Summary Paragraph

## Strand 6: Meeting All Students' Needs through Differentiation and Strategic Intervention

*Optimal learning takes place within students' "zones of proximal development"—when teachers assess students' current understanding and teach new concepts, skills, and strategies at an according level.*

(Vygotsky, 1978)

### Defining the Strand

Effective instruction successfully meets the needs of students with a wide range of ability levels and backgrounds. Effective teachers differentiate instruction. Effective curricular programs address the needs of struggling students, advanced learners, and English language learners. A wide body of research supports the idea that for learning to occur, learning activities must match the level of the learner (Tomlinson & Allan, 2000).

Any reader can struggle with a particular text. The struggling readers who need differentiated instruction, though, are the ones who struggle with most texts—those who lack the strategies to make sense of what they read and the engagement to persist in what they read. High-quality instruction for these students includes authentic purposes for reading and writing across content areas, the use of specific scaffolds, and lessons that teach essential strategies (Collins, 1998; Cunningham & Allington, 2007). Increasing these students' motivation is also essential.

Students for whom English is a second language vary widely in their academic success, but for many, developing English proficiency and meeting grade-level expectations is a struggle. English language learners (ELLs) “require effective instructional approaches and interventions to prevent further difficulties and to augment and support their academic development.” (Francis, Rivera, Lesaux, Kieffer, & Rivera, 2006a, 1)

For advanced learners, teachers must work to ensure that these students continue to progress—and to feel engaged and challenged. Differentiating instruction for these students can involve increasing pacing, providing extra opportunities for independent practice and exploration, and extending lessons to make them appropriately challenging.

In the *Journeys* program, specific suggestions and materials for differentiation support each of these groups. Strategic intervention materials include **Write-In Readers** and **Intervention Toolkits**. ELLs are supported through **Language Support Cards** and **English Language Learner Leveled Readers**. Advanced learners are challenged through leveled texts and small-group instruction tailored to their levels of readiness. More specifics on how *Journeys* supports each of these populations is provided in the following sections of this report.

## Research that Guided the Development of the *Journeys* program

### *Struggling Readers*

As stated above, struggling readers are those who lack the skills in phonics and decoding to read, lack the strategies to comprehend what they read, and lack the engagement to persist in reading.

For these students, demonstrations of effective strategy use and continued opportunities to apply strategies learned are essential components of effective instruction (Cunningham & Allington, 2007; Allington, 2001; Fielding & Pearson, 1994; Armbruster, Anderson, & Ostertag, 1987; Raphael & Pearson, 1985; Baumann, 1984). Struggling readers benefit from the same instructional strategies from which all learners benefit, but also benefit from more intensive instruction on skills (Au, 2002). Graphic organizers and predictable learning sequences have been shown to be effective with struggling learners (Collins, 1998) as have integrating reading and writing, setting authentic purposes for literacy activities, and providing consistently high-quality classroom instruction (Cunningham & Allington, 2007).

All struggling readers do not struggle for the same reasons. They differ in their needs for instruction. Some need additional instruction in phonics, decoding and word recognition. Others need instruction focused more closely on comprehension strategies (Pressley, Gaskins, & Fingeret, 2006). What these students do not need is slowed-down instruction which will ensure that they remain behind their peers (Allington & Walmsley, 1995).

Increasing the motivation of struggling readers is particularly important because of the close connection between motivation and reading achievement, as discussed in the earlier section of this report on engagement and motivation.

### *English Language Learners*

English language learners benefit from the same kinds of effective instructional strategies from which all learners benefit (Chiappe & Siegel, 2006; Proctor, Carlo, August, & Snow, 2005). The five key components of reading, as identified by the National Reading Panel (2000), are clearly helpful to second language learners—including instruction in phonemic awareness and phonics (Mathes, Pollard-Durodola, Cárdenas-Hagan, Linan-Thompson, & Vaughn, 2007), fluency, comprehension, and vocabulary—as is explicit instruction in oral language and in writing strategies and structures (August & Shanahan, 2006; Vaughn, Mathes, Linan-Thompson, & Francis, 2005). Francis, Rivera, Lesaux, Kieffer, and Rivera (2006a) suggest that while the first two are particularly important for early readers, the last three components are critical during all stages of reading development. Explicit instruction in strategies for comprehension are an important part of an instructional plan for these students, and has been shown to lead to higher levels of comprehension among these students (Klingner & Vaughn, 2004). Grammar instruction, embedded in the context of writing experiences, has been shown to benefit these

students as well (Scarcella, 2003). And, the use of technology—including word processing—has been shown to be beneficial as well (Silver & Repa, 1993).

In addition, English language learners (ELLs) have some specific instructional needs. Added instructional time, through grouping or other arrangements, benefits these students (Linan-Thompson, Cirino, & Vaughn, 2007). Additional instruction in vocabulary—and specifically in *academic language*—benefits these students (Francis, Rivera, Lesaux, Kieffer, & Rivera, 2006a; Carlo et al., 2004; Zimmerman, 1997; Rousseau, Tam, & Ramnarain, 1993; Perez, 1981). While ELLs are likely to acquire conversational English easily, academic language is most likely acquired through direct instruction and classroom experiences (Teale, 2009; Jacobson, Lapp, & Flood, 2007; August & Shanahan, 2006). Instruction that is multimodal, that is, instruction which connects the visual and the verbal, appears to lead to achievement gains among this population (Early & Marshall, 2008; McGinnis, 2007). In addition, the work of Short and Fitzsimmons (2007) revealed nine promising practices for developing literacy among ELLs:

1. Integrated reading, writing, listening, and speaking instruction
2. Explicit instruction in the components and processes of reading and writing
3. Direct instruction in reading comprehension strategies
4. A focus on vocabulary development
5. Development and activation of background knowledge
6. Theme- and content-based language instruction
7. Strategic use of native language
8. Integrated technology use
9. Increasing motivation through choice

### *Advanced Learners*

Like English language learners and struggling learners, advanced learners require differentiation in their instruction as well. Those who are advanced in the subject need to be sufficiently engaged to be motivated to continue to challenge themselves. Differentiation in activities and delivery can accomplish this purpose (Rogers, 2007; Tomlinson, 1995, 1997; VanTassel-Baska & Brown, 2007), as can centering activities around issues, problems, and themes that are of interest and relevant to these children (VanTassel-Baska & Brown, 2007).

A number of practices have been identified by research as particularly effective with this population of students. A learning environment with the following characteristics has been demonstrated to be effective for advanced learners:

- On-going assessment of students, in varied modes likely to give students the most opportunity to demonstrate their knowledge and skill;
- Multiple learning options and varied instructional strategies;
- Variable pacing;
- Engaging tasks for all learners; and

- Flexible grouping (Tomlinson, 1995).

Rogers (2007) adds that advanced learners need daily challenge, opportunities to work with peers, and varied instructional delivery. Additionally, while group work and working with peers are beneficial for these students, independent learning is a key to an effective instructional program to challenge these advanced learners. Research suggests that “gifted learners are significantly more likely to prefer independent study, independent project, and self-instructional materials.” (Rogers, 2002) So, whole group, small group, and independent activities will all serve specific purposes in meeting the needs of these students.

