EXPLORING HOW THIRD-GRADE AFRICAN AMERICAN CHILDREN

LEVERAGE ACADEMIC DISCOURSE TO ENGAGE IN

LITERATE BEHAVIORS

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE

DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF READING COLLEGE OF PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

BY

MELANIE LOEWENSTEIN B.A., M.A

DENTON, TEXAS DECEMBER 2018

DEDICATION

For my husband, Steven Loewenstein, my daughter, Leigh and my Dad, Dr. David Brown.
Thank you for supporting me throughout this journey.
In memory of my mother, Patricia Brown, who began this academic pilgrimage.
It is an honor to finish what you started.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

ABSTRACT

MELANIE LOEWENSTEIN

EXPLORING HOW THIRD-GRADE AFRICAN AMERICAN CHILDREN LEVERAGE
ACADEMIC DISCOURSE TO ENGAGE IN LITERATE BEHAVIORS

DECEMBER 2018

The purpose of this qualitative embedded multiple case study (Yin, 2003) was to

explore the written and literate language structures, or the academic discourse features, of eight

African American students in order to gain insight into the influences of their knowledge of

academic discourse on their literate behaviors, such as their abilities to decode, anticipate,

retell text, and answer comprehension questions. Select third-grade African American students

participating within this study represented three reading proficiency levels (on-level, above-

level, and below-level). These levels were chosen to more fully reveal the influences of

students' knowledge of academic discourse on their literacy abilities. Additionally, this study

explored students' literate identities. It focused on their values, beliefs, and practices as well as

their metalingustic knowledge or their knowledge of their own linguistic understandings. These

linguistic understandings were manifested within their reading processes. The dual purposes of

this dissertation reflect key concepts of James Gee's discourse analysis theory, which examines

discourse at the d/discourse and the D/discourse levels (2014). The concept of D/discourse

captures the ways in which people identify with the beliefs, values, and behaviors of a group,

while d/discourse involves language that people use that links them to a particular discourse.

Study participants engaged in five research tasks: the Burke Reading Interview, a wordless picture book story construction, leveled reading, combined comprehension tasks (retelling and answering comprehension questions), and a Cloze reading task. The first two tasks were intended to reveal students' levels of academic language knowledge (d/discourse) and their identity (D/discourse) as readers. The students' performances on the other tasks were studied through the lenses of the first two tasks. Multiple analysis procedures used to analyze the data including theoretical thematic analysis, discourse analysis, miscue analysis, Kucer's comprehension taxonomy analysis, and inductive thematic analysis. Also, frequency charts and analysis tables were used to examine the data resulting from some of the tasks more closely.

The results indicated that students' knowledge of academic language acts as clues, tools, and mental blueprints, aiding them in making sense of text, creating stories and reconstructing authors' messages. The results also indicated that students use their knowledge of these structures in various ways as they engage in literate behaviors. Additionally, the results showed that most of the students within this study took on a test-taking identity, as most of their responses showed that they had adopted test taking values, beliefs, and practices. However, students who identified less with the culture of test-taking were more likely to have stronger academic language and to use that language in more complex ways.

This study revealed the need for educators to be more aware of students' academic language development, especially that of culturally and linguistically diverse students and students who are approaching the critical fourth grade level, where there is an increase in the academic language demand. This research also showed that educators must be mindful of the messages that are being sent to students within the context of literacy learning. These messages

greatly affect their literacy identity, which may be linked to their literacy growth and academic

discourse development.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Oral language is both a resource and a beneficiary.

Marie M. Clay

School is a social context where children often take on new kinds of discourse (Gee, 2012) or new ways of speaking, behaving, interacting, thinking, believing, and valuing, which may differ from their discourse at home and in their community. Often, their abilities to take on these discourses are reflected in their abilities to adopt language and its corresponding values, behaviors, and practices. According to Gee, just as there are many different discourses within students' conjoining social contexts, there are also many literacies that support those social contexts. Language and literacy are important aspects of discourse. Gee stated, "Language makes no sense outside of discourses, and the same is true for literacy" (Gee, 2012, p. 3). Each discourse has its own tacit theories or beliefs regarding what is considered normal or right, and the ability to internalize those beliefs as well as the language associated with those discourses often signals membership or successful assimilation within those discourses. School-based literacy is a type of discourse. Given Gee's assertions, it seems possible that children's ability (or inability) to adopt and internalize the discourse of school literacy, as reflective of their beliefs, values, and behaviors, as well as their ability to use the school-based language, may influence their ability to become successful readers. This school-based language, often understood as a type of academic language, is a register (or specialized language) more

1

closely associated with school, books, and learning (Nagy & Townsend, 2012; Snow & Uccelli, 2009).

Le Monine and Soto (2017) recognized the value of learning academic language. They proposed that there were two types of academic language learners: English Language Learners (ELLs) and American Standard English Learners (SELs). ELLs must learn English itself as well as Academic English. By contrast, SELs must learn Academic English because they speak a variation of English that differs in its structure and grammar from American Standard English. Generally, SELs include Mexican American-non-new immigrant students who speak some level or form of Mexican American Language (MxAL) or "Chicano English." Additionally, many African American students, especially those who may speak a form of African American Language or African American English, may be considered SELs. Low socioeconomic white children may also need support in learning the discourse of school (Purcell-Gates, 1995), as may any student who has not acquired academic discourse (Gee, 2004).

Researcher Background

As a Reading Recovery Teacher and K-2 Reading Specialist, I have had the opportunity to work with a variety of students. I have worked with these kinds of students whom Clay (2016) referred to as the "hardest to teach children" (p. 119) in the first grade, providing specific one-on-one instruction, tailored to each individual child's distinct developing reading processing system. In addition, I have worked with small groups of children in grades K-5 who required additional reading support outside of their classrooms. I have provided instructional support and coaching to classroom teachers on my campus in the area of reading and language arts.

Observations of my individual students' developing literacy processing systems inspired me to learn more about language and its role in promoting young children's development into proficient readers. In my first encounters with the professional literature related to oral language development and acquisition, I learned that language is made up of various systems: pragmatic, semantic, syntactic, morphemic, orthographic, and graphophonemic (Goodman, Watson, & Burke, 2005; Kucer, 2009; Roth, Speece, & Cooper, 2002). However, it was the narrative aspect of oral language that piqued my interest. As a result, my quest to learn more about oral language shifted into a more focused investigation of children's oral narratives, also known as storytelling or narrative discourse. I became intrigued by what could be learned from examining children's oral stories. Not only did these stories reveal information about students' individual and cultural identities, they revealed what students understood about language. Their stories uncovered their understanding of the construction of narrative discourse at its microstructure and macrostructure levels. Narrative microstructure refers to the syntactic and semantic structures that make sentence level communication cohesive (Hughes, McGillivray, & Schmidek, 1997; Terry, Mills, Bingham, Mansour, & Marencin, 2013). Narrative macrostructure refers to the general organizational properties of a story (Hughes et al., 1997). Consequently, children's oral stories gave me a very comprehensive snapshot of their language abilities, providing information at both levels of language.

As a reading specialist, concerned with the reading proficiencies of my students, I also wanted to understand how children's knowledge of specific linguistic features contributed or hindered their ability to read. I was curious about how children were able

to leverage their own knowledge of these linguistic features to assist them in decoding and comprehending text. Furthermore, I was especially interested in how linguistically and culturally diverse children engaged in this process of accessing academic language and using lexical and syntactical resources to aid them as readers even when their primary discourse patterns or the language of home and community differed from their secondary discourse patterns (Gee, 2012), the language of school, books, and learning. This type of language is also referred to as *academic language* (Cummins & Yee-Fun, 2007).

A number of my culturally or linguistically diverse students were able to successfully decode and comprehend written text, but others struggled in one or both of these areas. While it seemed that some students' difficulty in comprehending and decoding could be attributed to their inability to use and/or integrate phonetic and phonological processes with meaning and syntactic cues or information, other students mostly displayed an inability to anticipate or to correctly predict the lexical and semantic patterns employed by the author. While this pattern of reading behavior was seen across the reading levels, it was more noticeable as children began to read text containing more academic features. At times, their inability to anticipate the syntactical structures of books led to an over-dependence on visual or graphophonic sources. As a result, they were less fluent in their reading, and therefore less balanced in their reading processing system. Surprisingly, I observed this type of reading behavior in children whose oral language was adequate, fluent, and sufficient for communicating everyday ideas, needs, and wants clearly. I, like many educators, assumed that surely their oral language would

4

be an adequate resource to assist them as readers, but for many of these students, this did not seem to be true.

My observations of children's language and their ability to read prompted me to search the literature to learn more about language and its connection to the journey of children in becoming literate. As I explored the complexities of language and literacy in culturally and linguistically diverse students, I was also introduced to the concept of reader identity and discourse through the writings of James Gee (2001, 2003, 2009, 2012). My search for answers led me to the tangled intersection of the complexities of language, literacy, and reading identity.

Background to the Problem

Language and Literacy Learning

Walter Loban's (1963) groundbreaking longitudinal study, which investigated the developmental stages of oral language across the grade levels, revealed a strong association between children's oral language and their reading achievement. Loban's study study began the conversation about the connection between language and literacy. Since then, other researchers have attempted to understand the connection between the two areas. Nevertheless, in spite of research on these two areas, there is not a clear consensus regarding the explicit linguistic links between children's language and literacy achievement in education (Roth et al., 2002). Furthermore, it is believed that children bring a basic knowledge of oral language and narrative structure to reading, and it is this knowledge that aids children in deciphering printed text (Leu, 1981; Roth et al., 2002; Snow, 1991). Nevertheless, many educators and especially reading teachers are not aware of the specific syntactic and semantic language structures that children possess which

may act as linguistic resources in helping them to decode and to understand text both literally and inferentially. It is also believed that children whose overall language structures differ from the structures of school language or who possess delays in oral narrative ability may experience reading difficulty (Leu, 1981; Roth et al., 2002; Hester, 2010; Westby, 1985). However, without a clear understanding of useful syntactical and semantic features that support students' ability to decode and to comprehend text, demonstrated through their ability to engage in literate behaviors, teachers are insufficiently equipped to bridge the gap between the language of home and community and the academic language patterns or discourses associated with school, books, and learning.

Oral storytelling. From my experience, many educators are unaware of the utility of oral narrative discourse or storytelling. While they may be cognizant of some of its instructional benefits within the language arts classroom, educators may not be as knowledgeable about its diagnostic functions in revealing students' specific oral strengths and weaknesses in relation to the language patterns or features associated with academic language or the language of books, school, and learning.

Literate language. In the field of speech and language pathology, language with school-based language features is referred to as literate language (Benson, 2009; Westby, 1985). While children's oral language is used to communicate their basic desires and needs within a shared context, literate language, which can be captured in children's storytelling, is much denser and more explicit because it is usually not supported by a shared context or shared knowledge. This type of language is typically developed as a result of general learning and literacy experiences within storytelling and in situations

where children have had opportunities to reflect on or share ideas, thoughts, and experiences (Westby, 1985). Conjunctions, elaborate noun phrases, mental and linguistic verbs, and adverbs are believed to be four foundational exemplars of literate language (Benson, 2009; Curenton & Justice, 2004; Greenhalgh & Strong, 2001).

   Written language. In the field of reading, researchers have used the term written language rather than literate language when distinguishing between oral and academic language registers (Akinnaso, 1982; Leu, 1981; Leu, 1982; Murray, 1988; Pontecorvo & Zucchermaglio, 1989; Purcell-Gates, 2001; Sulzby, 1982; Tannen, 1984). Features of such language include subordinate and relative clauses, appositive phrases, and passive verbs (Leu, 1981). However, the knowledge of written language structures is also thought to be mediated by the knowledge of literate language structures, typically found in storytelling (Westby, 1985). The term written language refers to language with the syntactic structures found mostly in printed text. It is not merely oral language written down (Clay, 1991; Fillmore & Snow, 2000). These syntactic structures are distinct from oral language structures. Spoken or oral language contains sentence structures with multiple clauses and with fewer content words per clause. By contrast, written language is more condensed, consisting of fewer syntactical clauses, with more content words per clause (Halliday, 1979). Currently, it may be called book language, or in its more emergent forms, "talking like a book" (Clay, 1991, p. 78).

   When children have meaningful opportunities to interact with books, this book language can be internalized; furthermore, this interaction may build on and extend students' existing language structures (Clay, 2001; Goodman & Goodman, 2014; Purcell- Gates, 1988). Westby (1985) also proposed that the distinction between oral

and written language is not merely a distinction between speaking and writing, but rather a dichotomy reflecting why and how language is used. Nevertheless, while children use both literate and oral language story patterns when they tell stories, their control of literate and/or written language may be more advantageous for them in learning to read and comprehend fluently (Leu, 1981, 1982; Purcell-Gates, 1988; Westby, 1985).

Anticipating language structures. The ability to hypothesize, anticipate, or predict upcoming text is essential for reading proficiently (Goodman, Fries, & Strauss, 2016). Prediction occurs when readers access their own knowledge of the text's possible content, structure, and language patterns. Yet, in order to predict the author's intended text accurately, the reader's schema must contain adequate information including internalized knowledge of specific literate syntactical features used by the author (Leu, 1981; Goodman et al., 2016). Considering this relationship between reading and language, many students may simply need more intentional and targeted literate or written language instruction, attained through meaningful and authentic literacy experiences (Benson, 2009). These literacy experiences may allow them to add the features of the language of school and specifically the language structures often found in text to their linguistic repertoires in order to assist them in becoming more proficient readers.

Language variation and academic discourse. Oral language is more subject to cultural, regional, and community variation than the written language register (Fillmore & Snow, 2000). Oral language is divided into dialects. Dialects are differentiated by their vocabulary, syntax, and even their accent (O'Neal & Ringler, 2010). Standard English is

considered the most important dialect because of its association with the education system or with academic language (Craig, Zhang, Hensel, & Quinn, 2009; O'Neal & Ringler, 2010; Trudgill, 1999). Often researchers use standard English and academic language interchangeably (Craig et al., 2009; O'Neal & Ringler, 2010).

However, it is not merely the students' adoption of cultural language variations that may make learning to read and to understand written and literate language structures more difficult; having a limited knowledge of these academic language structures may prevent students from becoming successful readers (Fillmore & Snow, 2000). Standard English Learners (SELs), such as African American students, often speak a dialect referred to as African American English (AAE) (Craig, Kolenic, Hensel, 2014; Craig et al., 2009). However, African American students who have also internalized academic structures and are able to dialect shift or code switch from their primary discourse or dialect to standard English performed better on select reading tasks than students who did not demonstrate an ability to shift their dialect (Craig et al., 2009).

Language, Literacy, and Reading Identity

Students' identities as readers reveal what they value, how they see themselves and others, and what they understand about their reading processes (Goodman, et al., 2005; Harste, 2009; Sumara, 1998). Their identity reveals their level of enthusiasm about reading as well as their level of agency in engaging in the reading process. In addition, their reading identity also reflects their interests in various text genres and authors (Bang-Jensen, 2010). This awareness often results in greater amounts of reader empowerment and engagement, which can affect reading growth and development (Allington & Gabriel, 2012; Bang-Jensen, 2010). Gaining information about students' identities also

9

helps us to determine how well students are becoming a part of the "club of readers"

(Smith, 1988), how they are positioning themselves as members within the reading

culture of their literacy environment, and how they are joining the discourse group of

those students who consider reading a lifelong pursuit and not just a task to be completed

in response to a literacy lesson or activity. Harste proposed, "You need to see yourself as

a reader to become one" (2009, p. 7).

Children whose home literacy practices match the school's tacit values and

practices often have little difficulty taking on a reader identity, thus becoming a member

of the discourse of reading, but there are some culturally or linguistically diverse children

who may have difficulty taking on this new identity (Compton-Lilly, 2007; Gee, 2003,

2004). Typically, these are the students who did not receive a head start into school's

valued literacy practices and who in turn missed the early opportunity to acquire

foundational academic language structures and literacy discourse principles. Gee (2004)

argued that schools do a very inadequate job of teaching students academic language

varieties, and therefore many poor and minority children fail to become a part of the

discourse of reading and in turn fail to develop into proficient readers. Their ability or

inability to adopt the language of school-based literacy may be connected to their ability

to take on the identity of a reader. Gee postulated that it is not the status of being poor

which prevents students' entry into this discourse; rather, it is the lack of school-based

linguistic resources that prevent them from gaining entrance.

Rationale of the Study

As classrooms become more diversified, filled with learners whose language and

literacy background differ from the school's, both educators and researchers must gain a

better understanding of students' linguistic resources in addition to the linguistic knowledge that students need in order to be proficient readers. In the field of reading, currently, little focus has been given to the investigation of literate and written language features and their influence on children's ability to read and comprehend text. Instead, much of the more current research connecting language to literacy has generally focused on the domain of phonological awareness (Roth et al., 2002). Nevertheless, researchers such as Leu (1981), Purcell-Gates (1988), Sulzby (1996), and Goodman (2005) have determined that knowledge of written language is essential to the successful reading and understanding of text. However, current research in reading has not adequately explained these written language patterns or attempted to demonstrate why or how knowledge of these structures influence students' decoding and comprehending of text.

The current study is important to current research because it explores the link between literacy and language without minimizing the complexity of reading. Past research by Heath (1983), Taylor and Dorsey-Gains (1988) and Wells (2009) revealed information about the language and literacy mismatches between school and home through ethnographic studies. This methodology enabled researchers to gain a more holistic view of the complexities of children's home literacy practices and understandings, as well as insight into what could be interpreted as their reading identity. The previous research acknowledged the sociocultural aspects of literacy learning. While the ethnographic methodology was not used in this dissertation, in order to approximate the complexities of reading and the sociocultural influence of literacy acquisition, multiple literacy tasks and a student interview were included in this study. Specifically, this interview was designed to reveal how participants viewed themselves and others as

readers as well as participants' understanding of the reading process. I was not able to locate a study in past or present research designed to capture students' adoption of school-based literacy D/discourse while simultaneously revealing students' affiliated linguistic resources.

It is believed that students must have academic language in order to be successful in school-based literacy (Gee, 2004; Snow & Uccelli, 2009; Van Kleeck & Schwarz, 2011). Nevertheless, according to the research, many low-socioeconomic students and culturally and linguistically diverse students lack these language patterns (Delpit & Dowdy, 2008; Le Moine & Soto, 2017). In particular, African American children have consistently scored below White children on literacy assessments (Craig et al., 2009; Hester, 2010; Howard, 2010). Language has often been cited as one of the factors that may have contributed to the achievement gap between many African American students and their mainstream peers. Yet, in the field of reading, there has been little research that explored the influence of the presence of academic language structures internalized by school age African American children and the influence of these structures on their reading behaviors and achievement.

In the field of speech and language pathology and developmental psychology, the narrative domain of language has been linked to comprehension abilities (Hester, 2010; Gardner-Neblett & Iruka, 2015; Snow & Beals, 2006). From my investigation of narrative research, research focusing on the narrative discourse domain of oral language has revealed many predictive relationships between how pre-school age children tell stories and their literacy abilities once in elementary school (Dickinson & Porche, 2011; Reece, Suggate, Long, & Schaughency, 2010; Roth et al., 2002); Roth, Speece, Cooper,

12

& Paz, 1996; Storch & Whitehurst, 2002), but very few studies have explored the concurrent link between aspects of children's narrative discourse abilities and their reading decoding and comprehension abilities. By studying the concurrent link between students' academic language features and discourse, researchers and educators may gain a clearer understanding of the connection between language, literacy, and identity.

Statement of the Problem

Based on my experiences as an educator and my investigations into past and current research, the achievement gap between non-mainstream and mainstream students requires continued exploration into language, identity, and literacy. Without an adequate understanding of how these areas operate or work in tandem in young children, we may never fully understand how to effectively support them on their journey in becoming literate.

In order to more effectively teach culturally and linguistically different students, educators must be knowledgeable of the types of academic language that students possess and must possess in order to become proficient readers, especially SELs, such as African American students, whose language differences have been implicated in their lower literacy achievements. In addition, educators need to learn the best way to assess students' internalized academic language structures using natural but appropriate assessment methods. Finally, how students see themselves as readers and what they understand about their own reading processes may reveal areas that may help educators better serve African American students or other SELs.

Statement of the Purpose

The purpose of this qualitative embedded multiple case study has been to explore possible links between select African American students' knowledge of literate and written language and their ability to read and comprehend text. In this study, the ability to read and to comprehend text was demonstrated through literate behaviors such as decoding, anticipating, retelling text, and answering comprehension questions. Within this exploratory study, I examined how African American children, at differing reading proficiency levels, used their literate and written language patterns, also called academic language, as a resource in decoding, comprehending, and anticipating text. Additionally, I investigated students' identities as readers by uncovering their beliefs and values concerning school-based literacy and their metalinguistic knowledge (their knowledge of their individual reading processing strategies). My intent was also to determine the influence that their reading identity had on the aforementioned reading behaviors.

Theoretical Framework

The overall theoretical framework of this qualitative embedded multiple case study is supported by James Gee's discourse analysis theory (Gee, 2004, 2012). His theory encouraged the evaluation of discourse at two levels, capital "D"/Discourse and lowercase "d"/discourse. While "d"/discourse refers to "language-in-use" or the actual grammatical and lexical components of language, "D"/Discourse refers to the beliefs, values, attitudes, traditions, and behaviors that are often coupled with the expressions of "d"/discourse. Capital "D"/discourse encapsulates identity, while lowercase "d"/discourse expresses this identity linguistically.

In Gee's perspective, school literacy is a type of discourse or social construction framed by distinct values, beliefs, languages and practices (Gee, 2004, 2012). This type of discourse is known as secondary discourse because it is outside of the discourse patterns of the home. This secondary discourse is linked to school-based literacy and school-based language learning practices. Many times the primary discourse patterns of students' home and community is different from and may even conflict with the secondary discourse practices of school. However, sometimes students' primary discourse matches their secondary discourse patterns.

In this study, children's knowledge or use of academic structures represented the "d"/discourse; while the "D"/Discourse was expressed through children's reading identity within the context of the literate discourse of school. As a result, "d"/discourse and "D"/Discourse made up the academic discourse and served as the lens through which children's literate behaviors were investigated.

Significance of the Study

This study is important to educational practitioners and to the body of research for several reasons. Its exploratory design gives us a greater understanding of the separate and synergistic influences of three very complex areas: academic language, identity, and literate behaviors. For educators who work with culturally linguistic children growing in their ability to read complex text, this study provides insights into vital language features that may function as resources in decoding and comprehending text.

Additionally, this study positions literate and written language as cultural products rather than objectives or skills that children must learn. This study does not discredit students' existing language resources; rather, it was designed to gather

15

information about the development of their academic linguistic resources within the culture of school.

In order to support the idea that reading is a language process (Goodman et al., 2005), a linguistic lens was used to understand children's reading ability. This dissertation merged the findings and concepts of language research from multiple disciplines such as speech and language pathology, reading, child psychology, linguistics, and early childhood in order to bring to the forefront a topic that had either lain dormant as a product of past research or had simply not been fully considered as an essential variable in literacy learning.

Furthermore, this study incorporated authentic reading measures, such as appropriately leveled fiction picture books. These picture books were used to discover how children solved and made sense of text containing literate language and written language as opposed to using standardized criterion referenced tests that measured reading performance through reading passages or lists of isolated words.

Finally, this qualitative study is significant in that it explores the language and literacy behaviors of African American children, a population which has been studied much less often than middle-class white children in the area of literacy learning (Gardner-Neblett, Pungello, & Iruka, 2012).

Delimitations

This study looks primarily at third-grade African American participants because few studies have qualitatively explored the reading processing decisions of African American students and because I was interested in learning more about the language, literacy, and identity of this population. Students were chosen to form three reading

16

proficiency level groups. The sample size was kept small, and this enabled me to more thoroughly understand relevant links between students' literate language and written language and specific reading behaviors. It is my hope that as a result of this study, researchers and other educators can learn more about the influence that students' knowledge and control of academic discourse may have on their literacy development.

Conclusion

As educators, we are in what seems to be a never-ending battle to help our students become literate. Daily, we teach children whose culture, language, and social background differ from our own. While many of us seek to understand and appreciate various aspects of our students' culture, such as their language, we know that in order for them to be successful in school they must have a more solid grasp of the language of school and learning, also known as written and literate or academic language (McNaughton, 2002; Pellegrini, 1985; Purcell-Gates, 2001). Researchers such as Goodman (Goodman et al., 2005) and Fillmore and Snow (2000) have encouraged teachers to acquire more linguistic knowledge to aid them in supporting students' literacy development.

It is my hope that this study will to bring to the forefront the formally valued linguistic perspective of children's literacy learning. It is also my hope that both educators and researchers will better understand the school-based discourse that diverse learners such as many African American learners may need in order to be successful readers.

Finally, it is my desire that, as a result of this study, disciplines influencing the language learning of children will begin to work more collaboratively in the realm of

17

research and in the daily educational practices of school to more effectively bridge the gap between the discourse of home and that of school.

Definition of Key Terms

1. *African American.* Also referred to Black Americans or Afro-Americans. A particular ethnic group of citizens or residents of the United States having total or partial ancestry from people of Sub-Saharan African. This designation is often given to those who were descendants of those enslaved in America during 18th and 19th century. They are the largest racial minority in the United States and the second largest racial group after the white population (African Americans Law and Legal Definition, 2016).

2. *Academic Language.* Oral and written academic registers usually relating to school and learning and used to understand and express ideas in both oral and written modalities (Cummins & Yee-Fun, 2007).

3. *African American English (AAE).* Also known as Ebonics, a term used to describe the common core or grammatical, phonological, and lexical features of language often associated the nonstandard dialect spoken by many African Americans (Rickford & Rickford, 2001; Wyatt, 1995).

4. *Code-switching.* The utilization of two languages or dialects within a communicative setting that occurs when a person lacks a word in the second language/dialect or when it feels better to speak in one language or dialect rather than another (Kucer, 2001).

5. *Comprehending.* A process of making sense of written language (Goodman, 1996).

6. *Comprehension.* The resulting meaning or the end product of reading (Goodman, 1996).

7. *Contextualize Discourse*. Talk involving situations and objects that are a part of the immediate context (Curenton, Craig, & Flanigan, 2008).

8. *Cultural Capital*. A collection of symbolic and concrete resources that contribute to the societal ranking and individual potential for social and economic advancement (Bourdieur, 1986).

9. *Cultural Difference Model*. A model which postulates that the differences observed in intelligence testing, cultural conventions, and language used in a non-white middle class community are not the result of faulty learning, pathology, or genetic inferiority, but a manifestation of specifically unique cultural characteristics and expressions (Howard, 2010) .

10. *Decontextualized Discourse*. Talk that is used to reveal or share information about abstract objects and events outside of the present environment (Curenton et al., 2008).

11. *Dialec*t. "Variation in language resulting from geography, social status, or cultural influence" (Goodman et al., 2005, p. 84).

12. *Deep Structure*. "...the underlying relationships that are perceived by, or rather constructed by the reader or listener on the basis of his or her prior knowledge and experience, schemas, in other words"(Weaver, 1988, p. 34).

13. *Deficit Model*. A model proposing that members of minority ethnic groups are deficient because their cultural practices are not congruent with those of the dominant ethnic majority group. It asserts that members of racial ethnic groups do

19

not achieve as highly as their white majority peers because their families are dysfunctional and lack those characteristics common within white American culture (Howard, 2010).

14. *Discourses*. Ways of using language that fit a specific social, economic, educational, or cultural context. "…ways of behaving, interacting, valuing, thinking, believing, speaking, and often reading and writing that are accepted as instantiations of particular identities" (Gee, 2012, p. 3).

15. *Expected Response (ER)*. A response by the reader, while decoding text, which matches what the observer expects to hear (Goodman et al., 2005).

16. *Language cues.* Syntactic, semantic, and graphophonemic information used to identify unknown words and to construct meaning during reading (Weaver, 1988).

17. *Language Variation*. Variability of language in different contexts, such as ethnicity, geography, speaker age, speaker gender, and socioeconomic status (Levey, 2011).

18. *Literate Language.* Language with a denser and more specific lexicon coupled with a more complex syntactic form than those of oral language, which develops in tandem with literate behavior (Benson, 2009).

19. *Microstructure*. Structure related to how words and utterances work together to build cohesive sentences. It involves syntactic and semantic productivity, accuracy and complexity (Terry et. al., 2013).

20. *Macrostructure*. Hierarchical structure that moves the listener from the beginning of the story, when the settings and characters are introduced, to the end of the

20

story, through a plot that develops into a resolution. Example: Story grammar, Episodic Narrative (Terry et al., 2013).

21. *Miscue.* A mismatch between a reader's observed response (OR) and the expected response (ER) within the text (Goodman et al., 2005).

22. *Narrative.* A real or imagined account of experiences or events that are temporally sequenced and convey meaning. A narrative can unintentionally be embedded within conversations and oral interactions (Engel, 1995).

23. *Observed Response (OR).* A response to text that an observer notices during the process of oral reading (Goodman et al., 2005).

24. *Oral Language.* Language which "serves informal purposes such as talking on the telephone or face-to-face conversations, but can also be used formally, as in structured interviews or lectures" (Goodman et al., 2005, p. 25).

25. *Phonological Awareness.* "The awareness of words, rhyming words, onsets and rimes, syllables, and individual sounds" (Fountas & Pinnell, 2009, p. 547).

26. *Primary Discourse.* The initial discourse of home and community, where one learns to culturally operate in the everyday demands of life as a non-specialized and non-professional person (Gee, 2012).

27. *Secondary Discourse.* Any of the discourses that are acquired following the primary discourse such as those used by institutions such as schools, community organizations, religious groups, or businesses (Gee, 2012).

28. *Story Grammar.* A set of rules that determine story organization, story components, and the relationship between those components at various locations in a story (Gordon & Braun, 1983).

29.	*Story Schema.* "*...*a set of expectations about the internal structure of stories which serves to facilitate both encoding and retrieval" (Mandler & Johnson, 1977, p. 112).

30.	*Surface Structure.* "*...*the visible or audible text, the squiggles and vibrations that are interpreted as words and word patterns—including the grammatical signals of word endings, function words, and word order" (Weaver, 1988, p. 34).

31.	*Written Language.* Language that is generally more formal and is used primarily for essays, scientific reports, and historic documents but can also be used informally in personal letters, notes, and shopping lists (Weaver, 1988).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

"To become literate a person must master, in addition to a set of culturally defined skills, all the cultural information involved in decoding and producing texts, including the frames of reference for comprehending their contents."

Bernardo Ferdman

My doctoral journey began with a major paradigm shift in my view of literacy from seeing it as primarily the acquisition of reading and writing skills and strategies in order to understand the author's message to seeing it as a culturally constructed entity that affects one's identity and language (Gee, 2012; Gee, 2015; Gee & Spack, 1998). During this time, my interpretation of culture also evolved, as I came to understand it as less associated with ethnicity and more associated with the common beliefs, values, behaviors, literacy, and ways of learning among groups of people. Gee referred to these groups of people with their common visible and tacit distinctions as discourses. Gee's discourse perspective guided my study, which explored the intersection of language, literacy, and identity in third-grade African American children who had reached that end-of-year benchmark before facing the higher academic complexities of the fourth grade. Therefore, this review of literature includes pertinent research and understandings from these three areas of literacy, culture, and discourse.

This research study explored African American students' adoption of the discourse of school-based literacy and its impact on their literate behaviors. These literate behaviors included the ability to decode, anticipate, retell, and answer comprehension questions. To provide background for the current study, this literature review presents

23

different perspectives on literacy as well as research and insights into non-mainstream literacies. These perspectives include a cultural and cognitive perspective on literacy, a discourse view of literacy, and a family and community view of literacy. These literacy perspectives are included within the review because they support my efforts to position this research in a cultural difference stance, a stance emphasizing the transforming of school practices, rather than a cultural deficit stance, which is a stance emphasizing the deficiencies of students (Howard, 2010). In addition, these perspectives also supported my own understandings and beliefs about literacy and contributed to the development of this study. Much of the research in this review is grounded in a sociocultural framework as it reflects the influences of cultural and social practices on identity, language, and literacy learning (Tracey & Morrow, 2006).

All of the participants in this study were African Americans. Therefore, some of the research involves African American children and families. Furthermore, since the study also focused on the language of African Americans, past research and present perspectives regarding the cultural deficit and cultural difference views of African American language are also included. In order to more fully understand some aspects of academic discourse, this review explains the differences between oral and written language and the possible links between children's knowledge of written language and literacy. Additionally, this review reveals how students come to understand text, through their understanding of storytelling and story grammar and how they apply these understanding through retellings. Finally, some ideas concerning the development of students' identity within the discourse of reading are also presented.

All of the literature in this review was selected to provide background about my dissertation and to uncover the relevant gaps in the current body of research that led to the development of this study.