## From Research to Practice

### *Struggling Readers in Journeys*

The *Journeys* program was designed to support the learning of all students. The effective instructional practices throughout the program support struggling readers in multiple ways and provide guidance for implementing daily individualized instruction with struggling readers. The authors of *Journeys* recognize that while “ambitious outcomes are appropriate for all students, one-size-fits-all instruction is not the best we can do.” (Lipson, 2011) In the *Journeys* program, **Write-In Readers** provide intervention for readers who struggle (those reading at a year or more below reading level) and **Reading Tool Kits** provide targeted skill-based intervention. The **Week at a Glance** at the beginning of each lesson provides an overview of the week’s strategic intervention instruction—which is then elaborated more fully in the back of the Teacher’s Edition, where the **Teal Intervention Tabs** provide specific suggestions for strategic intervention to meet the needs of struggling readers.

The **Write-In Readers** are provided for students in grades 1 and up and are provided both in print and as an online experience. Each **Stop, Think, Write** activity is designed to support and reinforce the key skill or strategy. **Look Back and Respond** pages offer hints that help children search the text for key information.

Online, the *Journeys* program provides the kinds of listening and reading support from which research shows that struggling readers benefit. The **Write-In Reader Online** is at the heart of *Journeys* intervention strategy. Online, students can listen to the selections at a slower speed and at a fluent reading speed. Whiteboard features and hints provided online support students as they go deeper into texts to increase their comprehension.

The *Journeys* **Reading Tool Kits** allow for targeted intervention in specific skills.

In the Primary Kit, the *Journeys* program provides targeted instruction and intervention in the five areas critical to reading success—phonics, phonemic awareness, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension—through multiple tools, including:

- I Do, We Do, You Do organization that provides an important gradual-release model and scaffolds student learning
- 90 lessons in each of the five domains (for a total of 450 lessons)
- The **Skill Index** that enables teachers to easily personalize instruction.

In the Intermediate Literacy Toolkit, the *Journeys* program provides:

- focused instruction in key reading skills
- activities that can be used for small-group or individual instruction
- leveled books that offer additional reading and skill application

## *English Language Learners in Journeys*

The *Journeys* program was designed to support the learning of all students. Scaffolded instruction for ELL students is provided throughout the Teacher’s Edition. The effective instructional practices throughout the program and various components of the program support ELLs such as with the:

- **Language Support Cards** which build background and promote oral language while developing students’ knowledge and understanding of high-utility vocabulary and academic language. These cards help teacher pre-teach critical skills and support varied ELL vocabulary needs—building background, promoting oral language, and developing high-utility and academic vocabulary. (They are referenced in the back of the Teacher’s Editions, behind the teal tabs.)
- **English Language Learner Leveled Readers** which offer sheltered text that connects to the main selection’s topic, vocabulary, skill and strategy and include an audio CD which models oral reading fluency.
- **Write-In Readers** provide for reinforcement of target vocabulary and textual themes, while providing strategic intervention on targeted skills and strategies through text-based questions and hints for struggling readers.
- **Red Intervention Tabs** provide specific suggestions for meeting the needs of ELL students.
- The **Week at a Glance** component, which provides an overview of the strategic intervention and English language instruction for each week of instruction. <<insert screen shot of Week at a Glance – such as Grade 6, Unit 6, Lesson 29, Teacher’s Edition, page T139>>

In addition, the program meets the specific elements suggested by research to be effective with ELLs. Research by Echevarria, Vogt, & Short (2008, 2010a, 2010b) cites as proven practices that effective teachers of ELLs should:

- Provide high-quality literacy instruction with accommodations for ELLs
- Write, post, and orally share content and lesson objectives for each lesson
- Adapt content and materials as needed for ELLs
- Explicitly link lesson concepts to students’ backgrounds and past learning (see section in this report with *Journeys* references)
- Introduce, write, review, and highlight key vocabulary throughout each lesson (see Vocabulary—Strand 1—in this report for *Journeys* references)
- Provide students with regular opportunities to use learning strategies (such as decoding, predicting, questioning, monitoring, summarizing, and visualizing)

- Scaffold student learning (such as through *Journeys* I Do, We Do, You Do structure)
- Employ varied groupings and opportunities for whole-group and small-group interactions
- Incorporate and integrated reading, writing, speaking, and listening

In addition, research syntheses by August and Shanahan (2006); Genessee, Lindholm-Leary, Saunders, and Christian (2006); and Gersten, Baker, Shanahan, Linan-Thompson, Collins, and Scarcella (2007) suggest that, in addition to the above elements, teachers can support ELLs with:

- Predictable routines (see section in this report on predictable routines for *Journeys* references)
- Graphic organizers that support comprehension of content (see section in this report on graphic organizers for *Journeys* references)
- Practice in reading words, sentences, and stories (as students will throughout every component of the *Journeys* program)

Every lesson in *Journeys* provides guidance for teachers on how to meet the particular needs of English Language Learners.

For example, see these suggestions from Kindergarten, Online Lesson 16:

### **Front-Load Vocabulary**

Make sure children know the meanings of *look, yard, tree, grass, flowers, birds, and me*. Use the illustrations and explanation to help clarify meanings.

Or, these suggestions from grade 3, Online Lesson 14: *Good Dogs, Guide Dogs*:

## **English Language Development**

### **Reading Support**

After reading aloud, help students make a list of interesting language and new words. They may wish to include the types of assistance dogs, the breed names, or the qualities of guide dogs.

### **Cognates**

Support Spanish speakers by pointing out cognates in the text. Understanding the Spanish words may help students learn the English words; for example, *transporte público* (*public transportation*), *inteligente* (*intelligent*), *desobediencia* (*disobedience*), and *independencia* (*independence*).

### *Advanced Learners in Journeys*

**Leveled Readers** in *Journeys* provide specific types of reading support for all students, whether they read on, below, or above grade level. Teachers at each grade level can search for leveled readers by reading level – below, on, or above grade level – or by Fountas-Pinnell level.

Research suggests that whole-group, small-group, and independent learning are all important components of an instructional program that will be effective for advanced learners. The *Journeys* program explicitly guides teachers in how to use the *Journeys* materials in three different instructional contexts: Whole-Group Teaching, Small-Group Teaching, and Independent Literacy Work. Each *Journeys* lesson is organized around Whole-Group Lessons, Small-Group activities, and Independent activities.

<<insert graphic of W-G, S-G, and Ind. Learning from page 1 of the *Comprehensive Language and Literacy Guide* – see <http://hmheducation.com/journeys/pdfs/Gr1CLLG.pdf> and graphic is on page 4 of 132 of the pdf.>>

Small-group **Literature Discussions** in *Journeys* are particularly engaging and motivating to advanced learners, as teachers bring together a small group of children, grouped by interest in a topic, genre, or author.

Independent work in *Journeys* includes meaningful and productive activities for students to do while the teacher is engaged in Small-Group Teaching. In the *Journeys* program, ideas for independent reading and literacy work are provided in the **Suggested Weekly Focus**. For example, a prompt to link to the week’s reading is provided each week for students to work in their **Reader’s Notebooks**. **Independent Reading** is also part of the *Journeys* program allows advanced learners to challenge themselves with higher-level texts and engaging topics.