Perspectives of Literacy

Literacy as Culture

Generally, people have deemed literacy to simply involve reading and writing. However, in a broader sense, literacy is the ability to think and reason according to the required literacy practices of a given culture or society (Langer, 1987). "Literacy is a cultural phenomenon," (Goodman, 1986, p. 1). Literacy is transmitted through language. The thinking processes that are valued in a society or culture are usually the same processes that are taught and expected to be mentally internalized in educational institutions or other learning settings. Culture greatly affects learning because it is the way the brain makes sense of the world (Hammond, 2015). Culture operates on three different levels: surface culture, shallow culture, and deep culture. Surface culture involves food, dress, music, and holidays. Shallow culture consists of unspoken rules and norms within everyday social interactions. However, deep culture, the level of culture that this research explored, influences the formation of the brain's cognitive structures. These structures determine how we receive, organize, interpret, and form new knowledge.

To explore the phenomenon of cognition and literacy through a cultural lens, Scribner and Cole (1981a, 1981b) studied how literacy and cognitive development were related. They investigated the Vai people of Liberia. At the time of the study, this community was the only known community in which Vai writing as a cultural practice

25

was taught in the home; it was not a part of the school's curriculum. Unique from other communities, this community was made up of different groups of people who learned English, Arabic, or Vai. This communities' literacy practices included learning to write and speak Arabic, to write and read the Vai script (taught at home), or to speak, read and write English through formal schooling. The three languages, reflecting the values and belief systems within the distinct cultural practices, were taught differently, and this resulted in three distinct literacies within the one community. The findings of the study suggested that the uses and practices of specific literacies produced cognitive abilities and skills directly related to how those literacies were taught and practiced. For example, when members of the three literacy groups were compared, those who read and wrote the Vai script communicated more clearly and specifically than members of the other literacy groups. This finding was discovered in one of the research tasks that assessed members of the three groups' abilities to explain the directions to a game verbally. Scribner and Cole (1981a, 1981) attributed the Vai literate group's ability to perform better than the non-Vai literate people to their skill in writing formal and informal letters and other forms of communication in Vai. The Vai script was used primarily for those purposes.

As a result of engaging repeatedly in that literacy, Vai literates developed a cognitive skill that could be transferred and applied to other tasks that required that same type of cognitive process. In addition, those who were literate in Arabic and whose literate training and practice involved learning the Qur'an by memory outperformed others in remembering a series of numbers. The Arabic students' literacy learning and practice involved rote memory; this practice enabled them to develop efficient memorization techniques and to outperform the other literacy groups who had not

26

developed those techniques within their literacy practice. The cognitive process of retelling a story was also a research task within their study. The group members instructed in the Vai English schools performed better than the other groups on this particular task, because retelling was a part of the school's literacy curriculum.

It is not uncommon for one society to include multiple literacies and to support and to teach those literacy practices formally and informally, as demonstrated in Scribner and Cole's study (1981a). However, in many societies or cultures there are literacies that are considered more dominant and more esteemed than others (Street & Street, 1995). Likewise, the associated cognitive processes of those dominant literacies are deemed just as valuable as the literacy practices themselves (Gee, 2001, 2012; Heath, 1983). Higher levels of the dominant literacy are considered a form of cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1973). Hence, individuals and communities who experience the dominant literacy are also more likely to develop valued cognitive tools, which also may serve as cultural capital (Gee, 2001, 2012; Heath, 1983). "Cultural capital pertains to specific acquired knowledge, value systems, language patterns, and/or visible dispositions" (Bartee & Brown, 2007, p. 1). Furthermore, both individuals and communities are labeled inadequate when they lack this cultural capital, while individuals and communities who possess this capital are more likely to experience school success.

Currently, many of the expectations of schooled literacy can be equated with Western assumptions about schooling, power, and knowledge (Street & Street 1995). As a result, home or family literacies that do not match the schools' westernized, mainstream interpretation of what good or real literacy looks like are often ill-favored (Taylor & Dorsey-Gaines, 1988). Repeatedly, culturally and linguistically diverse students find

themselves outside of the normative discourse of school literacy, and as a result, many students fail to develop higher literacy skills within the dominant discourse.

However, it is also important to note that this experience of not being assimilated into the discourse of school-based literacy is not limited to non-white children (Purcell-Gates, 1995). In Victoria Purcell-Gates' ethnographic study of a poor white Appalachian family's struggles in becoming literate, she determined that children born into a culture where written language did not mediate their everyday activities had a difficult time taking on the discourse of school and therefore had a difficult time reading. Children native to a print literate world were more likely to experience success in reading because they "know or acquire implicitly as they develop, the varying registers of written language with the accompanying 'ways of meaning' and 'ways of saying', the vocabulary, the syntax and the intentionality" (Purcell-Gates, 1995, p. 182). As a result, these children needed only to focus on mapping print onto an already familiar language. Purcell-Gates determined that students developing the culture of mainstream literacy had to learn it as a whole (1995). They had to acquire literate behaviors using print and to participate with literate others. In this way, they became enculturated into the world of literacy, learning just as much about the culture of literacy as about the specific language that encodes it.

Literacy as Discourse

James Gee proposed that to understand school-based literacy, it was important to comprehend the concept of discourse because schooling provided a type of school-based literacy discourse. According to Gee, a discourse is "a socially accepted association among ways of using language, of thinking and of acting that can be used to identify

oneself as a member of a socially meaningful group or 'social network'" (Gee & Spack,

1998; Gee, 2012). He compared a discourse to an "identity kit," which included an

appropriate costume and instructions on how to behave, speak, and assimilate into a role

that is recognizable and familiar to others (Gee & Spack, 1998, p. 1). Discourses are

ideological, involving a set of values that one must embrace in order to be counted as a

member of that discourse. Discourse groups are comprised of people who share many

tacit beliefs and viewpoints. Discourse beliefs may be influenced by competing or

divergent discourses. Discourses may marginalize beliefs, thoughts, and values of other

discourses. Additionally, discourses may be linked to social power and a hierarchical

structure in society. As a result, membership or affiliation with certain discourses may

lead to higher access to social goods such as money, power, and status. An individual's

identity is often representative of a historically and socially defined discourse, reflecting

its language, ideas, values, behaviors, thoughts, and beliefs.

When new social languages and genres are acquired, to the extent that a person

can not only consume them but also produce them, the person has been socialized into a

particular discourse simultaneously taking on its language as well as other noticeable

signs of the discourse (Gee, 2001). However, some people do comfortably produce the

new discourse but may only be consumers. Therefore, they may recognize the discourse

readily but still not be able to fully display or identify with the discourse.

Many times, membership within a particular discourse occurs when individuals

are put in a position where they can acquire it (Gee & Spack, 1998). Gee and Spack

asserted that acquisition took place subconsciously in meaningful, natural, and functional

settings. In contrast, learning involved a conscious construction of knowledge explained

by an expert that breaks down the concepts into analytic parts. There are some cultural discourses that involve more modeling or demonstrations, and the potential member is expected to simply pick up the skill. Acquired skills lead to more masterful mental constructions, while learned skills lead to more metacognitive awareness of what has been taught.

The next section of this review discusses the research of Shirley Brice Heath (1982, 1983) who studied three communities (Trackton, Roadville. and the Townspeople) with differing literacy and language practices. Heath also discovered different but complimentary discourse apprenticing behaviors in researching the three communities. She noticed that the Trackton and Roadville parents were more likely to have their children learn primarily through observing a task, while the Townspeople often added more explicit oral instructions when demonstrating a task. However, both processes were important in gaining access into new discourses.

Some discourses required both or one mental apprenticing process. For example, Gee attributed learning the first language solely to the process of acquisition. Yet, he also believed that gaining a school-based or academic language occurred through a process of learning and acquiring both linguistic and tacit understandings (Gee, 2005). Nevertheless, regarding schooling and the language related to literacy, Gee proposed that school-based literacy and language discourse could not be fully and overtly taught in a classroom, but could only be extended through instruction that incorporated apprenticeship, mentoring, modeling, and social practice. Therefore, he proposed that acquisition must take place before learning and overt teaching.

The first discourse acquired at home and in the community is called primary discourse (Gee, 2005). Any discourse outside of the home, and especially the discourse of school, is called secondary discourse. Gee described literacy as mastery of a secondary discourse. He stated that an individual is not a member of a discourse until the individual has mastered the discourse. Again, mastery is obtained mainly through acquisition, with the support of learning. Keeping this in mind, many non-mainstream students come to school without having acquired foundational aspects of the school-based discourse. Many times the achievement gap began to exist before formal schooling commenced and was exacerbated by traditional schools' inability to effectively facilitate school-based discourse acquisition (Gee, 2005, 2012).

However, there were non-mainstream families that adopted formal schooling discourse practices. According to Gee (2005), these families or social groups in society connected with formal schooling in some way and as a result socialized their children into practices that supported acquiring later school-based secondary discourses. Families who took on more esteemed secondary literacy discourse practices such as reading with their child or telling expository stories, asking and answering questions, and labeling various objects or describing concepts practiced what Gee referred to as early discourse borrowing. Nevertheless, the purpose of early discourse borrowing was not primarily to give children certain skills, but to instill in them the values, attitudes, motivations, and ways of interacting and perceiving that would allow them to enter that discourse successfully.

31

Literacy as Family and Community Constructions

Shirley Brice Heath's (1982, 1983) research paralleled Gee's perspectives on the connections and disconnections between home and school, or between primary and secondary discourse. In her study, Heath studied three communities: Roadville, Trackton, and the Townspeople. Her main finding was that children were socialized into language and literacy, which might or might not match the literate behaviors of school- based language and literacy learning. Each of these communities had their own unique rules for interacting socially and sharing knowledge. Essentially, she found that each community had its own ways with words.

One of the study groups, which Heath referred to as the Townspeople, were black and white people residing within the inner borders of the town (Heath, 1983). Their professional responsibilities, clothes, speech, and habits of talking set them apart from the other communities. In addition, the Townspeople were very school oriented and believed that being academically and socially successful in school was vital to being a successful adult. They were expected to develop habits and values that reflected their membership within the school-based literate society (Heath, 1982). In their perspective, school promoted values such as respectability, responsibility, acceptance, and hard work. Written materials at home and school were frequently referenced and were at the center of many of their conversations with each other and with their children. Their children often engaged in literacy events. Heath defined literacy events as "occasions in which written language is integral to the nature of participants' interactions and their interpretive processes and strategies" (p. 50). Family literacy events for preschoolers included listening to bedtime stories, reading cereal boxes and stop signs, seeing

television ads, and interpreting instruction for commercial games and toys. As children aged, they were expected to give attention to the information contained in books, to answer questions about what they heard or read, to respond to adult commentary about books, and to engage in book talks where children would suspend reality, telling stories that mirrored what they understood about the structures of books. They developed decontextualized language ability (Rowe, 2013), the ability to use specific language to discuss an event or story. Also, the literacy events included book-related entertainment events and listening to their parents describe specific features of an object while discussing their opinions and ideas (Heath, 1982).

In keeping with Gee's literacy discourse perspective, it can be concluded that these children acquired the discourse of school-based literacy. They were immersed in events that not only affected their understanding of written texts but also affected their values and beliefs about literacy and even affected how they positioned themselves and others as readers. Consequently, they took on the identity or discourse of a reader often even before starting formal schooling.

However, Heath discovered that the literacy experiences in the Roadville community, a white working-class mining community, differed from those of the Townspeople, even though they shared a few similarities (Heath, 1982, 1983). Reading and reading-based events were most likely to occur before bedtime. Roadville children engaged in reading books. Roadville adults worked to support children in using words properly and understanding the meaning of the written word. This understanding was important for both educational and religious success. Nevertheless, even though books were read, they were not discussed deeply. Literacy was not discussed in a series of

33

questions and answers in order to help students build meaning. Rather, questioning was used to assess children's knowledge. In addition, as stated earlier in this review, when children learned a new game or task, they were not given explicit verbal directions, but were asked to watch the game or task being demonstrated in order to learn it. Furthermore, even though these children were encouraged to tell stories, their stories were about real events and not about fictionalized imaginary occurrences.

Concerning the Trackton children, who were a part of a predominately African American community, Heath discovered that they had vastly different experiences with print (Heath, 1982, 1983). In that community, there were no reading materials designated for children except for Sunday school materials, and the adults did not sit and read to the children. There was not a night routine that involved story reading. At times, reading occurred when an older child would read to a younger child. They would play school, and "teacher" siblings would ask the "student" siblings questions about what was read.

Nevertheless, parents saw these literacy events as merely entertainment. Additionally, preschoolers were not asked "what-explanation" questions (Heath, 1982). Rather, they were asked analogical questions that encouraged comparisons of items, events, or people. Also, children were asked questions that would be unknown to the adult but known to the child. Trackton adults did not simplify their language when talking to young children or, in conversation, explicitly label features of objects or the environment. However, these children learned to create links between known and new situations through analogy. They did not use decontextualized language, but rather relied largely on contextualized nonverbal and verbal language.

The research of Scribner and Cole (1981a, 1981b) and Heath (1982, 1983) and the linguistic theoretical underpinnings of Gee (2005, 2012) suggested the importance of understanding the literacy practices that are connected to a culture or discourse. Scribner and Cole (1981a, 1981b) and Heath's (1982, 1983) research also implies that some individuals or even groups of individuals may not be very successful in taking on a new discourse because they have not been regularly exposed to the thinking that may prepare them for success in the new discourse. However, it is also evident from the research that early exposure to the valued literacy learnings of school is vital to students' successes. Specifically, both the Trackton and Roadville community experienced varying difficulties in learning, while the Townspeople's children excelled fully in the discourse of school.

At home, they learned how to "take meaning from books" (Heath, 1982, p. 56) and how to discuss those meanings with others. Even though the Townspeople engaged in more school-based literacy behaviors than the Roadville residents both groups incorporated different aspects of secondary discourse reading experiences into their daily lives and, as a result, their children formed foundational cognitive, linguistic, and motivational resources that were needed for them to succeed in school. These children successfully adopted the "D"/discourse or the values, behaviors, beliefs, and understandings about reading that Trackton children did not take on. The Trackton children struggled the most in trying to orient themselves to basic questions as well as to questions that required critical thinking (Heath, 1982). Consequently, as cognitive demand increased within the secondary discourse, the Trackton children struggled even more and eventually lost interest. Nevertheless, even though many of Roadville's children experienced success early in school through the third grade, because they did not

completely acquire skills in answering deeper questions or thinking critically about story events and characters, their children also eventually struggled to learn other aspects of school-based literacy.

At their core, all literacies are inherently equal. The home literacy practices within the communities that Heath studied were sufficient for the demands of home and community. Also, in keeping with Scribner and Cole's (1981a, 1981b) research, which established that literacy learning experiences resulted in distinct cognitive abilities, all three communities developed skills and cognitive processes that were linked to the way they used and acquired literacy and language. However, it was the skills and cognitive processes developed by the Townspeople's children that were more valued in school. In agreement with Gee's (2012) discourse perspective, this school-based discourse, which was linked to the dominant culture in the social hierarchy, was held in greater esteem, while some of the home literacy practices engaged in by the Roadville and Trackton residents were marginalized.

Non-Mainstream Literacy Practices

Researchers like Denny Taylor and Catherine Dorsey-Gaines (1988), in their research of the literacy practices of inner city children, brought attention to non-school-based literacy practices engaged in by many non-mainstream and poor children in an effort to legitimize these unique literacy practices and to recognize the valuable cognitive processes that were developed through these experiences. Taylor & Dorsey-Gaines' five-year ethnographic study followed a group of impoverished African American inner-city families and investigated their engagement with print in their homes and in their community. Taylor & Dorsey-Gaines found that there were often general similarities

between the way these families used print in their homes and in the ways many middle-class families used print in their homes. Taylor stated, "We are more alike than we are different, and the differences are of our own making" (1993, p. 551). Taylor also uncovered the inequitable literate demands often made of these poor families when they applied for government aid.

Victoria Purcell-Gates (1996) studied the ways that print was used in low-income families and how the consequent knowledge of print influenced children's understanding of print used in emergent mainstream classrooms. Purcell-Gates found that the use of print was varied in these families. In some of the families, the children were regularly exposed to print in their everyday lives. While this exposure to print did not always involve book reading, it may have involved reading cereal boxes, milk cartons, flyers, or coupons, or writing grocery lists and to-do lists and engaging in name writing. Yet, similarly to Heath's (1983) literacy communities study and Scribner and Coles' (1981a, 1981b) culture and cognition study, Purcell-Gates (1996) discovered that different types of emergent literacy knowledge appeared to be associated with differing aspects of home and school literacy experiences. She determined that experiences with those non-school-based print sources allowed children to construct a semiotic concept of the function of written language. However, she concluded that children who personally engaged in or who were supported in using print genres such as storybooks, novels, magazine articles, and newspapers were more likely to build stronger cognitive resources and understandings of the complexities of written discourse. Consequently, this knowledge was more likely to transfer to early school-based literacy practices. Nevertheless, recognizing the validity of both conventional and non-conventional literacy experiences

in these homes, Yetta Goodman asserted, "There is no single road to becoming literate" (Goodman & Goodman, 2014, p. 56).

Language and Learning

Language Deficits and Differences Views

Just as literacy learning, oral language has been a controversial topic, especially in the context of schooling. Some views of language development will be covered in this section to provide insight into the highly disputed journey that has taken place in academia in seeking to understand language in the context of learning. The views of Walter Loban, Basil Bernstein, William Labov and Gordon Wells provide a historical perspective of language and learning while other researchers present more current perspectives.

Walter Loban's groundbreaking research began the conversation about the influence of language on reading development (Purcell Gates, 2001). Loban's seven-year longitudinal research began in 1953 on the semantic and syntactical development of children's language established the idea that language and literacy were connected. His research of 338 school children in Oakland showed a connection between children's language complexity and their ability to achieve in reading (Loban, 1963). Loban studied three groups of language learners, those with high language abilities, those with low language abilities and a random group of language learners. Overall, Loban determined that as children got older they were more able to expressively produce longer phrases and that children's incorporation of subordinate clauses within their speaking and writing were a sign that they were developing advanced language structures or those structures that are more associated with written language. This language complexity was evident in

students' writing. Students with higher language abilities were more apt to use more subordinate clauses in writing, possessing the ability to adjust their register when engaging in a writing task; whereas, the low language group used predominantly oral language features or conversational language within their writing. Additionally, Loban determined that students of lower socioeconomic status used less complex or sophisticated syntactical structures than students of higher socioeconomic status.

Loban's research helped to begin a paradigm that viewed both reading and writing as language processes (Purcell-Gates, 2001). Loban concluded that because of the strong connection between reading, writing, and language, weakness in one area would likely affect the other areas (Loban, 1963, 1976).

Since Loban's research, many people have argued that the major cause of low educational achievement, especially as it relates to language and literacy, is directly linked to the socioeconomic level and ethnicity of families. Some educators considered poor families and in particular poor African American families to not have the language resources needed to learn in school (Labov, 1972; Wells, 2009). As a result, compensatory education programs were created to equip children with the language skills that were assumed to not be present. The programs were designed to meet the needs of at-risk children. However, the existence of these programs often furthered the idea that poor children, and specifically African American children, were culturally and linguistically deprived. William Labov's (1972) criticisms of the negative perceptions of African American dialect shed light on the narrow perceptions of many educators and researchers who felt that the African American dialect contributed to these students' difficulty in becoming successful learners. They believed that African American children possessed a

39

dialect that was simple and inferior in comparison to standard English (Labov 1972; Wells, 2009). This unfavorable perception of African American Language, also known as African American Vernacular (AAV), was fueled by studies done by white researchers who took young African American children out of the comfort of their environment (in the mid to late 1960s) to ask them questions. When the African American children did not respond as fluidly as the researchers believed that they should have, they were labeled as being without language or being linguistically and culturally deprived.

Labov's groundbreaking ethnographic research study in Harlem in the 1960s demonstrated that African American children came from verbally rich environments. Labov argued against the belief that African American children were culturally and verbally-deprived, rejecting the popular assumption that poor black children did not have language or culture. Labov insisted that these children had the same basic vocabulary and possessed a capacity for conceptual learning that was equal to that of white students (Labov 1969, 1972). Labov believed that they were capable of logical thinking in spite of their language variation. Labov likened the negatively biased research context to the classrooms in which these students were educated. Moreover, he attributed their lack of success in these classrooms to their unfamiliarity with Standard English and how it was used in the classroom for learning as well as to the teacher's negative perceptions of AAV. This led to the notion of what is now officially labeled the mismatch between home and school.

While Labov's research shed light on the different nonstandard English variations within the US, and in particular the African American variation or register, Basil Bernstein (in Wells, 2009) viewed this mismatch in a different way. Bernstein attempted

40

to explain the difference in the academic achievement of lower class families in comparison to the achievement of upper middle-class families attending British schools. Bernstein's views are relevant to this review because they were used to support the language deficit perspective in the US (in Bolander & Watts, 2009). Bernstein proposed two kinds of linguistic registers (1964). Bernstein suggested that children from lower-class families were socialized into a restricted linguistic code, a code where the speakers' meaning is implicit because it involves a shared knowledge or common context, while children from middle or upper-class families were socialized into the restricted code in addition to an advanced register called the elaborated code. The elaborated code contained language patterns that were more explicit and more context independent. In terms of syntax, elaborated codes had more complex sentences that contained two or more clauses. Usually one clause was the main clause and the other clause was the subordinate clause. In contrast, restricted codes featured sentences with less complex structures. These language patterns consisted of more coordinating clauses, or two word or groups of words joined together by a conjunction. According to Bernstein (1964), these two distinct linguistic variations also represented ways of thinking. The elaborated patterns were used to express more abstract thinking, while the restricted patterns expressed more concrete and contextual thinking. Inspired by Bernstein's findings, Hasan (2002) also studied middle class and working class Australian mothers of preschool children and found differing conversation patterns between the two groups of mothers (Wells, 2009). Hassan hypothesized that the conversational patterns that these children were socialized into established different ways of learning, solving problems, and making sense of their world (Hasan, 2002).

41

Nevertheless, Gordon Wells' (2009) Bristol Language study challenged both Bernstein's theory and Hassan's research. This study, which covered over fifteen years of ethnographic observations of young children in the context of home and school, found no significant language differences resulting from students' economic backgrounds up to the age of five years old. Unlike Bernstein's findings, which associated linguistic registers solely with a group's economic status, Wells found that differences in children's language had more to do with their incorporation of literacy within the home regardless of families' socioeconomic status or ethnicity (Jones, 2013; Wells, 2009;).

Even though Bernstein's terms of elaborated and restricted codes are no longer in use, terms such as decontextualized language and contextualized language seem to have taken their place (Gee, 2009; Rowe, 2013; Van Kleeck et al., 2011). Decontextualized language is abstract language used to talk about events or happenings that are removed from the here and now, while contextualized language is language used to talk about a shared event or context. Like the elaborated code, decontextualized language is more challenging for children because its meaning is primarily conveyed through linguistic cues instead of the clues from the immediate physical environment or from a shared knowledge. It also requires more abstract levels of analytical thinking. Decontextualized language may represent concepts such as cause and effect and sequential relationships.

Syntactically, decontextualized utterances are longer and contain more low-frequency words, elaborated noun phrases, adverbs, connectives, and mental state verbs. Nevertheless, decontextualized language is more closely associated with written language than oral language. Written language is the language of books and learning. According to

42

Snow (1991), young children's development of decontextualized language is linked to later reading comprehension abilities in the middle grades.

Oral and Written Language

Victoria Purcell-Gates (2001) and other researchers interested in the influences of the nature of written and oral language extended the findings from Wells' Bristol Language study (Wells, 2009) further and suggested that it was children's knowledge of written language that should concern both educators and researchers, not just their oral language patterns. Purcell-Gates asserted that written language is not merely printed oral language and that children are not learning to read written speech but rather are learning to read text printed in a written register. She uncovered children's knowledge of these two language register differences when she investigated the lexical and syntactical constructions that 20 kindergarteners and 20 second graders employed when they told a personal story and when they created a story using a wordless picture book. Specifically, Purcell-Gates found that the students used differing registers when telling a personal story and when constructing a story from a wordless picture book. The wordless picture book story was comprised of more decontextualized or written language features, reflecting the written language register. According to Purcell-Gates:

> The written narrative registers were distinguished from the oral narrative registers in the following ways: they were syntactically more integrated; they were lexically more literary and varied; they were lexically and syntactically more involving through the use of high-image verbs, image producing adverbials, and attributive adjectives; and they were more decontextualized through appropriate endophoric reference use. (2001, p. 16)

Her study suggested that the knowledge of written language patterns might have resulted from parents regularly reading to their children. Other studies employing similar

43

research tasks have shown that students who had not been exposed to book reading had a limited knowledge of written language (Pappas, 1991; Purcell-Gates, 2001; Sulzby, 1985).

In describing the differences between language use and acquisition, Westby (1985) situated language on a continuum from oral interactive language to written texts. Oralcy or face-to-face communication was on one end of the continuum, and formal written language was at the opposite end. Along the continuum from oral to written language, there were differences in how language functioned, how language was structured, and what topics and content that language contained. In keeping with Vygotsky's (1978) and Halliday's (1975) social perspectives on language development, Goodman believed that written language mirrored the acquisition of oral language (in Dombey, 2005). Oral language developed in meaningful and purposeful situations where children, through necessity, communicated their ideas, feelings, desires, and needs.

Therefore, it was believed that written language could only be fully learned and developed in authentic situations where there was a strong need to learn to understand and use written language in purposeful ways. On Westby's oral language to written language continuum, narratives or knowledge of school-based stories served as a transition between oral and written language genres (1985).

While Purcell-Gates' study revealed the language register that students internalized as a result of being readers, an earlier study by Donald Leu (1981) showed that second and third-grade students were able to more successfully read and comprehend passages written in an oral register than similar passages printed in the written register.

The following frequently occurring written syntactical patterns were found in the written discourse register passage: subordinate and relative clauses, appositive and participial phrases, and passive verbs. Comprehension of the two passages was assessed using a standardized retelling task. Leu's study emphasized the importance of students' ability to predict or to anticipate text structures as they read. Like Goodman (Goodman et al., 2016) and Smith (1975), Leu considered the process of predicting text important to the reading process. In reading, predictions produced by prior knowledge with text meaning and syntax allowed the reader to reduce the number of linguistic options in text, making reading more natural (Goodman et al., 2016). Leu concluded that readers might need to acquire syntactic expectations that appropriately map onto written language discourse structures. Further, he concluded that a reader's oral discourse experience might not provide sufficient information about the make-up of written discourse, preventing the reader from successfully processing text written in the written register. These readers may have inaccurate expectancies of an unknown word because of their lack of familiarity with written syntactic structures.

In the field of Speech and Language Pathology, literate language is a language register that serves an academic function similar to that of written language. Literate language is also considered decontextualized. Anthony Pellegrini (1985) identified four significant literate language patterns that were found more prevalently in children's narratives in the context of symbolic play. Those patterns include elaborate noun phrases, conjunctions, adverbs, and mental and linguistic verbs. Like written language, literate language is dependent on children's literacy achievement or literacy experiences (Greenhalgh & Strong, 2001). Typically, literate language is found in children's

narratives and, in the field of Speech and Language Pathology, is often assessed within children's narratives. Literate language allowed the speaker to convey meaning textually instead of just contextually, relying on contextual cues or shared assumptions (Pellegrini, DeStefano, & Thompson, 1983). Literate language provided the speaker with linguistic tools to convey details about an event or situation in a way that increased the listener's understanding of an event. The ability to rely on language alone to convey meaning is the same ability that children use to construct meaning from text. Therefore, the assessment of children's literate language is critical in identifying students whose language differences may prevent them from becoming proficient readers.

Linking Narrative Knowledge with Reading Comprehension

Narrative Knowledge

Literate and written language structures are more typically associated with the microstructural level of language, while narrative structure, story grammar, or the organization of a story is shown in the macrostructure of a story (Terry et al., 2013). Outside of school, stories or narratives are important sources of interaction used to socialize children into their family and community environments (Cheatham & Jimenez-Silva, 2011; Heath, 1982; McCabe & Bliss, 2003; Urbach, 2012). The structure of children's narratives may reflect a particular organization or style that is more closely associated with their community, family, or culture. Therefore, many minority children enter school with narrative structures that do not match the school's desired narrative form. However, while teachers must be aware and respectful of students' individual and cultural narrative styles, it is also important to support students' acquisition of school-based narrative structures (Cheatham & Jimenez-Silva, 2011; Urbach, 2012). Students'

knowledge of the structures and elements of school-based narratives has been linked to their abilities to comprehend text more successfully (Dymock, 2007). The concept of school-based stories involves a knowledge of elements such as setting, character, and plot (Golden, 1984). While there are many traditional story grammars, the first of which were introduced by David Rumelhart (1975), other story grammars have also been used in school and research settings in the work of Mandler and Johnson (1977), Stein and Glenn (1979), and Thorndyke (1977). All of those story grammars attempt to categorize and coherently arrange story components that are deemed important to school-based literacy. These story grammars identify parts of a story and indicate how these parts tie together to build a well-constructed story (Dymock, 2007). Nevertheless, it is students' schema or prior knowledge of these structures that influence their abilities to predict, recall, and comprehend story events. Knowledge of story structure and its components aids students in creating expectations about what might occur in a story. This prior knowledge also serves as a guide for retrieving pertinent information during the process of constructing meaning.

Reading Comprehension

Comprehension as a process involving the reader's ability to integrate reading strategies that include predicting and confirming, using a four-tiered language cueing system: graphophonic, syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic (Goodman et al., 2005). His/her ability to read may also be reflected in the student's quality of miscues and self-corrections. Additionally, a student's ability to comprehend a story is revealed in the semantic and syntactic acceptability of language structures employed during the reading process. A reader actively constructs meaning as he/she transacts with written text (Kucer

2010; Rosenblatt, 2005). This construction of meaning is often a synthesis of the prior knowledge and experiences of both the author and the reader. As a result, sometimes the reader's constructed meaning may match the author's intended meaning, it may be a modification of the author's intended meaning, or it may represent a new concept or idea separate from what the author may have intended. Additionally, different readers may interpret the same text in radically different ways. Furthermore, a reader may understand a text but understand it differently than a person asking him/her comprehension questions.

Kucer (2010) created a comprehension retelling taxonomy after investigating the retellings of two groups of fourth graders who read a fictional text and an expository text. He classified retold clauses that did not match the author's intended meaning and created the following categories to explain how the way students retold clauses deviated from the author's original message: substitution (a semantically accepted modification); addition (a semantically acceptable enhancement); summary (a condensing of separate ideas into one idea); conflict (a contradicting idea); rearrangement (a mismatching sequence); and omission (a deletion of an important idea). This taxonomy was also used in my own study to understand students' retelling. In comparing students' ability to reconstruct fiction versus expository text, Kucer also found that students were more likely to fully retell the fiction story as compared to the expository story. Kucer attributed students' abilities to retell the fiction story in a way that more closely matched the author's fictional rendering to their familiarity with the story's structure, language, and content.

Academic Language, Language Variation, and Reading

Through my investigation of the literature regarding language, the term written language is not used as much. Distinguishing written language knowledge from oral language knowledge is no longer at the forefront of literary research. However, the term academic language, which includes past understandings of the syntactical features of written language in addition to other more literary language features, continues to reference a hot topic in the field of reading and is becoming of interest in the field of Early Childhood and Speech and Language Pathology. This study focuses more on the syntactical aspects of academic language, a register that is comprised of six components: the density of information, complex syntax, abstract ideas, narrative structure, and content area vocabulary (Luna, 2017).

Cummins (1979, 2000) first introduced the term academic language in an effort to distinguish between basic interpersonal communication (BICS) and cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP). Cummins found that BICS was related to the understanding and sharing of simple content and everyday conversations. In contrast, CALP was necessary for comprehending cognitively demanding and academic interactions. In these exchanges, language was more decontextualized; little information was shared via gestures and pointing, and both verbal and written communication involved the exchange of complex and information-dense language patterns (Heppt, Haag, Bohme, & Stanat, 2015). Therefore, academic language proficiency reflected the extent to which students could access and command the oral and written registers of school (Cummins & Yee-Fun, 2007). Cummins also maintained that extensive reading was crucial for the development of academic language because academic language was

comprised of more book-like syntactic structures and less frequently used vocabulary, often having Greek and Latin linguistic roots. In agreement, Gee asserted that words having Germanic roots were used more often in everyday contexts while words with Latin or Greek origins were more closely associated with the academic register (2011).

Even though Cummin's research focused on English Language Learners, he concluded that acquiring academic language could be challenging for all learners, even learners whose first language was English (Cummins & Yee-Fun, 2007). While ELLs have received much attention concerning their academic language development, other language minorities having registers that differ from the more standard forms of English have also struggled in this area (LeMoine & Soto, 2017). SELs or Standard English Learners are students who have acquired a form of English as their first language which includes its vocabulary, but the structure and form of their language may still be heavily influenced by their cultural origins. SELs include African American students who speak African American language (AAL) and Mexican American non-new immigrant students who speak Mexican American Language (MxAL).