Finally, the *Journeys* program recognizes that a one-size fits all instructional program will not meet the needs of all students. Even in the suggestions for specific populations, such as English Language Learners, the *Journeys* program provides suggestions for differentiating the level of instruction, such as in this example in the Grade 2 Teacher’s Edition:

<<Insert Unit 1, page xix in the Grade 2 Teacher’s Edition – ELL suggestions for Beginning, Intermediate, Advanced, and Advanced High.>>

## Bibliography

- Abrami, P. C., Lou, Y., Chambers, B., Poulsen, C., Spence, J. C., & Abrami, P. C. (2000). Why should we group students within-class for learning? *Educational Research & Evaluation*, 6(2), 158-179.
- Achieve, Inc. (2005). *Rising to the challenge: Are high school graduates prepared for college and work?* Washington, DC: Author.
- ACT. (2005). *Crisis at the core: Preparing all students for college and work*. Iowa City: Author. Retrieved July 20, 2010, from [http://www.act.org/research/policymakers/pdf/crisis\\_report.pdf](http://www.act.org/research/policymakers/pdf/crisis_report.pdf)
- Adey, P. S., & Shayer, M. (1993). An exploration of the long-term far-transfer effects following an extended intervention programme in the high school science curriculum. *Cognition and Instruction*, 11(1), 1-29.
- Afflerbach, P. (1986). The influence of prior knowledge on expert readers' importance assignment processes. In J. A. Niles & R. V. Lalik (Eds.), *National reading conference yearbook. Vol. 35: Solving problems in literacy: Learners, teachers, and researchers*. Rochester, NY: National Reading Conference.
- Alfassi, M. (2004) Reading to learn: Effects of combined strategy instruction on high school students. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 97(4), 171-184.
- Allington, R. (2001). *What really matters for struggling readers: Designing research-based programs*. New York: Addison-Wesley.
- Allington, R., & Walmsley, S. (1995). *No quick fix: Rethinking literacy programs in America's elementary schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Anglin, J. M. (1993). *Vocabulary development: A morphological analysis*. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development (Serial No. 238), 58 (10).
- Annetta, L.A., & Holmes, S. (2006). Creating presence and community in a synchronous virtual learning environment using avatars. *International journal of instructional technology and distance learning*, 3(8). Retrieved July 20, 2010 from [http://www.itdl.org/Journal/Aug\\_06/article03.htm](http://www.itdl.org/Journal/Aug_06/article03.htm)
- Appalachia Educational Laboratory (AEL). (2005). *Research digest: Effective instructional strategies*. Charleston, WV: Author. Retrieved January 27, 2011 from [http://www.edvantia.org/pdta/pdf/Effective\\_Instructional\\_Strategies.pdf](http://www.edvantia.org/pdta/pdf/Effective_Instructional_Strategies.pdf)
- Applebee, A.N. (1981). *Writing in the secondary school: English and the content areas*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Applebee, A., & Langer, J. (2006). *The state of writing instruction: What existing data tell us*. Albany, NY: Center on English Learning and Achievement.
- Armbruster, B. B., Anderson, T. H., & Ostertag, J. (1987). Does text structure/summarization instruction facilitate learning from expository text? *Reading Research Quarterly*, 22(3), 331-346.
- Aronoff, M. (1994). Morphology. In Purves, A. C., Papa, L., & Jordan, S. (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of English studies and language arts*, Vol. 2 (pp. 820-821). New York: Scholastic.
- Atwell, N. (1987). *In the middle*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

- Atwell, N. (1989). *Coming to know: Writing to learn in the intermediate grades*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Atwell, N. (1998). *In the middle: New understandings about writing, reading, and learning*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Au, K. H. (2002). Multicultural factors and the effective instruction of students of diverse backgrounds. In A. E. Farstrup & S. J. Samuels (Eds.) *What research has to say about reading instruction* (392-413). Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association.
- August, D. & Shanahan, T. (Eds.) (2006). *Developing literacy in second-language learners: A report of the National Literacy Panel on Language-Minority Children and Youth*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ausubel, D. (1963). *The psychology of meaningful verbal learning*. New York: Grune and Stratton.
- Baker, J. A., Clark, T. P., Maier, K. S., & Viger, S. (2008). The differential influence of instructional context on the academic engagement of students with behavior problems. *Teacher and Teacher Education*, 24(7), 1876-1883.
- Baker, S. K., Simmons, D. C., & Kame'enui, E. J. (1995a). *Vocabulary acquisition: Curricular and instructional implications for diverse learners, Technical report no. 13*. University of Oregon: National Center to Improve Tools for Educators.
- Baker, S. K., Simmons, D. C., & Kame'enui, E. J. (1995b). *Vocabulary acquisition: Synthesis of the research, Technical report no. 13*. University of Oregon: National Center to Improve Tools for Educators.
- Ball, A. F. (2006). Teaching writing in culturally diverse classrooms. In C. A. MacArthur, S. Graham, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Handbook of writing research* (293-310). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Baumann, J. F. (1984). The Effectiveness of a Direct Instruction Paradigm for Teaching Main Idea Comprehension. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 20(1), 93-115.
- Baumann, J. F., & Kame'enui, E. J. (1991). Research on vocabulary instruction: Ode to Voltaire. In J. Flood, J. Jensen, D. Lapp, & J. R. Squire (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching the English language arts* (604-632). New York: Macmillan.
- Baumann, J.F., Kame'enui, E.J., & Ash, G.E. (2003). Research on vocabulary instruction: Voltaire redux. In J. Flood, D. Lapp, J.R. Squire, & J.M. Jensen (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching the English language arts* (2nd ed., pp. 752-785). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Beck, I. L., McKeown, M. G., & Kucan, L. (2002). *Bringing words to life: robust vocabulary instruction*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Berninger, V. W., Abbott, R. D., Abbott, S. P., Graham, S., & Richards, T. (2002). Writing and reading: Connections between language by hand and language by eye. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 35(1), 39-56.
- Berninger, V. W., Abbott, R. D., Nagy, W., & Carlisle, J. (2010). Growth in phonological, orthographic, and morphological awareness in grades 1 to 6. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 39(2), 141-163.