Many teachers are not aware of the linguistic elements of academic language and as a result may not adequately address it in the classroom (Heppt et al., 2015). However, as students read text, some educators have noticed that students' ability to construct deep meaning is impeded by their inability to understand the meaning of sentences that contain less-familiar syntactical structures (Mesmer & Rose-McCully, 2018). Educators must develop a greater knowledge of the specific syntactical structures needed for students to understand text and be able to monitor students' development of those structures.

While researchers like Le Moine and Soto (2017) seem to use the terms academic language and Standard English interchangeably; researchers like O'Neal and Ringler (2010) consider Standard English distinct from Academic English. In their view, academic language encompassed more complex structures as well as more specialized content area vocabulary than Standard English. Thus, from their perspective, school and literacy success was determined not just by students' mastery of Standard English; rather, it was determined by their proficiency in academic English. However, Trudgill claimed that Standard English was simply one of several dialects, while Academic Language was a register or language used in specialized situations (1999). Clay stated that students' dialect might differ from the language used in educational settings in the following ways: "in sounds, accent or intonation, in vocabulary, in the grammatical forms and in the type and range of sentence forms used," (1991, p. 71). Even though society and the educational system values and demarginalizes certain dialects, all dialects are internally equal in that they possess their own set of rules and function to ensure successful communication within a given family or community setting (O'Neal & Rigler, 2010).

Trudgill (1999) concluded that the learning of Standard English was perceived as important to learning academic language within a school or academic setting. However, as mentioned in the section on views of language deficits and differences views in this review, the African American language variation has been stigmatized for years. It still remains a highly controversial topic in today's classrooms, often because of societal perceptions of African Americans. Taylor stated (in Hamilton, 2005):

> For example, French culture is perceived as high quality, its cuisine is considered to be great, its fashions are considered to be avant-garde, so if a person speaks with a French accent, its perceived to be very positive because the people are

perceived positively. But if a group is considered to be ignorant, primitive, backward, ill-informed, then their language is given similar attributes. The problem is that African –American people and Black people around the world are perceived by dominant societies to be inferior, and so their language is perceived in a similar way. (p. 35)

In studying 165 African American English speaking students in first through fifth grade, Craig and fellow researchers found that it was not just the concentration of students' dialect that impacted their able to read; it was students' skill in dialect shifting or being able to transition into standard English when needed that was most beneficial (Craig et al., 2009). Children who possessed this ability had stronger reading outcomes. Students' facility to change their dialect or language structures was observed in their dexterity to narrate oral and written stories. In addition, Craig and fellow researchers determined that students who were able to incorporate more standard English structures in their narrative writing, rather than in just their oral stories, showed increased achievement outcomes in reading. Because of studies like this, there has been a significant shift toward teaching SELs, and particularly African American students, to dialect shift. It is important that students be able to shift between one form of speaking to the other according to the context or demand (Craig et al., 2009; Hamilton, 2005; O'Neal & Rigler, 2010; Wolfram, 2013). This ability is referred as being bi-dialectal.

Understanding the reality of students' language variations and their presence within the reading process, Clay (1991) asserted that good teachers must work to preserve students' first language while supporting them in adding Standard English or the language of school and books in order to assist them in becoming literate. Teachers must also understand students' metalinguistic processes, their ability to monitor and use syntactic and semantic information during a language-based reading process, is

52

influenced by their personal dialect (Goodman et al., 2005). Specifically, their dialect influences their judgment about their oral reading processes. Their dialect serves as their culturally constructed standard which they use to determine what is semantically or syntactically correct as they read and make sense of text. Therefore, students' inability or ability to internalize and apply the expectations of Standard English associated with academic discourse may influence their ability to read and comprehend text successfully.

Reading Identity

Entering the Reading Club

While d/discourse refers to students' knowledge of syntactic and organizational language patterns within a given discourse, D/discourse refers to literacy practices, behaviors, values, and understandings that students have as members of that discourse (Gee, 2012; Gee & Spack, 1998). Students' first identify with their primary discourse or the discourse of family and community. However, as they move into formal schooling, they become a part of a secondary discourse of school and possibly the discourse of reading. Membership within this discourse is shown by students' adoption of the linguistic, behavioral, and tacit characteristics of the discourse.

These literacy discourse characteristics reflect students' ability to take on the identity of a reader. Smith (1988) described the adoption of the discourse of reading as joining the literacy club. He proposed that children learn to read and write effectively when they are among a community of writers and readers. He likened membership in this club to membership in the spoken language club, a club where children are immersed into oral language development, and where they purposely learn language and the functional uses of language in authentic and meaningful situations. Just as in the spoken

language club, in the literacy club, children approximate the behaviors, beliefs, and practices of its expert members, which are usually children's parents or teachers. Smith argued that we join the clubs of people who we determine to be like us, and we reject or differentiate ourselves from clubs that do not reflect who we are. Regarding taking on a reading identity, Harste contended that in order to become a reader, one must perceive himself/herself as a reader (2009).

Constructing a Literate Identity

Interestingly, in Martens and Adamson's case study of five first grade struggling readers, they concluded that literacy identity involved construction. This construction process is akin to the way that children construct their knowledge of the reading process or their knowledge of language (2001). Children's literate identities were constructed from their literacy experiences, also called literacy events, within the context of socially and culturally defined literacy practices. In this case study, the two researchers created a reading club as a form of reading intervention for these struggling readers. During the course of the study, the Martens and Adamson determined that the learning context and the text in which the children read contributed to their identity as readers. For example, the context of the reading club involved reading and writing predictable books, books containing language that students could easily anticipate. In this context, students could more easily take risks, and create or invent familiar language structures to express their ideas. Also, in this club, students listened to and discussed interesting stories. These students were immersed in reading and writing. However, in the context of their classrooms, these students engaged in drilled vocabulary and phonics exercises and worksheets. They read basal stories, and the focus of the class was accuracy and word

recognition rather than making sense of text. Martens and Adamson wrote about two of the students who participated in the study and reported that when these students engaged in the reading club's activities, they took more risks as readers and writers, and their success within the context of the reading club led them to label themselves as good readers. They gradually engaged in more monitoring and more self-correcting during their reading and felt more confident as readers. However, their struggles in the context of their classroom complicated their view of themselves as readers. The conflicting cultural practices in these two environments were used to construct student's perceptions of themselves as readers, resulting in their developing fragile reading identities. While Martens and Adamson perceived the students as making progress, their classroom teachers were concerned about the students' reading performances.

McCarthey and Moje (2002) asserted that identities are built within social interactions that involve stories that we unconsciously tell ourselves and stories that others tell about us. Yet, these identities can also be conscious and strategic, especially in the ways we choose to represent ourselves to others. Literacy learning is a process in which literacy identity is constructed. Like Martens and Adamson (2001), McCarthey and Moje (2002) contended that children's literacy identities are challenged or supported by the type of instruction that they experience. Additionally, the perceptions of students' teachers may also affect how students see themselves.

Knowledge of Reading Processes Contributing to Identity Formation

While much attention is given to students' reading skills and abilities, it is just as important that educators understand what readers value, how readers perceive themselves and others, and what they understand about the reading process (Goodman et al., 2005;

Harste, 2009; Sumara, 1998). This knowledge is related to students' level of enthusiasm about reading and its exploration provides information about their level of agency in making sense of text. Students' metalinguistic knowledge in the context of the reading process reveals their sensitivity to how language is used to make meaning during reading (Goodman et al., 2005). Harste stated that there is often a relationship between an individual's ability to articulate their knowledge of their reading process and their ability to employ that knowledge while they read (2009). However, at times, what readers say about their reading process may be different from what they actually demonstrate in the course of reading (Goodman et al., 2005). Nevertheless, this knowledge equips teachers with more information about students so that they can provide targeted reading instruction and appropriate experiences within the classroom.

Negotiating Home and School Literacy Identities

Gee contended that being a reader does not always fit within the identities that children bring to school. In order to develop a new literacy identity, connections must be made between the student's current home-literacy identity and the school's literacy discourse (2003). Meaningful learning experiences allow children to make those connections. During these learning experiences, students try on different identities as they make use of elements of their home literacy or current literacy identities (Gee, 2003). Ferdman (1990) proposed that becoming literate and taking on a literate identity is not an individual process; rather, the individual is constantly transacting, redefining, and renegotiating their role and position in a social environment.

Similarly, Compton-Lilly (2007) concluded that sometimes the tacit values, practices, and beliefs of linguistically and culturally diverse students' home literacy

56

practices influence the formation of their school-based literacy identity. Compton-Lilly found that in addition to children's cultural backgrounds, even gender influences students' construction of the school's literacy discourse (2006). Compton-Lilly came to this conclusion after working with an African American Reading Recovery first grade student whose conversations during the lesson revealed his sensitivity to what he perceived as his teacher's and tutor's impressions of him as an African American and as a male. His conversation revealed that he believed that his teacher thought girls were smarter than boys. His conversation also revealed that his reading tutor, who happened to be African American, understood him better as a literacy learner because of their shared ethnic backgrounds. In addition, his responses uncovered his interest in superheroes and in playing video games, which reflected other aspects of his identity, and which served as cultural resources. In this case study, the researcher provided him with opportunities to access these cultural resources to assist him in learning to read and write, or, rather, to assist him in taking on the new literacy discourse of school. Compton-Lilly (2006) argued in favor of the tendency of teachers to include students' cultural resources that reflect their interests or hobbies, but she challenged teachers not to ignore the gender and racial influences that might affect children's school literacy identity formation.

Characteristics of a Good Reader

How students saw themselves as readers was an important question in the Burke Reading Interview, a tool used to gather information about students' reading identities. This interview captured students' values, beliefs, and behaviors about reading and their knowledge of their reading processes (Goodman et al., 2005). This tool, which has been used by both researchers and teachers in order to understand students' developing reading

identity, was used in the present study. The final question of the interview asks, *Do you think you are a good reader? Why?* Often, the students' responses to this question reflect what other people think of them. However, sometimes students' experiences with text and literacy instruction are determined more by how students perceive themselves as readers than by their actual cognitive abilities (Hall, 2016). As a result, sometimes children may self-identify as good readers yet may have decoding and comprehension problems, or they may not be aware or believe that they need to engage differently with the text; while other students, self-identifying as poor readers, may not engage with text because they want to conceal their reading struggles.

In general, the perception of what makes a good reader varies among educators, children, and researchers. However, when people attempt to define the characteristics of a good reader, they tend to include children's ability to choose appropriate books or to make agentive decisions about their own reading interests and goals (Abodeeb-Gentile & Zawilinski, 2013; Bang-Jensen, 2010; Barone & Barone, 2016). In response to the idea that being a good reader involves more than just learning and applying skills, a teacher and her fifth-grade students constructed a criteria for what being a good reader involves: reading for fun, talking about books, completing a book, relating to book characters, reading different genres, reading for extended amounts of time, reading many books, and reading for enjoyment and for the love of reading (Barone & Barone, 2016). While the concept of a good reader can be interpreted in different ways, this teacher's goal was to create classroom experiences, leading to a literacy culture where students saw themselves as good readers according to the criteria that they created.

Conclusion

Much of this literature review regarding literacy, language, and identity supports the belief that effectively instructing children, especially culturally and linguistically diverse children, is not merely about teaching them reading skills and strategies (Barone & Barone, 2016; Harste, 2009; Martens & Adamson, 2001; McCarthey & Moje, 2002; Moje & Luke, 2009). Instructing children involves creating instructional environments and experiences that facilitate children's entrance into the literacy club (Smith, 1988) or the D/discourse of reading (Gee, 2012; Gee & Spack, 1998,). In order to accomplish this, teachers must ensure that students take on both the d/discourse and the D/discourse of school literacy, that is, that they adopt the language of school as well as its beliefs, values, and practices. Those beliefs, values, and practices often reflect tacit ideas about what a good reader looks like. There is much research regarding the necessity of decontextualized language, academic language, Standard English, and written and literate language. Additionally, research can be found about the mismatch between home and school literacy and language. However, research on how these three areas converge and possibly influence each other was not found in the literature.

While there is much concern as to culturally and linguistically diverse students' lack of suitable language structures and their non-existent or limited book-based reading experiences, little research has considered the knowledge that teachers must have in successfully closing the achievement gap by nurturing the development of d/discourse (microstructure and macrostructure language aspects) and D/discourse (beliefs, values, and behaviors). In fact, Gee (2009) challenged the view that children fail merely because they lack decontextualized language or academic language patterns. Recognizing the role

that educators must play in preparing these children, he contended that often, students'

failure was due to the schools' failure to immerse students in meaningful and authentic

reading context, which would allow students to acquire the patterns of grammar and the

ways with words that are necessary for their success. It is in this context that teachers act

as experts or knowledgeable others (Vygotsky, 1978), guiding students in becoming a

part of the culture of school-based literacy or the discourse of reading (Gee & Spack,

1998, 2012). Nevertheless, in order to assist students in becoming successful readers, we

must not only understand elements of their cultural language patterns which may make it

difficult for them to engage successfully in school-based reading: we must also have a

better understanding of the type of academic discourse that they must gain in order to be

successful readers (Fillmore & Snow, 2000).

CHAPTER III

DATA COLLECTION AND METHODOLOGY

"Teachers play a unique role as agents of socialization—the process by which individuals learn the everyday practices, the system of values and beliefs, and the means and manners of their cultural communities."

Fillmore & Snow

Educators today must be more aware of the cognitive and linguistic processes used by children in order to help them develop into proficient readers (Goodman, 1976; Goodman et al., 2005). Teachers' awareness of children's cognitive and linguistic processes is especially vital in teaching literacy to students who have low socioeconomic status and are culturally and linguistically diverse (Hoff, 2012). This study seeks to provide added insight into children's knowledge of written and literate language structures and how their knowledge of these academic structures or discourse aids their ability to engage in literate behaviors such as constructing an oral story, decoding text, anticipating syntactic and lexical patterns in text, and retelling and answering comprehension questions. In this study, the complex connection between language and literacy was explored in eight low socioeconomic status (SES) African American third-grade students. In addition, the students' perception of the reading process and of themselves as readers was also investigated. James Gee's (2004; 2012) discourse analysis theory framed this study and provided a two-layered exploration of language. Through examining the values, behaviors, and beliefs associated with "D"/Discourse and the language-in-use lexical and syntactical patterns associated with "d"/discourse, this

qualitative investigation delved into the complex relationships among language, literacy, and identity.

In this chapter, readers of this dissertation will be presented with the research questions that guided this study. They will be provided with a brief description of the overall research methodology, and further into this chapter, they will gain information about the study's participants, its sampling procedures, and the specific data collection tasks and analysis procedures. In the latter part of the chapter, readers of this dissertation will learn how trustworthiness was ensured and how participants were protected from potential harm arising from this study.

Research Questions

Two broad exploratory questions guided this qualitative study, which was designed to explore the connections between the literate and written language knowledge of select African American third-grade students, as well as their reading values, beliefs, and metalinguistic processes. Each question reflected one layer of James Gee's (2004, 2012) two-layered discourse analysis theory. The first question focused on language-in-use and sought to examine reading behaviors in relation to literate and written language patterns. The second question targeted students' literacy values, beliefs, and practices as well as students' knowledge about themselves as readers and their reading processes. Furthermore, the second question was meant to ensure that the study explored students' reading identity.

1. How do third-grade African American children use their knowledge of literate and written language discourse as a resource in reading as evidenced by their ability to decode, anticipate, retell, and answer comprehension questions?

2.	How do these students' metalinguistic knowledge (knowledge of their reading

processes) and beliefs and values regarding reading influence their reading

behaviors as evidenced by their ability to anticipate, decode, retell and answer

comprehension questions?

Research Methodology Overview

An exploratory qualitative embedded multiple case study design (Yin, 2003) was

chosen for this study. The case study methodology is a useful tool for studying both

simple and complex phenomena. Case studies enable a researcher to engage in deep

inquiry regarding a person, a group of people, or a unit (Creswell, 2014; Gustafsson,

2017; Yin, 2003). This case study format allowed me to investigate the behaviors and

responses of students deeply in order to gain a more thorough understanding of their

reading identity, academic language, and literacy.