- Biancarosa, G., & Snow, C. E. (2006). *Reading next—A vision for action and research in middle and high school literacy: A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.)*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education. Retrieved April 20, 2010 from <http://www.all4ed.org/files/archive/publications/ReadingNext/ReadingNext.pdf>
- Blachowicz, C. L., & Fisher, P. (2000). Vocabulary instruction. In M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.) *Handbook of reading research, Vol. 2* (789-814). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Bohn, C. M., Roehrig, A. D., & Pressley, M. (2004). The first days of school in the classrooms of two more effective and four less effective primary-grades teachers. *Elementary School Journal*, 104, 269-287.
- Caine, R. N., & Caine, G. (1997a). *Education on the edge of possibility*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Caine, R. N., & Caine, G. (1997b). *Unleashing the power of perceptual change: The potential of brain-based teaching*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Calkins, L.M. (1994). *The art of teaching writing* (2nd ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Cantrell, S. C., Almasi, J. F., Carter, J. C., Rintamaa, M., & Madden, A. (2010). The impact of a strategy-based intervention on the comprehension and strategy use of struggling adolescent readers. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 102(2), 257–280.
- Carlo, M. S., August, D., McLaughlin, B., Snow, C. E., Dressler, C., Lippman, D., et al. (2004). Closing the gap: Addressing the vocabulary needs for English language learners in bilingual and mainstream classrooms. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 39, 188-215.
- Center for the Improvement of Early Reading (CIERA). (2003). *Put reading first: The research building blocks for teaching children to read*. Ann Arbor, MI. Retrieved July 20, 2010 from <http://www.nationalreadingpanel.org/publications/researchread.htm>
- Chapman, M. (2006). Preschool through elementary writing. In P. Smagorinsky (Ed.), *Research on composition: Multiple perspectives on two decades of change* (pp. 15-47). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Chard, D. J., Pikulski, J. J., & McDonagh, S. H. (2006). Fluency: The link between decoding and comprehension for struggling readers. In T. Rasinski, C. Blachowicz, & K. Lems (Eds.), *Fluency instruction: Research-based best practices* (39-61). New York: Guilford Press.
- Chiappe, P., & Siegel, L. S. (2006). A longitudinal study of reading development of Canadian children from diverse linguistic backgrounds. *The Elementary School Journal*, 107(2), 135-152).
- Chiesi, H.L., Spilich, G.J., & Voss, J.F. (1979). Acquisition of domain-related information in relation to high and low domain knowledge. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 18, 257-274.
- Clark, K. F., & Graves, M. F. (2008) Open and directed text mediation in literature instruction: Effects on comprehension and attitudes. *Australian Journal of Language and Literacy*, 31(1), 9-29.
- Clay, M. M. (1991). *Becoming literate: The construction of inner control*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Collins, J. L. (1998). *Strategies for struggling writers*. New York: Guilford.

- Common Core State Standards Initiative. (2010a). *Common core standards for English language arts and literacy in history/social studies, science, and technical subjects*. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). Retrieved January 22, 2011 from <http://www.corestandards.org/>
- Common Core State Standards Initiative. (2010b). *Mission Statement*. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). Retrieved December 3, 2010 from <http://www.corestandards.org/>
- Connor-Greene, P. A. (2000). Making connections: Evaluating the effectiveness of journal writing in enhancing student learning. *Teaching of Psychology*, 27, 44-46.
- Connor-Greene, P.A., & Murdoch, J.W. (2000). Does writing matter? Assessing the impact of daily essay quizzes in enhancing student learning. *Language and Learning Across the Disciplines*, 4(1), 16-21.
- Corden, R. (2007). Developing reading-writing connections: The impact of explicit instruction of literary devices on the quality of children's narrative writing. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, 21(3), 269-289.
- Cotton, K. (1995). *Effective schooling practices: A research synthesis 1995 update*. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. Retrieved January 31, 2011 from <http://educationnorthwest.org/resource/825>
- Coyne, M.D., Simmons, D.C., Kame'enui, E.J., & Stoolmiller, M. (2004). Teaching vocabulary during shared storybook readings: An examination of differential effects. *Exceptionality*, 12(3), 145-162.
- Craig, S. D., Sullins, J., Witherspoon, A., & Gholson, B. (2006). The deep-level reasoning effect: The role of dialogue and deep-level-reasoning questions during vicarious learning. *Cognition and Instruction*, 24, 565-591.
- Cunningham, P.M., & Allington, R.L. (2007). *Classrooms that work: They can all read and write* (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Dickson, S., Simmons, D., & Kameenui, E. (1996). *Text organization and its relation to reading comprehension: A synthesis of the research*. Oregon: University of Oregon. Retrieved May 6, 2008 from <http://idea.uoregon.edu/~ncite/documents/techrep/tech17.html>
- Dixon-Krauss, L. (2001/2002). Using literature as a context for teaching vocabulary. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 45(4), 310-318.
- Dole, J. A., Duffy, G. G., Roehler, L. R., & Pearson, P. D. (1991). Moving from the old to the new: Research on reading comprehension instruction. *Review of Educational Research*, 61, 239-264.
- Dole, J. A., & Smith, E. L. (1989). Prior knowledge and learning from science text: An instructional study. In S. McCormick & J. Zutell (Eds.), *Cognitive and social perspectives for literacy research and instruction*. (Thirty-eighth Yearbook of the National Reading Conference, 345-352). Chicago, IL: National Reading Conference.
- Dolezal, S.E., Welsh, L.M., Pressley, M., & Vincent, M.M. (2003). How nine third-grade teachers motivate student academic engagement. *Elementary School Journal*, 103, 239-267.
- Downing, S.O. (1995). Teaching writing for today's demands. *Language Arts*, 72, 200-205.

- Durkin, D. (2003). *Teaching them to read* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). Needham, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Early, M. & Marshall, S. (2008). Adolescent ESL students' interpretation and appreciation of literary texts: A case study of multimodality. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 64(3), 377-397.
- Eccles, J.S., Wigfield, A., & Schiefele, U. (1998). Motivation to succeed. In N. Eisenberg (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Volume 3 – Social, emotional, and personality development* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York: Wiley.
- Echevarria, J., Short, D., & Powers, K. (2003). *School reform and standards-based education: How do teachers help English language learners?* Technical Report Santa Cruz, CA: Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence.
- Echevarria, J., Vogt, M.E., & Short, D. (2008). *Making content comprehensible for English learners: The SIOP Model*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Echevarria, J., Vogt, M.E., & Short, D. (2010a). *Making content comprehensible for elementary English learners: The SIOP® Model*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Echevarria, J., Vogt, M.E., & Short, D. (2010b). *Making content cComprehensible for secondary English learners: The SIOP® Model*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Edwards Santoro, L. Chard, D.J., Howard, L., & Baker, S.K. (2008). Making the most of classroom read-alouds to promote comprehension and vocabulary. *The Reading Teacher*, 61, 396-408.
- Fearn, L., & Farnan, N. (2005, April). *An investigation of the influence of teaching grammar in writing to accomplish an influence on writing*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada.
- Fielding, L. G., & Pearson, P. D. (1994). Reading comprehension: What works. *Educational Leadership*, 51(5), 62-69.
- Fisher, D., Frey, N., & Lapp, D. (2008). Shared readings: Modeling comprehension, vocabulary, text structures, and text features for older readers. *The Reading Teacher*, 61(7), 548–556.
- Flannery, K. B., & O'Neill, R. E. (1995). Including predictability in functional assessment and individual program development. *Education & Treatment of Gifted Children*, 18(4), 499-500.
- Fountas, I.C. (2010). *Guided reading with Irene Fountas*. HMHEducation.com. Retrieved January 20, 2011 from [http://hmheducation.com/journeys/guided\\_reading.php](http://hmheducation.com/journeys/guided_reading.php)
- Fountas, I.C., & Pinnell, G.S. (1996). *Guided reading: Good first teaching for all children*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Fountas, I.C., & Pinnell, G.S. (2001). *Guiding readers and writers: Teaching comprehension, genre, and content literacy*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Fountas, I.C., & Pinnell, G.S. (2006). *Teaching for comprehending and fluency: thinking, talking, and writing about reading*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Francis, D. J., Rivera, M., Lesaux, N., Kieffer, M., & Rivera, H. (2006a). *Practical guidelines for the education of English language learners: Research-based recommendations for instruction and academic interventions*. Houston: University of Houston Center on Instruction.

- Francis, D. J., Rivera, M., Lesaux, N., Kieffer, M., & Rivera, H. (2006b). *Practical guidelines for the education of English language learners: Research-based recommendations for serving adolescent newcomers*. Houston: University of Houston Center on Instruction.
- Fretz, E. B., Wu, H. K., Zhang, B., Davis, E. A., Krajcik, J. S., & Soloway, E. (2002). An investigation of software scaffolds supporting modeling practices. *Research in Science Education*, 32, 567-589.
- Genesee, Lindholm-Leary, Saunders, & Christian (2006). *Educating English language learners: A synthesis of research evidence*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gersten, R., Baker, S., Shanahan, T., Linan-Thompson, S., Collins, P., & Scarcella, R. (2007). *Effective literacy and English language instruction for English learners in the elementary grades: A practice guide*. (NCEE 2007-4011). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U. S. Department of Education. Retrieved January 31, 2011 from <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/practiceguides/20074011.pdf>.
- Goodson, B., Wolf, A., Bell, S., Turner, H., & Finney, P.B. (2010). *The effectiveness of a program to accelerate vocabulary development in kindergarten (VOCAB)*. (NCEE 2010-4014). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.
- Goodwin, A. P., & Ahn, S. (2010). A meta-analysis of morphological interventions: effects on literacy achievement of children with literacy difficulty. *Annals of Dyslexia*, 60(2), 183-208.
- Graesser, A. C., & Person, N. K. (1994). Question asking during tutoring. *American Educational Research Journal*, 31, 104-137.
- Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). *Writing next: Effective strategies to improve writing of adolescents in middle and high schools—A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.
- Graham, S., MacArthur, C., & Schwartz, S. (1995). The effects of goal setting and procedural facilitation on the revising behavior and writing performance of students with writing and learning problems. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 87, 230-240.
- Graves, D.H. (1983). *Writing: Teachers and children at work*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Graves, D.H. (1991). *Build a literate classroom*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Graves, D.H. (1994). *A fresh look at writing*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Graves, M. F. (2006). *The vocabulary book: Learning and instruction*. New York: Teachers College Press
- Graves, M. F., & Avery, P. G. (1997). Scaffolding students' reading of history. *Social Studies*, 88(3), 134-139.
- Griswold, P. C., Gelzheiser, L. M., & Shepherd, M. J. (1987). Does a production deficiency hypothesis account for vocabulary learning among adolescents with learning disabilities? *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 20(10), 620-626.
- Guthrie, J. T., Hoa, A. L. W., Wigfield, A., Tonks, S. M., Humenick, N. M., & Littles, E. (2007). Reading motivation and reading comprehension growth in the later elementary years. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 32(3), 383-313.

- Guthrie, J. T., Hoa, L. W., Wigfield, A., Tonks, S. M., & Perencevich, K. C. (2006). From spark to fire: Can situational reading interest lead to long-term reading motivation? *Reading Research and Instruction*, 45, 91-117.
- Guthrie, J. T., & Humenick, N. M. (2004). Motivating students to read: Evidence for classroom practices that increase reading motivation and achievement. In P. McCardle, & V. Chhabra (Eds.), *The voice of evidence in reading research*, (329-354). Baltimore, MD: Paul H Brookes Publishing.
- Guthrie, J.T., & McCann, A.D. (1997). Characteristics of classrooms that promote motivations and strategies for learning. In J.T. Guthrie & A. Wigfield (Eds.), *Reading engagement: Motivating readers through integrated instruction* (pp. 128-148). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Guthrie, J. T., & Wigfield, A. (2000). Engagement and motivation in reading. In M.L. Kamil, P.B. Mosenthal, P.D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 3, 403-422). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Harris, K. R., Graham, S., & Mason, L. (2006). Improving the writing, knowledge, and motivation of struggling young writers: Effects of self-regulated strategy development with and without peer support. *American Educational Research Journal*, 43, 295–340.
- Haywood, H. C. (2004). Thinking in, around, and about the curriculum: The role of cognitive education. *International Journal of Disability, Development, and Education*, 51(3), 231-252.
- Hidi, S., & Boscolo, P. (2006). Motivation and writing. In C.A. MacArthur, S. Graham, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Handbook of writing research* (144-157). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Hillocks, G., Jr. (1993). Environments for active learning. In L. Odell (Ed.), *Theory and practice in the teaching of writing* (244-270). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Hillocks, G., Jr. (1987). Synthesis of research in teaching writing. *Educational Leadership*, 12, 71-82.
- Hillocks, G., Jr. (1986). Research on written composition: New directions for teaching, Urbana, IL. ERIC *Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills*.
- Hillocks, G., Jr. (1982). The interaction of instruction, teacher comment, and revision in teaching the composing process. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 16(3), 261-278.
- Hillocks, G., Jr. (1979). The effects of observational activities on student writing. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 13(1), 23-35.
- Holdaway, D. (1984). *Stability and change in literacy learning*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Hollingsworth, M., & Woodward, J. (1993). Integrated learning: explicit strategies and their role in problem-solving instruction for students with learning disabilities. *Exceptional Children*, 59(5), 444-455.
- Jacobson, J. Lapp, D, and Flood, J. (2007). A seven step instructional plan for teaching English-language learners to comprehend and use homonyms, homophones, and homographs. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 51, 98-111.
- Jenkins, J., Stein, M., & Wysocki, K. (1984). Learning vocabulary through reading. *American Educational Research Journal*, 21, 767-788.

- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1990). Cooperative learning and achievement. In S. Shlomo (Ed.), *Cooperative learning: Theory and research* (pp. 23-27). New York: Praeger.
- Kapusnick, R. A., & Hauslein, C. M. (2001). The “silver cup” of differentiated instruction. *Kappa Delta Pi Record*, 37(4), 156-159.
- Kauchak, D. P., & Eggen, P. D. (2006). *Learning and teaching: Research-based methods* (5th edition). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Kendeou, P., van den Broek, P., White, M. J., & Lynch, J. S. (2009). Predicting reading comprehension in early elementary school: The independent contributions of oral language and decoding skills. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 101(4), 765–778.
- Kern, L., & Clemens, N. H. (2007). Antecedent strategies to promote appropriate classroom behavior. *Psychology in the Schools*, 44(1), 65-75.
- Kim, A., Vaughn, S., Wanzek, J., & Wei, S. (2004). Graphic organizers and their effects on the reading comprehension of students with LD: A synthesis of research. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 37(2), 105-118.
- Kim, J. S., & White, T. G. (2008). Scaffolding voluntary summer reading for children in grades 3 to 5: An experimental study. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 12(1), 1-23.
- Kieffer, M.J., & Lesaux, N.K. (2007). Breaking down words to build meaning: Morphology, vocabulary, and reading comprehension in the urban classroom. *The Reading Teacher*, 61(2), 134-144.
- King A. (1994). Guiding knowledge construction in the classroom: Effects of teaching children how to question and how to explain. *American Educational Research Journal*, 31, 338-368.
- Kiuhara, S. A., Graham, S., & Hawken, L. S. (2009). Teaching writing to high school students: A national survey. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 101, 136–160.
- Klauda, S. L., & Guthrie, J. T. (2008). Relationships of three components of reading fluency to reading comprehension. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 100, 310-321.
- Klesius, J., & Searls, E. (1991). Vocabulary instruction. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 84, 177-182.
- Klingner, J., & Vaughn, S. (2004). Strategies for struggling second-language readers. In Jetton, T., & Dole, J. (Eds.), *Adolescent literacy research and practice* (183-209). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Kolich, E. M. (1988). Vocabulary learning – what works? Perspectives from the research literature. *Reading Improvement*, 25, 117-124.
- Ku, K. Y., & Ho, I. T. (2010). Metacognitive strategies that enhance critical thinking. *Metacognition and Learning*, 5(3), 251-267.
- Lane, H.B., & Wright, T.L. (2007). Maximizing the effectiveness of reading aloud. *The Reading Teacher*, 60, 668-675.
- Langer, J.A. (1986a). *Children reading and writing: Structures and strategies*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