Using embedded multiple design; I was able to divide the participants into three

reading proficiency level groups and to analyze the data within and across the reading

proficiency groups in order to determine similarities and differences (Yin, 2003). In this

study, each proficiency level group was considered a unit; while the individual

participants in the group were considered subunits (Yin, 2003). The advantage of this

design was that it allowed me to gather and analyze each proficiency group's data as I

investigated individual students within the proficiency groups.   Additionally, an

exploratory approach was chosen because of my limited knowledge of the influence of

reading identity and academic language knowledge on students' reading abilities and

because of the limited existing body of research on the intersection of these three areas

(Manerika & Manerika, 2014). This exploratory stance permitted me to uncover more

specific facets of those areas that might warrant further study. Moreover, since the case

study was considered exploratory, it did not have a single predictable set of outcomes

(Baxter & Jack, 2008; Yin, 2003). Hence, the absence of restricted outcomes permitted

me to look at the data through a wider lens.

Furthermore, this study was a cross-sectional study rather than a longitudinal

study. In a cross-sectional study, the investigation is typically done on one occasion or in

a single point in time, while longitudinal study involves more than one investigation over

a period of time (Flick, 2008). This format was chosen to determine the cumulative

effects of students' beliefs and abilities at the end of their third-grade year.

Several research tasks were used to study students' language, reading behaviors

and school-based literacy discourse understandings. Oral storytelling was used to reveal

children's knowledge of literate and written language to understand more deeply the

relationship between the types of and frequency of select academic language structures.

In this task, students constructed an oral story based on the illustrations within a wordless

picture book. In addition, an interview was used to shed light on students' identities as

readers by examining students' perceptions of reading, their metalinguistic knowledge of

the reading process, and their understanding of the discourse of reading. In combination,

these two tasks revealed students' "d"/discourse and "D"/Discourse respectively. This

information was then used as a lens to gain a discourse perspective on how students

performed reading behaviors such as orally decoding or processing written text at their

instructional reading level, retelling or reconstructing the same story and answering

comprehension questions about that story. Lastly, students also anticipated text in a

Cloze task. In this Cloze task, they used their knowledge of the story in combination

with their knowledge of both oral and academic structures to predict deleted words within a portion of a text. The text was at students' independent reading level instead of their instructional reading level to provide a less difficult reading experience for children. These tasks and reading levels are more explicitly explained later in this chapter.

Context of the Study

This study took place at a Title I campus that had the largest percentage of economically disadvantaged children at the elementary school level within its district. Ninety-eight percent of the students were economically disadvantaged. In addition, this campus also had the largest number of African Americans among the elementary schools within the same district. At the time the study was implemented, African Americans made up thirty-two percent of the campus and thirty-four percent of the third grade.

There were four third-grade teachers, and the participants came from all four teachers' homeroom classrooms. On this campus, third-grade teachers were departmentalized, which means that the teachers taught in their area of specialization, while the students moved from classroom to classroom to receive instruction in a specific content area or areas (Chan & Jarman, 2004; Parker, Rakes, & Arndt, 2017). There were different configurations for departmentalizing instruction on a campus. At this school, the third-grade teachers taught in two-person teams. Table 3.1 shows the teaching design used for the instruction of third-graders on that campus. There were two teams in third grade.

One teacher in each dyad taught reading/language arts, while the other taught math, science, and social studies. Math was planned weekly, but science and social studies were alternately planned, since these two subjects were not taught daily.

Typically, the reading/language arts teachers planned their classes together, and the teachers who taught math, science, and social studies intermittently planned together. This arrangement ensured that the students taught by each team received the same instruction.

Table 3.1

Third-Grade Teaching Design

Dyad 1	
Teacher A Reading/Language Arts	**Teacher C** Math/Science or Social Studies

Dyad 2	
Teacher B Reading Language Arts	**Teacher D** Math/Science or Social Studies

One of the reading/language arts teachers had taught over 15 years at the elementary level, while the other reading/language arts teacher was in her second year of teaching. However, it was her first full year at the campus. The veteran reading/language arts teacher was an expert in reading/language arts and had a master's degree in this area. She also served as a mentor to the novice language arts teacher. The teachers in the dyads received instructional support and coaching from a campus- level reading specialist who specialized in working with teachers and students in grades 3-5 and from a district math specialist who primarily provided teachers with instructional support in grades K-5.

The readers' workshop was a required instructional framework on the campus. However, third-grade teachers did not fully implement the readers' workshop model. The

readers' workshop is an instructional approach that provides students with daily

opportunities to read teacher-selected and student-selected books independently and with

the support of the classroom teacher (Calkins, 2001). Other instructional components

such as guided reading, partner reading, teacher-student conferences, and book clubs may

also be included during this time. The third-grade teachers on this campus also provided

reading lessons and instructional experiences using Comprehension Toolkit (Harvey &

Goudvis, 2005) and the Third Grade Journey's Reading Basal Literacy Kit (Vogt et al.,

2014). The Third Grade Journeys Reading Basal Literacy Kit is an instructional basal

system that teaches students to acquire foundational reading skills in order to read literary

and informational texts, whereas the Comprehension Toolkit is an interactive literacy

program used to teach reading strategies such as making connections, inferring,

visualizing, determining important information, summarizing, and synthesizing

information within non-fiction text. Teachers used this interactive read-aloud program to

instruct students in the metacognitive use of the previously named reading strategies so

that they could better understand nonfiction text. This literacy program was designed to

encourage students to record their thinking on sticky notes or on response sheets as they

engaged in independent reading. Additionally, teachers incorporated guided reading into

their literacy teaching, but mostly for those students who were below reading level.

Guided reading is a differentiated instructional strategy in which teachers teach students

with similar reading abilities to decode and comprehend new or unseen text (Fountas &

Pinnell, 2017).

There was not a great deal of writing instruction as a result of the limited time

within the departmentalized literacy block and due to the emphasis on teaching reading

skills and strategies designed to prepare students to take monthly reading benchmarks assessments. Much of the instruction after January was focused on preparing for the end-of-year state standardized test called STAAR, the State of Texas Assessment of Academic Readiness test. In order to prepare for the test, students regularly completed practice passages and worked in comprehension stations.

African American children were of interest in this study because they have been represented less often in previous reading research and specifically in reading research which used authentic reading measures. They were also chosen because they represented a population whose language and identity often differ from the school's language and identity expectations (Compton-Lilly, 2005; Gladsden & Harris, 2009) and who currently perform and have historically performed less proficiently than white students (Howard, 2010; Hughes-Hassell, Koehler, Barkley, 2010; Washington, 2001).

In addition, the participants in this study were at the end of the third grade, which is considered a critical time in the life of a developing reader (Fiester & Smith, 2010; Hernandez, 2011). Hernandez (2011) referred to third grade as "an important pivot point in a child's education" (p. 4), marking a transition between learning to read and reading to learn. Even though I do not fully endorse the assertion that children must first learn to read before they read to learn, as advanced by Chall (1983) and other stage theorists, I have noticed that many researchers, past and present, have made reference to this notion, explicitly or implicitly, in explaining the shift between early and later reading development or in explaining the transition to more fluent reading abilities. This shift or transition into engaging with more demanding text often affects students' literacy performance. Additionally, I agree with Hernandez (2011), who also asserted that reading

to learn does require a more fluent reading ability. Hernandez's longitudinal study of approximately 4,000 students showed that children who are not reading fluently by the end of the third grade are four times more likely to not graduate from high school (Hernandez, 2011). The high school graduation rate is even lower for poor African American and Hispanic students. Yet, I also support Szymusiak & Sibberson's (2001) proposal that learning to read is not confined to the early grades, but occurs even in the upper grades. Older students must learn a new set of strategies and develop an understanding of the language and organization of more advanced text. Reading more advanced text in the upper grades requires a familiarity with a variety of genres and text structures and more complex literary language (Fisher, Frey, & Lapp, 2012). Therefore, the learn to read and read to learn paradigm, though still referred to by many researchers, may not fully explain the change in students' reading performance when moving to fourth grade text.

Finally, the third-grade level was chosen because existing research suggested that the influence of children's narrative ability and their skill in using decontextualized language was more evident when reading becomes less about decoding and more about comprehending text (Roth et al., 2002; Snow, Tabors, Nicholson, & Kurland, 1995; Snyder & Downey, 1991). Specifically, Snyder and Downey (1991) found that narrative discourse ability more significantly influenced reading comprehension ability in children between 8 and 11 years of age and in children ranging from eleven to fourteen years old. Given these findings, since one of the goals of this study was to examine students' oral narrative ability in relation to their comprehension, it was important that students in at least the third grade level be chosen to participate in the study.

69

Even though socioeconomic status was not the main consideration for selecting students for this research, it is important to note that all the participants in the study were from low socioeconomic homes and received free or reduced school lunch. Even though their socioeconomic status was not a significant factor in the selection process, their status as students from lower income homes made relevant the research suggesting that often African American children at the lower socio-economic levels experience more difficulty in school than African American children from middle or higher income level homes (Washington, 2001).

Finally, the study included students from three different reading proficiency levels as determined by the Fountas and Pinnell text leveling continuum (2006), which was created to assist teachers in matching children to the appropriate instructional text level. In this continuum, the length of the text, its appearance, print placement, illustration support, and story predictability as well as other distinguishing text features determines text difficulty. These indicators were used to create book-leveled gradients from Levels A-Z that were also utilized in determining children's instructional or guided reading level. These guided reading levels were also correlated to grade levels. Table 3.2 lists the end-of-year expected instructional reading levels on this campus.

Table 3.3 presents students' reading levels within the reading proficiency groups. In this study, the three reading proficiency levels include below-level guided reading (1-3 levels below), on-level guided reading, and above-level guided reading (1-3 levels above). I used the benchmark levels given by the teacher to place the child in one of the three reading proficiency groups. The teacher used the Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessment System to determine students' instructional reading levels (Fountas &

Pinnell, 2008). Selecting children from different reading proficiency levels enabled me to examine their use of literate and written language and the influence of these linguistic registers on reading behavior at differing levels of ability.

Table 3.2

End of Year Reading Expectations

End of Year Reading Expectations		
Grade Level	**Fountas & Pinnell Text Reading Gradient (Fountas & Pinnell, 2007)**	**Reading Stage**
Kindergarten	Level D	Early
First Grade	Level J	Transitional
Second Grade	Level N	
Third-grade	Level P	
Fourth Grade	Level R	Fluent/Self-Extending
Fifth Grade	Level T	

Table 3.3

Actual Third-Grade Sample

	Above -Level (Levels Q-R)	On- Level (Levels P-Q)	Below Reading Level (Levels N-O)
Female Students	1	1	0
Male Students	1	2	3

Sampling Procedures

Purposeful sampling was used to recruit participants for this study. Purposeful sampling permitted me to select only those children who met the criteria of the study: African American male and female third-grade students from three different reading

71

proficiency levels. Once given permission by the gatekeepers, the school principal, appropriate district administrators, and the university IRB committee and graduate school office, I sent home a recruitment packet containing a research flyer, a parent notification letter, and the consent form to the parents of all the African American students in third-grade. The parent notification letter included information about the study including information about myself (the researcher), the purpose of the study, the type of tasks students were expected to engage in, confidentiality procedures, and a list of possible risks. The letter also included my contact information. Parents had a week to sign and return the consent form. These letters were given to the teachers to pass out to students. The teachers returned the sealed envelopes to me in a large envelope, as I would collect them each morning.

It was anticipated that 12 African American third-graders would be selected to participate in this study, and it was presumed that an equal number of boys and girls would be included in the study. Twenty-three students were sent home with a recruitment packet; however, only eight students returned consent letters agreeing to participate. Only two females were part of the study. Once the forms were returned, I made arrangements with the students' teachers as to the best time to administer the tasks, in order to minimize classroom disruption.

I met with each student two to three times during the two-week study window to administer the tasks. In the first session, I verbally explained the expectations of the study and the tasks and then allowed the students to decide if they wanted to continue with the study. A Research Task Orientation Script was used with each student to ensure that all students received the same information regarding the study. The Research Task

Orientation Script can be found in Appendix A. All of the students agreed to participate and documented this agreement by signing an assent form.

After returning the signed consent form (granting or not granting permission), students were given a chapter book and decorative bookmark. Students who actually participated in the study received a $10 gift card/certificate to the business of their choice: Pizza Hut, a movie theater, or the local city water park.

Research Design

This exploratory study employed the case study approach, specifically, embedded multiple case study (Creswell, 2013; Yin, 2003). An assortment of tasks allowed me to more comprehensively study each case, or student, in order to answer the research questions. Creswell define the case study method as a real-life exploration of a "contemporary bounded system (a case) or multiple bounded systems (cases) over time, through detailed in-depth data collection involving multiple sources of information" (Creswell, 2013, p. 97). The study consisted of three reading proficiency level groups: below-level, on-level, and above-level. Each group represented a different case. The term embedded implies that specific elements within each case are investigated.

Therefore, in this study, each proficiency group, as well as the individual students embedded within the groups, were studied. There were two to three students in each proficiency level group. The embedded multiple case study approach enabled me to explore group and individual student data and to compare multiple students and groups as needed. Even though many case studies are longitudinal, this study was cross sectional (Flick, 2008) in design because it involved collecting data at one point in time, providing a snapshot of student's abilities. This design was chosen because it provided the best

framework for deeply exploring children's ability to leverage known literate and written language structures in the context of a variety of authentic literacy events or tasks.

Data Collection Tasks

Data collection took place during the school day within the last two weeks of school. At this time of year, students were less likely to miss essential classroom instruction. Data collection was divided into five different tasks. The first task was an interview designed to uncover the relationship between students' perceptions of reading, their identities as readers, and their reading behaviors. The remaining tasks were designed to reveal students' level of literate and written language and were meant to reveal how the knowledge or lack of knowledge of these school-based registers influenced students' abilities to construct the author's message, retell a story, comprehend story questions, and solve or predict unknown words while reading. Table 3.4 lists the data collection tasks used in this study. Also, Appendix B presents the procedures, prompts, and questions used in each task.

Table 3.4

Data Collections Tasks

Session 1	Task 1	Burke Reading Interview	10 mins.
	Task 2	Story Reconstruction Using Wordless Picture Book	10 mins.
Session 2	Task 3	Leveled Text Reading Task	10 mins.
	Task 4	Comprehension: Oral Story Retelling Questions	15 mins.
	Task 5	Reading Cloze Assessment	5 mins.

Burke reading interview. The first task, the Burke Reading Interview created by Carolyn Burke (Goodman et al., 2005), supported the "D"/discourse aspect of literacy. This interview usually supplements the miscue analysis procedure, which was also used

in this study and provided greater insight into students' metalinguistic knowledge and their perceptions of the reading process. The Burke Reading Interview (BRI), through a list of open-ended questions, was aimed at uncovering what children believed and understood about the reading process, their perception of reading, and their perception of what makes a good reader (Harste, 2009). Traditionally, this structured interview taps into the internal belief system of children, which is important in understanding as well as teaching developing readers. Furthermore, the BRI also helped to reveal if children were taking on the identity of a reader, exposing how they situated themselves in the discourse of literacy. Gee stated, "...it is important to see that making visible and recognizable who (identity) we are and what (practice) we are doing always requires more than language. It requires as well, that we act, think, value, and interact in ways that together with language render who we are and what we are doing recognizable to others (and ourselves)" (2014, p. 48).

Wordless picture book oral story construction. In the second task, students orally constructed an original story using a wordless picture book entitled *Chalk* by Bill Thomson (2014). The students' constructed stories were audio recorded, transcribed, and later analyzed for the presence of literate language (elaborate noun phrases, conjunctions, adverbs, mental/linguistic verbs) (Benson, 2009) and written language features (participial phrases, appositive phrases, relative clauses, passive constructions, and subordinate clauses (Leu, 1981). Information about students' abilities to tell a story was useful to this study because it revealed the types of literate language and written language children possessed. In previous research, oral storytelling was used to capture information on and measure students' decontextualized or literate language (Benson,

2009; Greenhalgh & Strong, 2001; Snow et al., 1995). It was hoped that the presence and frequency of specific types of literate language discovered in participants' oral story constructions would help to determine their level of control over the literate or written language register typically associated with school, books, and learning. These language structures are also referred to as academic language. Academic language is a term first used by Cummins (1979, 2000) to differentiate between basic interpersonal communication (BICS) and cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP). CALP involves language that is more associated with school and learning, while BICS is linked to linguistic communication used at home or in the community. Although this study focused on the syntactic structures of literate and written language. The more current definitions of academic language include the syntactical complexities of literate and written language in addition to other components such as story structure, content area vocabulary, density of information, and abstract ideas (Luna, 2017).