- Langer, J.A. (1986b). Learning through writing: Study skills in the content areas. *Journal of Reading*, 29, 400-406.
- Langer, J.A. & Applebee, A.N. (1987). *How writing shapes thinking: A study of teaching and learning*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Lenski, S.D., & Johns, J. (2000). *Improving writing: Resources, strategies, and assessments*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.
- Levie, H. W., & Lentz, R. (1982). Effects of text illustrations: A review of research. *Educational Communication and Technology Journal*, 30(4), 195-232.
- Levin, J. R., Anglin, G. J., & Carney, R. N. (1987). On empirically validating functions of pictures in prose. In D.M. Willows & H.A. Houghton (Eds.), *The psychology of illustration. Vol. 1.* (51-86). New York: Springer.
- Linan-Thompson, S., Cirino, P.T., & Vaughn, S. (2007). Determining English language learners' response to intervention: Questions and some answers. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 30(3), 185-195.
- Lipson, M. (2011). Why and how we read. In J.F. Baumann, D.J. Chard, J. Cooks, J.D. Cooper, R. Gersten, M. Lipson, L.M. Morrow, J.J. Pikulski, H.H. Rivera, M. Rivera, S. Templeton, S.W. Valencia, C. Valentino, M.E. Vogt, & I. Fountas, *Journeys*. Orlando, FL: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt School Publishers.
- Lutz, S. L., Guthrie, J. T., & Davis, M. H. (2006). Scaffolding for engagement in learning: An observational study of elementary school reading instruction. *Journal of Educational Research*, 100, 3 - 20.
- Lyon, G.R. & Moats, L.C. (1997). Critical conceptual and methodological considerations in reading intervention research. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 30, 578-588.
- Mace, A. B., Shapiro, E. S., & Mace, F. C. (1998). Effects of warning stimuli for reinforced withdrawal and task onset on self-injury. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 31, 679-682.
- MacArthur, C.A. (2007). Best practices in teaching evaluation and revision. In S. Graham, C.A. MacArthur, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Best practices in writing instruction* (pp. 141-162). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Marzano, R. J. (2003). *What works in schools: Translating research into action*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Mathes, P.G., Pollard-Durodola, S.D., Cárdenas-Haga, E., Linan-Thompson, S., & Vaughn, S. (2007). Teaching struggling readers who are native Spanish speakers: What do we know? *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, 38, 260-271.
- Mayer, R. E. (2001). *Multimedia learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mayer, R. E., & Gallini, J. K. (1990). When is an illustration worth ten thousand words? *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82(4), 715-726.
- McBride-Chang, C., Wagner, R. K., Muse, A., Chow, B. W.-Y., & Shu, H. (2005). The role of morphological awareness in children's vocabulary acquisition in English. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 26, 415-435.

- McGinnis, T.A. (2007). Khmer rap boys, X-men, Asia's fruits, and Dragonball Z: Creating multilingual and multimodal classroom contexts. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 50(7), 570-579.
- McKeown, M.G., & Beck, I.L. (2006). Encouraging young children's language interactions with stories. In D.K. Dickinson & S.B. Neuman (Eds.), *Handbook of early literacy research* (Vol. 2, pp. 281–294). New York: Guilford.
- McKeown, M. G., & Beck, I. L. (1988). Learning vocabulary: Different ways for different goals. *Remedial and Special Education (RASE)*, 9 (1), 42–46.
- McKeown, M. G., Beck, I. L., & Blake, R. G. K. (2009). Rethinking Comprehension Instruction: Comparing Strategies and Content Instructional Approaches. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 44 (3), 218-253.
- McNamara, D. R., & Waugh, D. G. (1993). Classroom organisation: A discussion of grouping strategies in the light of the 'Three Wise Men's' report. *School Organization*, 13(1), 41-50.
- Metcalf, J., & Kornell, N. (2005). A region or proximal of learning model of study time allocation. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 52, 463-477.
- Moats, L. C. (2001) When older students can't read. *Educational Leadership*, 58(6), 36-40.
- Moffett, J. (1965). I, You, and It, *College Composition and Communication*, 16(5), 243-248.
- Moffett, J. (1981). *Active voice: A writing program across the curriculum*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers, Inc.
- Moffett, J. (1983). *Teaching the universe of discourse*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers, Inc.
- Moffet, J. (1992). *Active voice*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishing.
- Moffet, J., & Wagner, B.J. (1992). *Student-centered language arts, K-12*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishing.
- Morris, D., Blanton, L., Blanton, W. E., Nowacek, J., & Perney, J. (1995). Teaching low-achieving spellers at their "instructional level." *Elementary School Journal*, 96(2), 163-177.
- Nagy, W. (2007). Metalinguistic awareness and the vocabulary-comprehension connection. In Wagner, R. K., Muse, A. E., and Tannenbaum, K. R. (Eds.). *Vocabulary acquisition: Implications for reading comprehension* (pp. 52-77). New York: Guilford.
- Nagy, W. (1988). *Teaching vocabulary to improve reading comprehension*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Nagy, W., & Anderson, R. C. (1984). How many words are there in printed school English? *Reading Research Quarterly*, 19, 304-330.
- National Assessment Governing Board. (2010). *Writing framework for the 2011 National Assessment of Educational Progress*. Washington, D.C.; National Assessment Governing Board. Retrieved January 29, 2011 from <http://www.eric.ed.gov.proxy.lib.ohio-state.edu/PDFS/ED512552.pdf>
- National Commission on Writing. (2003). *The neglected R: The need for a writing revolution*. Retrieved January 29, 2011 from [http://www.collegeboard.com/prod\\_downloads/writingcom/neglectedr.pdf](http://www.collegeboard.com/prod_downloads/writingcom/neglectedr.pdf)

- National Commission on Writing. (2004). *Writing: A ticket to work...or a ticket out: A survey of business leaders*. Retrieved July 20, 2010, from [http://www.collegeboard.com/prod\\_downloads/writingcom/writing-ticket-to-work.pdf](http://www.collegeboard.com/prod_downloads/writingcom/writing-ticket-to-work.pdf)
- National Commission on Writing. (2005). *Writing: A powerful message from state government*. Retrieved July 20, 2010, from [http://www.collegeboard.com/prod\\_downloads/writingcom/powerful-message-from-state.pdf](http://www.collegeboard.com/prod_downloads/writingcom/powerful-message-from-state.pdf)
- National Reading Panel. (2000). *Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction*. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.
- Nelson, J. M., & Manset-Williamson, G. (2006). The impact of explicit, self-regulatory reading comprehension strategy instruction on the reading-specific self-efficacy, attributions, and affect of students with reading disabilities. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 29(3), 213-230.
- Nokes, J., & Dole, J. (2004). Helping adolescents read through explicit strategy instruction. In T. Jetton & J. Dole (Eds.), *Adolescent literacy research and practice* (162-182). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Ogle, D., & Blachowicz, C. (2002). Beyond literature circles: Helping students comprehend informational texts. In C. Block & M. Pressley (Eds.), *Comprehension instruction: Research-based best practices* (259-272). New York: Guilford Press.
- Paivio, A. (1986). *Mental representations: A dual coding approach*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Paivio, A. (1983). Empirical case for dual coding. In J. Yuille (Ed.), *Imagery, memory, and cognition: Essays in honor of Allan Paivio* (307-332). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Paivio, A. (1979). *Imagery and verbal processes*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Pearson, P. D., & Dole, J. A. (1987). Explicit comprehension instruction: A review of research and a new conceptualization of instruction. *The Elementary School Journal*, 88(2), 151-165.
- Pearson, P. D., & Fielding, L.G. (1991). Comprehension instruction. In R. Barr, M. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, & P. D. Pearson (Eds.) *Handbook of Reading Research: Vol. II*. New York: Longman.
- Pearson, P.D., & Tierney, R.J. (1984). On becoming a thoughtful reader: Learning to read like a writer. In A.C. Purves & O. Niles (Eds.), *Becoming readers in a complex society, Eighty-Third Yearbook of the National Society of the Study of Education* (pp. 144-173). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Pennington Whitaker, C., Gambrell, L.B., & Morrow, L.M. (2004). Reading comprehension instruction for all students. In E.R. Silliman & L.C. Wilkinson (Eds.), *Language and literacy learning in schools* (pp. 130-150). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Perez, E. (1981). Oral language competence improve reading skills of Mexican American third graders. *Reading Teacher*, 35, 24-27.
- Polette, K. (2008). *Teaching grammar through writing: Activities to develop writer's craft in ALL students in grades 4-12*. Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.

- Pressley, M. (2000). What should comprehension instruction be the instruction of? In M. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 3). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Pressley, M., Gaskins, I. W., & Fingeret, L. (2006). Instruction and development of reading fluency in struggling readers. In S. J. Samuels & A. E. Farstrup (Eds.), *What research has to say about fluency instruction* (47-69). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Pressley, M., Mohan, L., Fingeret, L., Reffitt, K., & Raphael-Bogaert, L. (2007) Writing instruction in engaging and effective elementary settings. In S. Graham, C.A. MacArthur, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Best practices in writing instruction* (pp. 13-27). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Pressley, M., Wood, E., Woloshyn, V.E., Martin, V., King, A., & Menke, D. (1992). Encouraging mindful use of prior knowledge: Attempting to construct explanatory answers facilitates learning. *Educational Psychologist*, 27(1), 91-109.
- Pressley, M., Yokoi, L., Rankin, J., Wharton-McDonald, R., & Mistretta, J. (1997). A survey of the instructional practices of grade 5 teachers nominated as effective in promoting literacy. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 1(2), 145-160.
- Proctor, C. P., Carlo, M., August, D., & Snow, C. (2005). Native Spanish-speaking children reading English: Toward a model of comprehension. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 97(2), 246-256.
- Pulido, D. (2007). Topic familiarity and passage sight vocabulary. *Applied Linguistics*, 28(1), 66-86.
- Purcell-Grates, V., Duke, N., & Martineau, J. (2007). Learning to read and write genre-specific text: Roles of authentic experience and explicit teaching. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 42(1), 8-45. Retrieved January 31, 2011 from <http://www.reading.org/Library/Retrieve.cfm?D=10.1598/RRQ.42.1.1&F=RRQ-42-1-Purcell-Gates.html>
- Raymond, E. (2000). *Cognitive Characteristics. Learners with Mild Disabilities*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Reutzel, D. R. (2003). Organizing effective literacy instruction: grouping strategies and instructional routines. In L. M. Morrow, L. B. Gambrell, & M. Pressley (Eds.), *Best practices in literacy instruction* (2nd edition, 241-267). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Robinson, D., & Kiewra, K. (1995). Visual argument: Graphic organizers are superior to outlines in improving learning from text. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 87(3), 455-467.
- Rogers, K.B. (2002). *Re-forming gifted education: Matching the program to the child*. Scottsdale, AZ: Great Potential Press.
- Rogers, K.B. (2007). Lessons learned about educating the gifted and talented: A synthesis of the research on educational practice. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 51(4), 382-396.
- Rosenshine, B. & Meister, C. (1992). The use of scaffolds for teaching higher-level cognitive strategies. *Educational Leadership*, 49(7), 26-33.
- Rosenshine, B., Meister, C., & Chapman, S. (1996). Teaching students to generate questions: A review of the intervention studies. *Review of Educational Research*, 66, 181-221.
- Rousseau, M. K., Tam, B. K. Y., & Ramnarain, R. (1993). Increasing reading proficiency of language-

- minority students with speech and language impairments. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 16, 254-271.
- Saddler, B., & Graham S. (2005). The effects of peer-assisted sentence-combining instruction on the writing performance of more and less skilled young writers. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 97, 43-54.
- Samuels, S. (2002). Reading fluency: Its development and assessment. In A. E. Farstrup & S. Samuels (Eds.), *What research has to say about reading instruction* (166-183). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Scarcella, R. (2007). *Accelerating academic English: A focus on the English learner*. Oakland, CA: Regents of the University of California.
- Schiefele, U. (1999). Interest and learning from text. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 3(3), 257-279.
- Schraw, G., Bruning, R., & Svoboda, C. (1995). Sources of situational interest. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 27, 1-17.
- Schraw, G., & Dennison, R. S. (1994). The effect of reader purpose on interest and recall. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 26(1), 1-18.
- Schunk, D. H., Pintrich, P. R., & Meece, J. L. (2008). *Motivation in education: Theory, research, and applications*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson/Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Sedita, J. (2005). Effective vocabulary instruction, *Insights on Learning Disabilities*, 2 (1), 33-45.
- Shanahan, T. (1990). Reading and writing together: What does it really mean? In T. Shanahan (Ed.), *Reading and writing together* (pp. 1-18). Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon.
- Shanahan, T. (2004). Overcoming the dominance of communication: Writing to think and to learn. In T. L. Jetton & J. A. Dole (Eds.), *Adolescent literacy research and practice* (pp. 59-73). New York: Guilford.
- Shanahan, T. (2006). Relations among oral language, reading, and writing development. In C. A. MacArthur, S. Graham, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Handbook of writing research* (171-183). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Short, D., & Fitzsimmons, S. (2007). *Double the work: Challenges and solutions to acquiring language and academic literacy for adolescent English language learners – A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education. Retrieved January 31, 2011 from [carnegie.org/fileadmin/Media/Publications/PDF/DoubletheWork.pdf](http://carnegie.org/fileadmin/Media/Publications/PDF/DoubletheWork.pdf)
- Silver, N.W., & Repa, J.T. (1993). The effect of word processing on the quality of writing and self-esteem of secondary school English-as-second-language students: Writing without censure. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 9(2), 265-283.
- Simons, K. D., & Klein, J. D. (2007). The impact of scaffolding and student achievement levels in a problem-based learning environment. *Instructional Science*, 35(1), 41-72.
- Slavin, R. E. (1987). *Cooperative learning: student teams*. Washington, DC: National Educational Association.