Stories or narratives are an important part of this study. Many researchers consider oral narratives as culturally fair assessments in comparison to norm-referenced language assessments (Schachter & Craig, 2013). Often, the normative sample for those norm-referenced language assessments are insufficiently represented by culturally and linguistically diverse students. An adequate number of culturally and linguistically diverse students may have not been represented in the original norming sample. In addition, those norm-referenced assessments may have included content and linguistic biases against non-mainstream students. However, storytelling is a common practice across many cultures, and specifically among African American families, making it a

more ecologuaic valid way to assess the language of African American children (Craig, Washington, & Thompson-Porter, 1998).

Leveled text reading. The purpose of the third task was to provide an opportunity for students to read aloud fictional text at their instructional reading level so that I, the researcher, could more easily detect how children activated their knowledge of literate and written language during the process of constructing meaning. Fountas and Pinnell's (2009) guided reading model utilized Betts' (1946) three-tiered reading accuracy level construction, which measured and labeled children's accuracy range, or the percentage of words they read correctly, and sorted them under the following categories: instructional level, independent level, and hard level. However, each reading level not only indicated the percentage of correct reading: it also represented the level of control that children had in efficiently and strategically processing written text in order to gain meaning (Fountas & Pinnell, 2006, 2009). Children's instructional reading level was used in this study because it provided just enough text challenge to cause students to engage in a variety of visible processing behaviors (Fountas & Pinnell, 2006, 2009). Furthermore, I hoped that the visibility of children's processing at this level would also allow me to more easily capture how they leveraged their internalized literate and written language along with other reading behaviors in order to decode various syntactic structures found in the text.

Reading strategies and behaviors used to process text are problem solving operations employed by the brain (Goodman et al., 2005). According to Goodman's reading strategy model, readers initiate, sample and select pertinent information, predict, infer, confirm, disconfirm, and correct their reading as well as integrate and terminate their reading. Their strategic decisions, as readers, provide insight into their reading

process. Since the goal of this study takes into consideration students' reading behaviors, strategies, or decision-making, it was necessary that continuous text be used, rather than the isolated lists of words that have been used to measure reading performance of children in previous research. Also, it was my intention to make the leveled reading component of this study mirror the type of reading that children might typically engage in at home or school. Therefore, appropriately leveled fiction picture books were used rather than the leveled reading passages often associated with standardized or norm-referenced achievement tests. Fountas and Pinnell's (2006) book leveling correlation chart and the accelerated reader levels guided the leveling of the books used within this study. These books are listed in Appendix D. Accelerated Reader is a database of books used by many educators to assist in determining appropriately leveled books for students (Nunnery, Ross, & McDonald, 2006). The database also provides quizzes that students can access to measure their understanding of books at a particular level. These quizzes may be monitored by teachers to determine students' reading growth.

Many of the students in third-grade were in the transitional stage of the reading process. In this stage, children read text with multiple lines of print (Fountas & Pinnell, 2007, 2009, 2012). They read books organized into chapters, they read books from a wider variety of genres, and they read harder picture books that contain less commonly used vocabulary and more complex syntactic structures. According to this school district's expectations, by the end of the third-grade, students should be reading at an instructional reading Level P or above, in accordance with the Fountas and Pinnell leveling system. Teachers provide differentiated decoding and comprehension strategy instruction and support at students' instructional reading level. The independent accuracy

reading level represents the level at which students can read text with little to no assistance from an adult. However, students reading at an accuracy level of below 90% are often reading text that is too difficult. Table 3.5 shows how students' reading accuracy rates determined their reading instructional text level.

Table 3.5

Reading Accuracy Rate

Fountas & Pinnell Leveling System	Independent Level	Instructional Level	Hard Level
A-K	95%-100%	90%-94%	Below 90%
L-Z	98%-100%	95%-97%	Below 95%

Reading comprehension and retelling tasks. Comprehension was measured through a questioning and a retelling task. Comprehension can be measured as both process and product (Goodman & Goodman, 1994; Goodman, 1996). While the third task enabled me to gain insight into the comprehension process, or behaviors that children use to construct meaning from text during the act of reading (as they are leveraging literate and written language), the fourth task measured the product of students' reading through oral retelling and through explicit questions or "thinking within the text" questions and inferential questions or "thinking beyond the text" questions (Fountas & Pinnell, 2006, 2007).

Retelling was a comprehension task used to measure the product of children's comprehension of text (Geva & Olson, 1983; Goodman et al., 2005; Kalmbach, 1986; Morrow, 1986). Retelling is important in understanding how children reconstructed text and in understanding the sum of the processing behaviors of young readers. For this reason, Goodman often coupled retelling with the miscue analysis assessment procedure,

and I followed this procedure in my study. Retelling required the reader to reconstruct text by making inferences based on the original text and on the reader's prior knowledge (Morrow, 1986). Readers build an understanding or a representation of a text based on their purpose for reading the text as well as their linguistic, cognitive, and sociocultural background (Kucer, 2014). Because students bring different expectations and experiences to the comprehending process, how they retell the story may differ from the author's original rendering of the story. Rather than assessing only students' comprehension in terms of what they recognized about the story, which is often accomplished through questioning, I also incorporated retelling. Retelling allowed me, as a researcher, to gain insight into how students independently reconstructed the authors' messages after transacting with the text.

Nevertheless, in order to understand what constituted a good retelling according to the schools' expectation, it was important to understand the acceptable characteristics of story structures in the context of school. These structures were usually linear and customarily had settings, themes, characters, plot episodes, and goals or solutions (Morrow, 1985). Some of these structures are included in the concept of story grammar. There have been different types of school-based story grammars or structures that were often used as a standard in judging the correctness of a retelling. Students who were able to retell a story using school-based story structures or grammars were considered to have internalized these organizational structures (Mandler, 1982). Internalized mental organizational rules for various story structures are referred to as story schema.

Typically, literate and written language is associated with the microstructure layer of narratives. In contrast, story structure or story grammar represents the macrostructure

layer of narratives. Students' knowledge of story structure and story grammar has a significant role in supporting students' retelling of school-based retellings (Kucer, 2014; Morrow, 1985). Therefore, for the purpose of this study, literate and written language also included students' ability to retell a story. The ability to retell reflects students' school-based understandings of story grammar or story structure. However, it was also important to determine exactly how students reconstructed text. Therefore, Kucer's Comprehension Taxonomy (2014) was also used to identify students' constructive processes in recreating narratives. Further information about this taxonomy and how it was used within the current study is explained in the analysis portion of this chapter.

In preparation for the retelling task, I initially constructed a retelling guide based on the literary components of selected books used in the previous oral reading task (Goodman et al., 2005; Wilde, 2000). The retelling guide served as an evaluation framework which assisted me in determining how closely students' retellings matched the author's original story (Goodman et al., 2005), but most importantly the guide allowed me to identify the important aspects of the stories that would be appropriate to include in a school-based rendering of the narrative text. The retelling guide was divided into the following sections: character analysis, events, plot, and theme. Other headings were included depending on the story. After reading the oral story, students were asked to retell the story. An example of the retelling guide is found in Appendix E.

While identifying macrostructural parts of students' retellings were determined to be a significant aspect of this task, it was also interesting to discover the specific written and literary language structures (microstructure level) embedded within students' retellings. Additionally, within the fourth task, students answered inferential and explicit

81

questions about the text they had read in the third task. These comprehension questions were reflective of two distinct processing levels, explicit and inferential. Explicit or "thinking within the text" questions were questions purposely designed to assess students' abilities in processing printed text through solving words, monitoring searching, summarizing, and maintaining fluency (Fountas & Pinnell, 2009). Inferential or "thinking beyond the text" questions were questions that assessed students' abilities to predict, make connections, infer, and synthesize information.

In preparation for this task, I created questions related to various occasions on which written and literate language were used in the books. These questions provided evidence of students' abilities to construct meaning at those specific locations. I believed that this task would provide a greater understanding of how participants used their knowledge of literate and written language to gather meaning in the targeted areas of the text.

In summary, students' knowledge of literate and written language at the microstructural level as well as their knowledge of story structure or story grammar at the macrostructure level may influence students' comprehension, expressed through their retellings and in their answering of explicit and inferential comprehension questions.

Cloze reading assessment. The reading Cloze is a classroom literacy activity that has been used to assess a child's ability to solve unknown words (Goodman & Goodman, 1994; Mcgee, 1981; Weaver, 1988). In the past, the Cloze was used as an instructional tool for increasing students' comprehension of text and strengthening and assessing their ability to use reading strategies. In a Cloze story, words are strategically or randomly omitted, and the story is then given to the child to read. When completing a Cloze task,

the reader must use context clues, in the form of semantic and syntactic information, in order to supply the omitted words (Weaver, 1988). In predicting an omitted word, children often employ various processing strategies, using as a resource the context in the sentence (words or phrases before and after the unknown word), the context in the task itself and the context within the reader, also known as the reader's background knowledge or schema (Weaver, 1988). Following the Cloze reading task, the assessor usually investigates the relationship between the reader's actual response when solving the unknown word and the expected response (Goodman & Goodman, 1994). This process allows the assessor to gain useful insight into the reader's specific strategic behaviors used in an effort to reconstruct the author's message.

This task was significant to my study because it allowed me to observe children's processing behaviors without the aid of graphophonic information as students processed text that contained targeted literary and written language patterns. In order to predict the omitted word, the reader had to rely greatly on their semantic and syntactic strengths because the graphophonic representation of the word was unavailable to aid in the decoding process. A portion of a fiction storybook with strategically deleted words was used in this task. The storybook was at students' independent reading level, making it easier for them to more accurately process the author's message in spite of the omitted words.

Data Analysis Procedures

Multiple data analysis procedures were used to analyze student data for this study: a combination of discourse analysis (Gee, 2011) and theoretical thematic analysis (Braun & Clark, 2006) in which values coding and protocol coding (Saldana, 2009) were

applied to the interview and oral storytelling constructions respectively; a modified

version of Stephen Kucer's retelling analysis (Kucer, 2014), Kenneth Goodman's

miscue analysis (Goodman et al., 2005), and task specific theoretical thematic analyses

were used to analyze the Cloze and the comprehension question tasks (Braun & Clark,

2006). Finally, inductive thematic analysis was used to summarize and reflect on the data

from the five tasks (Braun & Clark, 2006), within and across the three reading

proficiency groups.

Discourse analysis and theoretical thematic analysis. In the first two tasks, it

was important to gain an understanding of children's language or "d"/discourse and how

they situate themselves within the school-based "D"/discourse of being a reader (their

identity). In light of Gee's works, I believed that an understanding of students' values,

beliefs, and behaviors would provide insight into students' identities as readers. This

information then served as lenses through which to explore any possible links between

language, identity, and reading.

Burke reading interview. James Gee's discourse analysis perspective provided a

lens through which to look at children's discourse through his use of inquiry "tools"

(Gee, 2011, p. 2). According to Gee, "A tool for discourse analysis is a specific question

to ask of the data. Each question makes the reader look quite closely at the details of

language in an oral or written communication" (Gee, 2011, p. 2). Gee's Identities

Building Tool is an encapsulation of my second research question: How do these

students' metalinguistic knowledge (knowledge of their reading processes) and beliefs

and values about reading influence their reading behaviors as evidenced by the ability to

anticipate, decode, retell, and answer comprehension questions? The Identities Building

Tool leads researchers to inquire about what socially recognizable identity or identities the speaker is trying to depict or to put on display for others. While Gee's Identities Building tool activated the analysis for this task, the process of thematic analysis, or more specifically theoretical thematic analysis, was initiated to further delve into students' interview responses.

Thematic analysis is a research method used to analyze and report patterns or themes that originate from collected data (Braun & Clark, 2006). Thematic analysis is useful for looking across multiple data sets in order to investigate a phenomenon. It is a method that can be used to mirror reality or to decipher or unravel the surface of reality. The purpose of this method is to discover themes or patterns of relevant responses or meaning across data sets. The emergence of themes is dependent on the researcher's judgment in determining which patterns are significant in addressing the research question. The prevalence of an item or items within or across data sets can be considered when determining themes. However, the determination of themes is less concerned with the frequency of patterns within the data set and more concerned with identifying those patterns that make possible a more thorough explanation of the phenomenon being studied. Themes can be identified through an inductive approach to thematic analysis or a theoretical approach. The theoretical approach is used when the researcher is coding for a very specific theoretical or analytic interest. By contrast, the inductive approach is used when the researcher's codes originate mostly from the data itself and not from a preexisting coding framework or specific research question.

As stated earlier in this section, theoretical thematic analysis was used to analyze the Burke Reading Interviews. Since the interview in this study was intended to provide

information about the "D"/discourse of young children, values coding (Saldaña, 2009) was used to analyze the interviews. Values codes are useful for determining participants' ideology, agency, motivation, and causality. Also, values coding allows the researcher to explore study participants' cultural perceptions as well as their intrapersonal and interpersonal values. There are three codes that are typically associated with value codes and are usually denoted with the initial capital letter of that code, followed by a very brief descriptive label that explains the purpose of that code within the transcribed student response: value (V); Attitude (A); and Belief (B). The term value can be described as the importance that is attributed to oneself, another person, a thing, or an idea regarding a specific phenomenon. Attitude is our thinking about ourselves, another person, or an idea or belief, including our knowledge, experiences, opinions, prejudices, morals, and other social perceptions.

Once students' responses were coded using the values coding system, they were categorized and reflected on in order to gain a better understanding of the students' reading processing and the strength of their membership within the "D"/discourse of school-based literacy.

Wordless picture book oral story construction. While Gee's Identities Building tool (Gee, 2011) initiated the inquiry for the second research question, Gee's Social Languages tool (Gee, 2011) was supported my first research question: How do third-grade African American children use their knowledge of literate and written language discourse as a resource in reading as evidenced in their ability to decode, anticipate, retell and answer comprehension questions? This tool established a lens through which to observe the "words and grammatical structures (types of phrases, clauses, and sentences)

86

to signal and enact a given social language" (Gee, 2011, p. 203). In order to answer this question, I located different instances of literate and written language in children's wordless picture book oral story constructions. The use of these academic structures in building their oral story revealed the extent to which they were taking on one of the many social languages, in the case of this study, the language of school, reading, and learning or academic language.

In order to maintain the flow of students' storytelling, and to more easily identify the types of language structures that students used, their stories were transcribed and parsed as they were spoken and were divided by page number. This task gave me a snapshot of students' internalized academic structures. After student's oral stories were transcribed, the rough transcriptions (Riessman, 1993) were segmented by the wordless picture book's page numbers. Gee suggested that research participants' stories be organized into stanzas (Gee, 2012). However, for this study, it was more useful to organize students' stories by page numbers, and to maintain the original structure that students used to express their story. Adjusting the analysis format allowed me to easily identify the language structures that were important to the study.

In order to continue to answer the first research question, the procedures for theoretical thematic analysis were implemented. The transcribed story was color- coded, making it easier to locate students' literate and written language features. I determined that protocol coding (Saldaña, 2009), a coding system which incorporates pre-established codes, originating from previous studies, was the best way to begin analyzing the children's oral stories. These codes allowed me to include literate and written language

designations based on the research of Anthony Pellegrini (1985) and Donald Leu (1982), who both explored the way children utilize academic language structures.

In his study, Pelegrini studied preschool children's symbolic play and their use of literate language (Pelligrini, 1985). He identified the following language features: elaborated noun phrases, conjunctions, adverbs, and mental/linguistic verbs. Pellegrini found that children engaging in higher levels of pretend play exhibited more literate language behaviors and styles. Many researchers in the field of speech and language pathology frequently use these language categories in studying the literate language features of children (Benson, 2009). Nippold (1998) coined the term literate language lexicon while studying the literate language features of school age and adolescent children. This lexicon represented the language important in reading, writing, listening to lectures, talking about language and thought and excelling in school. The designation, literate language features, is more recognized in the discipline of speech and language pathology. It refers primarily to a person's ability to control the language register associated with storytelling, a type of academic speech.

However, the term written language feature is a term used in the field of reading and is associated with the actual syntactic complexity of written text itself. Written language patterns can also be found in oral speech but tend to occur less frequently in comparison to everyday vernacular speech patterns (Leu, 1981, 1982). Written language patterns in printed text and in the expressive language of children and adults are subordinate and relative clauses, appositive and participial phrases, and passive verbs. In the past, research using these language categories focused more on the comprehension

potential of children; higher occurrences of written structures in oral speech were associated with the ability to comprehend written text more successfully.