- Slavin, R. E. (1991). Are cooperative learning and untracking harmful to the gifted? *Educational Leadership*, 48(6), 68-71.
- Slavin, R. E. (1995). *Cooperative learning: Theory, research, and practice* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Slavin, R. E. (2002). Cooperative learning in elementary and secondary schools. In D. L. Levinson (Ed.) & P. W. Cookson & A. R. Sadovnik (Co-Eds.), *Education and sociology: An encyclopedia* (pp. 115-121). New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Snow, C. (2002). *Reading for understanding: Toward an R&D program in reading comprehension*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.
- Snow, C.E., Burns, M.S., & Griffin, P. (Eds.). (1998). *Preventing reading difficulties in young children*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- Snow, C., & Sweet, A. (2003) Reading for comprehension. In A. Sweet & C. Snow (Eds.), *Rethinking reading comprehension*. New York: Guilford.
- Spandel, V. (2001). *Creating writers through 6-trait writing assessment and instruction*. (3rd ed.). Boston: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Spires, H., & Donley, J. (1998). Prior knowledge activation: Inducing engagement with informational texts. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 90, 249-260.
- Stahl, S. A. (1986). Three principles of effective vocabulary instruction. *Journal of Reading*, 29(7), 662-668.
- Stahl, S. A., & Fairbanks, M. M. (1986). The effects of vocabulary instruction: A model-based meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 56, 72-110.
- Stevens, R. J., Slavin, R. E., & Farnish, A. M. (1991). The effects of cooperative learning and direct instruction in reading comprehension strategies on main idea identification. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 83(1), 8-16.
- Stevens, R. J., Van Meter, P., & Warcholak, N.D. (2010). The effects of explicitly teaching story structure to primary grade children. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 42(2), 159-198.
- Stipek, D. (2002). Good instruction is motivating. In A. Wigfield & J.S. Eccles (Eds.), *Development of achievement motivation* (pp. 309-332). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Stone, C. A. (1998). The metaphor of scaffolding: Its utility for the field of learning disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 31, 344-364.
- Strangman, & Dalton, (2006). Improving struggling readers' comprehension through scaffolded hypertexts and other computer-based literacy program. In M. C. McKenna, L. D. Labbo, R. D. Kieffer, & D. Reinking (Eds.), *International handbook of literacy and technology, Volume II* (75-92). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associations.
- Su, Y. (2007). Students' changing views and the integrated-skills approach in Taiwan's EFL college classes. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 8(1), 27-40.
- Swanson, H. L. (1999). Reading research for students with LD: A meta-analysis of intervention outcomes. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 32, 504-532.

- Swanson, H. L., & Hoskyn, M. (2001). Instructing adolescents with learning disabilities: A component and composite analysis. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, 16, 109-119.
- Taylor, B. M., Pearson, P. D., Peterson, D. S., & Rodriguez, M. C. (2003). Reading growth in high-poverty classrooms: The influence of teacher practices that encourage cognitive engagement in literacy learning. *Elementary School Journal*, 104(1), 3-28.
- Teale, W.H. (2009). Students learning English and their literacy instruction in urban schools. *The Reading Teacher*, 62, 699-703.
- Templeton, S. (2004). The vocabulary-spelling connection: Orthographic development and morphological knowledge at the intermediate grades and beyond. In J. F. Baumann & E. J. Kame'enui (Eds.), *Vocabulary instruction: Research to Practice* (pp. 118-138). New York: Guilford Press.
- Templeton, S. (2009). Spelling-meaning relationships among languages: Exploring cognates and their possibilities. In L. Helman (Ed.), *Literacy development with English learners: Research-based instruction in Grades K-6* (pp. 196-212). New York: Guilford Press.
- Templeton, S., Bear, D., Invernizzi, M., & Johnston, F. (2010). *Vocabulary their way*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Tierney, R.J., & Shanahan, T. (1991). Research on the reading-writing relationship: Interactions, transactions, and outcomes. In R. Barr, M.L. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, & P.D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 2, pp. 246-280). New York: Longman.
- Tomlinson, C.A. (1995). *How to differentiate instruction in mixed-ability classrooms*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Tomlinson, C.A. (1997). Meeting the needs of gifted learners in the regular classroom: Vision or delusion? *Tempo*, 17(1), 1, 10-12.
- Tomlinson, C. A., & Allan, S. D. (2000). *Leadership for differentiating schools and classrooms*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Topping, K., & Paul, T. (1999). Computer-assisted assessment of practice at reading: A large scale survey using Accelerated Reader data. *Reading and Writing Quarterly*, 15, 213-231.
- Tustin, R. D. (1995). The effects of advance notice of activity transitions on stereotypic behavior. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 28, 91-92.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2002). *Guidance for the Reading First Program*. Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education. Retrieved January 27, 2011 from [www2.ed.gov/programs/readingfirst/guidance.doc](http://www2.ed.gov/programs/readingfirst/guidance.doc)
- U.S. Department of Education Office of the Secretary. (2001). *Back to school, moving forward: What No Child Left Behind means for America's communities*. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- Van Keer, H., & Verhaeghe, J. P. (2005). Effects of explicit reading strategies instruction and peer tutoring on second and fifth graders' reading comprehension and self-efficacy perceptions. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 73(4), 291-329.
- VanLehn, K., Graesser, A.C., Jackson, G.T., Jordan, P., Olney, A., & Rose, C.P. (2007). When are tutorial dialogues more effective than reading? *Cognitive Science*, 31, 3-62.

- VanTassel-Baska, J., & Brown, E.F. (2007). Toward best practice: An analysis of the efficacy of curriculum models in gifted education. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 51(4), 342-358.
- Vaughn, S., Gersten, R., & Chard, D. (2000). The underlying message in LD intervention research. *Exceptional Children*, 67, 99-114.
- Vaughn, S., Mathes, P., Linan-Thompson, S., & Francis, D. (2005). Teaching English language learners at risk for reading disabilities to read: Putting research into practice. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice*, 20(1), 58-67.
- Vaughn, S., Mathes, P., Linan-Thompson, S., Cirino, P., Carlson, C., Pollard-Durodola, S., Cardenas-Hagan, E., & Francis, D. (2006). Effectiveness of an English intervention for first-grade English language learners at risk for reading problems. *Elementary School Journal*, 107(2), 153-180.
- Vermette, P. (1988). Cooperative Grouping in the Classroom: Turning Students into Active Learners. *The Social Studies*, 79(6), 271-273.
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1962). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). Interaction between learning and development. In M. Cole (Trans.) *Mind in society* (pp. 79-91). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Weaver, C. (1997). *Teaching grammar in context*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- White, T. G., Power, M. A., & White, S. (1989). Morphological analysis: Implications for teaching and understanding vocabulary growth. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 24(3), 283-304.
- Williams, J. P. (2005). Instruction in reading comprehension for primary-grade students: A focus on text structure. *Journal of Special Education*, 39, 6-18.
- Williams, W. M., Papierno, P. B., Makel, M. C. & Ceci, S. J. (2004). Thinking like a scientist about real-world problems: The Cornell Institute for Research on Children Science Education Program. *Applied Developmental Psychology*, 25, 107-126.
- Zimmerman, C. (1997). Do reading and interactive vocabulary instruction make a difference? *TESOL Quarterly*, 31, 121-140.