As previously stated, in my study, students were asked to tell a story using the illustrations in a wordless picture book to assist them in constructing the plot. The academic features were color- coded based on the specific feature identified. The color codings were used to designate the types of written and literate language found in students' oral stories and to calculate the occurrences of the selected academic language structures. The color codes are shown in Appendix C. Additionally, I created frequency charts to aid in computing the occurrences of the targeted language features. The data collected in these charts provided insight into children's level of academic language proficiency. The charts also allowed me to identify the features that were more commonly and less commonly used by individual participants, within the proficiency groups and across the proficiency groups.

Miscue analysis. Goodman's miscue analysis procedure was used for analyzing data from the leveled story reading task. Miscue analysis was developed to help educators understand students' reading processes (Goodman et al., 2005; Wilde, 2000). A miscue is an observed response (OR) that does not match the expected response (ER), or what the observer expects to hear (corresponding to accurate text reading). Miscue analysis is based on Goodman's Taxonomy of Reading Miscues, which is a theoretically based system used to evaluate, categorize, and explain the presence of miscues observed during the reading of text orally. After students had orally read the text at their instructional reading level and after I marked their miscues using Goodman's standard symbols and marking procedures, indicating how they processed the text, I transferred each

participants' set of miscues to a Miscue Analysis Coding Form (Goodman et al., 2005).

The markings represented reading processing behaviors such as repetitions, reversals,

omissions, and insertions. The Miscue Analysis Coding Form in my study was created

using Goodman's original Miscue Analysis Classroom Procedure Coding Form. An

example of this form can be found in Appendix E.

As a part of the miscue analysis process, Goodman created five questions teachers

could use to guide the analysis of the miscues recorded on the Miscue Analysis Coding

Form. The questions are listed in Table 3.6. These questions allowed me to investigate

how children use information or cues from three systems of language: syntactic,

semantic, and graphophonic (Goodman et al., 2005; Wilde, 2000). I used 4 out of 5 of

Goodman's questions to analyze student miscues. The fifth question, regarding sound

similarity, is considered optional in implementing this analysis. The answer to the fifth

question was not significant to the findings of my study. Since the question that involved

graphic similarity provided enough information regarding the sound of the word,

Question 5 was not used in the analysis. Goodman's miscue analysis allowed me to

focus on students' overall reading behaviors as they worked to construct meaning from

text.

Table 3.6

Goodman's Classroom Procedure Questions for Miscue Analysis

Question 1	Syntactic Acceptability	Is the sentence syntactically acceptable in the reader's dialect and within the context of the entire text?
Question 2	Semantic Acceptability	Is the sentence semantically acceptable in the reader's dialect and within the context of the entire text?
Question 3	Meaning Change	Does the sentence, as finally produced by the reader, change the meaning of the entire text?
Question 4	Graphic Similarity	How much does the miscue (OR) look like the text word (ER)?
Question 5	Sound Similarity	How much does the miscue sound like the expected response (ER)?

Kucer's and Goodman's retelling analysis. I used Goodman's retelling guide (Goodman et al., 2005) and Kucer's Retelling comprehension taxonomy (Kucer, 2009, 2010, 2014,) analysis, located in Appendix E, to determine how well students were able to reassemble the macrostructure elements of a story that they read. Those macrostructure elements included specific character analysis, events, setting, and plot. As previously stated, when students included these elements in their retelling, they demonstrated their understanding of using literate language features. Students who were able to include many of the important elements of a particular story were labeled as having higher amounts of literate language at the macrostructure level. However, students who omitted these elements, added them incorrectly, or somehow incorrectly changed the story when reconstructing it often showed a more limited control over literate language. Goodman's retelling guide provided a template in which to more easily identify the integration, alternation, or omission of specific story elements or events that were considered important to the story.

After using Goodman's retelling guide, Kucer's comprehension taxonomy was used to continue to analyze students' story retellings. Kucer developed the comprehension taxonomy in order to capture the different ways in which retellings reflected how students comprehended text (Kucer, 2014). The taxonomy was developed during Kucer's research with a variety of elementary-aged proficient readers who retold both fiction and nonfiction text. After analyzing how these students' stories compared to the author's original rendition, he discovered various categories of retelling that included match, substitution, addition, summary, conflict, rearrangement, and omission. These categories form his comprehension taxonomy. Table 3.7 presents the categories in

Kucer's Comprehension Taxonomy. It is important to note that his taxonomy was not initially created be an assessment tool. It is not hierarchical, with some categories being inherently more acceptable or better than others. However, in my study, students' abilities to recreate parts of the story that were considered a "match" indicated their capacity to more closely capture the author's original message using the language of the text. Their closer approximations also served as a stronger indicator of students' understandings of how school-based stories should be reconstructed. Therefore, students who had more occurrences of matching or the match category demonstrated higher abilities to use literate language in their stories.

Although this analysis focused mainly on the macrostructure of the way student's told stories, I also took note of some of the microstructure literate and written language features as I wrote about the their retellings. This information was included on students' individual student profile charts, which were used in the reporting of the findings in Chapter Four. Table 3.7 was taken from Kucer's article, *What Retellings Can Tell Us About the Nature of Reading Comprehension in School Children.* Kucer developed this taxonomy based on the idea that comprehension is a constructive process (Kucer, 2014).

Table 3.7

Kucer's Comprehension Taxonomy (Kucer 2014)

Match	The idea expressed in the retelling matches an idea in the text. The surface structure may be different but the deep structure is the same.
Substitution	The idea expressed in the retelling is a substitution for an idea in the text. A substitution represents a modification of an idea articulated in the text that is semantically acceptable.
Addition	The idea expressed in the retelling is not found in the text but is semantically acceptable. An addition may represent implicit text meanings or a plausible inference.
Summary	At least two separate ideas in the text are condensed or synthesized into one more general idea in the retelling.
Conflict	The idea expressed in the retelling explicitly contradicts or is the opposite of an idea explicitly expressed in the text.
Rearrangement	The order of the ideas and their interrelationships expressed in the retelling are at a variance with the order of the ideas and their interrelationships expressed in the text.
Omission	The idea expressed in the text is not expressed in the retelling.

Comprehension question analysis. In analyzing the questions, I created charts based on Kucer's Comprehension Taxonomy (Kucer, 2014, 2009, 2010). The charts showed the type of academic language that was used in the text for each question and indicated why the answer was considered correct or incorrect. The indication of why the answer was correct or incorrect was added to the analysis process and was based on Kucer's and Goodman's assertion that students build or construct understanding in different ways (Kucer, 2009, 2010, 2014; Goodman et al., 2005). Kucer proposed that readers actively engage with the text by building a representation of text based on their background and on their purpose for reading (Kucer, 2014). In light of these assertions, I created an analysis table that determined how students' answers may have differed or coincided with the expected answer. The explanations used to analyze student's questions are listed in Table 3.8. A detailed example of the actual comprehension analysis table is found in Appendix E.

Table 3.8

Comprehension Question Analysis Categories

Correct Answer			Incorrect Answer		
Uses Language of Text	Different From Researchers Expected Answer	Different Surface Structure/Same Deep Structure	Not Found or Supported Within Text	Answer Partially Correct/Slightly Modified	Incomplete Answer

Cloze analysis. In analyzing the Cloze task, students' attempts to solve the

unknown word were recorded on a chart. Not only did the charts capture whether

participants' responses were syntactically and semantically correct; in keeping with

Goodman's miscue analysis (Goodman et al., 2005), the responses were also categorized

as being embedded within more academic or oral language structures reminiscent of

Leu's (1982) oral and written discourse study. Leu's study observed students' abilities to

predict and comprehend text written in both the oral and written language registers. The

latter distinction was relevant to my study as it was useful for determining what types of

language structures were more or less predictable within the text.

Summarizing the data using inductive thematic analysis. The inductive

thematic approach was used to identify patterns and themes across multiple data sets

(Braun & Clark, 2006): five tasks and three reading proficiency groups. Individual profile

charts for each student and group summary tables for each task facilitated the analysis of

data. Using this approach, findings were determined applying three different lenses: an

individual student data set, a within proficiency level group data set, and a comparative

data set which includes all tasks at all three proficiency levels. Table 3.7 provides a list of

analysis tasks used in this study, while Table 3.8 indicates the three different levels of analysis incorporated within this study.

Table 3.9

Data Analysis Procedures

TASKS	TYPE OF ANALYSIS		
TASK 1	Burke Reading Interview	Theoretical Thematic Analysis Values Coding	Inductive Thematic Analysis
TASK 2	Story Reconstruction Using Wordless Picture Book	Discourse Analysis Protocol Coding Frequency Chart	
TASK 3	Leveled Story Reading Task	Miscue Analysis	
TASK 4	Comprehension: Retelling	Discourse Analysis Kucer's Comprehension Taxonomy Frequency Chart	
	Comprehension: Explicit & Inferential Questioning	Analysis Table	
TASK 5	Reading Cloze Assessment	Analysis Table	

Table 3.10

Inductive Thematic Analysis Three Data Sets

Individual
Within Each Reading Proficiency Level
Across Reading Proficiency Levels (Comparison)

Analytic Memos

This research study required a significant amount of reflection. Therefore, I incorporated analytic memos (Saldaña, 2009) within the analysis portion of the research process to assist me in thinking deeply and critically about the emerging data and the appropriate categories or codes for use in analyzing them. Analytic memos are similar to research journals in that they provide the investigator with a place to construct and to

archive their thinking. The use of analytic memos allows researchers to reflect on the following information: personal connections to the data or participants in the study; the study's research questions or theories and how they should be answered; codes, emerging, patterns, themes, and concepts and how they relate to each other; problems or challenges in the study; and the progress of the study. Analytic memos were electronically created through a notetaking Google App called Google Keep. Some of my initial thinking was recording using the analytic memos. However, many of my reflections about student data were recorded on the analysis tables and within the student data summary profiles. Examples of analytic memos are found in Appendix H, and the data summary tables for individual students and the reading proficiency groups can be found in Appendix G. Finally, a complete set of one student's data for all five tasks is located in Appendix E.

Ensuring Trustworthiness

Ensuring trustworthiness is essential to research. It is important that readers be able to have confidence in the research process as well as the results of this study. Therefore, different procedures were put in place to ensure trustworthiness, which in a qualitative study represents credibility, dependability, transferability, and confirmability. Credibility ensures that the findings of the study match reality or that the phenomenon being studied has been accurately measured and recorded (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Shenton, 2004). I established credibility in my study by choosing established research tools and procedures such as miscue analysis, oral storytelling, the Burke Reading Interview, and Cloze reading. I also established credibility by debriefing the analysis process and the results of the study with two different peer debriefers. I was given

feedback on how well the type of analyses supported the research question and how well the findings aligned to the research questions, as well as the limitations and implications of the study. Both of the debriefers are reading specialists who work with teachers and students within my district. Also, they are both trained reading recovery teachers. One debriefer has earned a Ph.D. in reading. Her research interests include early literacy, writing development, and bilingual education. The second debriefer is currently a doctoral candidate at the end of her dissertation process. Her research interests include writing development, early literacy, and teacher effectiveness and professional development.

Furthermore, the dependability and transferability of a study is demonstrated when other researchers can repeat the study for their own specific inquiries. I ensured that this study was dependable and transferable by providing detailed descriptions of the data collection and analysis procedures. I included scripts and prompts that were consistently used for each task within the appendix of this dissertation so that the process could be more accurately replicated. In addition, I provided the analysis tables used to make sense of the data so that others could replicate the study.

Conclusion

The complexities of this study suggest how we should view, investigate, and learn from literacy development. Language and literacy are complicated, and as educators and researchers we must abandon our simplistic views of becoming literate and embrace and seek to understand the real influence of society, culture, family, language, and cognition on children's literacy development. The tasks in this study were purposely chosen to provide more comprehensive insight into children's attempts to take on the secondary

discourse of school. It is my hope that this study will encourage continuation of the

conversation about the complexity of literacy and that it will add to the understanding of

how best to prepare children to be successful in school. It is also my intention that this

information will be used to equip teachers with instructional assessments that reflect

students' thinking and their approximations at gaining more solid control over school-

based-literacy.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

"...children learn to read and write effectively only if they are admitted into a community of written language users which I shall call the 'literacy club,' starting before children are able to read or write a single word for themselves. Such a club has to be similar to the community of spoken language users to which infants are admitted almost from the moment of birth."

Frank Smith

According to Le Monine and Soto (2017), academic language is a pathway to equity, allowing academic expectations to be reached and maintained, yet our understanding of children's language and its effect on their ability to engage in literate behaviors such as decoding, anticipating, retelling, and comprehending are not fully understood. Likewise, the effects of children's literate identities are not fully understood, especially in relation to their level of proficiency in the aforementioned reading behaviors. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to explore and attempt to explain possible links between students' levels of literate and written language, or academic language, and their ability to read and comprehend text. Their ability to read and to comprehend text can be revealed through literate behaviors such as decoding, anticipating, retelling text, and answering comprehension questions.

This study primarily included students who Le Monine and Soto (2017) called SELs. While ELLs are students who are learning English as well as Academic English, SELs are students who speak language variations that are different from American Standard English in structure and grammar, even though this variation is inclusive of widely-used English vocabulary words (Le Monine & Soto, 2017). SELs also include

Mexican American-non-new immigrant students who speak some level or form of Mexican American Language (MxAL) or "Chicano English." Moreover, African Americans may be considered SELs as well. The primary participants in this study were African American. All of these students spoke some level or form of African American Language or African American English. There was one ELL student who spoke the West African language Yorouba in addition to English.

This qualitative multiple case study was framed by the theoretical perspective of James Gee (Gee, 2004, 2012), who contended that reading acquisition and learning is equivalent to adopting a particular discourse. A discourse is a social identity reflecting behavior, interaction, values, beliefs, and language. Gee proposed that taking on discourse involved adopting both the language, which he referred to as "d"/discourse, and the tacit understandings that govern the way people think, feel and believe, referred to as "D"/Discourse. Consequently, as people take on the linguistic patterns and structures of a language, they also take on the values, beliefs, and behaviors of the discourse. This study examined how children have taken on the discourse of school-based reading, or what Gee referred to as the discourse of "storybook reading" (Gee & Spack, 1998, p. 17) at both discourse levels, by investigating the "d"/discourse reflected in their academic language patterns and the "D"/Discourse reflected in their thoughts about reading and their reading process. Gee proposed that school-based reading or storybook reading is a secondary discourse, or a discourse that originated from outside of the home, in comparison to students' first experience with language, termed primary discourse (2012).

In this chapter, the reader will be provided with information about this dissertation's research design and about why this design was chosen. The reader will also

learn about the findings relating to each participant through language excerpts embedded within this chapter, as well as important findings within and across each reading proficiency group. Finally, the following research questions will be answered:

1.   How do third-grade African American children use their knowledge of literate and written language discourse as a resource in reading as evidenced by their ability to decode, anticipate, retell, and answer comprehension questions?

2.   How do these students' metalinguistic knowledge (knowledge of their reading processes) and beliefs and values about reading influence their reading behaviors as evidenced by their ability to anticipate, decode, retell, and answer comprehension questions?

The research questions for this study were matched with two inquiry tools created by Gee (2011). The two inquiry tools mirrored the two research questions, respectively. These tools initiated the probing and analysis process at the respective discourse levels of this study. The social languages tool, representing the "d"/discourse, was used to identify words and grammatical structures at the microstructure level that reflected a specific social language. In the case of this study, the social language, academic language, was expressed through written and literate language structures. Also, for the purpose of this study, children's knowledge of story grammar or story structure at the macrostructure level was also observed and was considered a form of literate language or academic discourse. Internalization of these microstructure and macrostructure linguistic features signaled membership in the discourse of reading. The identities building tool was used to inquire about the socially recognizable identity that the speaker was trying to enact, by exploring how participants positioned themselves and others in a particular discourse. In

this study, the identities building tool was used to investigate the extent to which students took on the values, beliefs, and behaviors of the discourse of reading while exploring the influence of students' adoption of this discourse on their reading behaviors.

Research Design Summary

Methodology

This research study was considered an exploratory qualitative embedded multiple case study (Yin, 2003). The case study methodology itself allowed me to investigate the very complex intersection between language, identity, and literacy using a select group of African American third-grade participants. In addition, the embedded multiple case design enabled me to study students at three differing proficiency levels: on-level, below-level, and above-level. Investigating students at each of those levels gave me a more comprehensive view of students' abilities in adopting academic language as well as their abilities in taking on school-based reading identities. Furthermore, this investigation made it possible for me to observe the link between their abilities to decode and to comprehend text at their individual reading proficiency levels.

Students' reading levels were determined by their classroom reading teachers, who used Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessment System or BAS (2008). Using this system of leveled books, teachers observed students' reading behaviors and asked them literal and inferential level comprehension questions. The answers to literal comprehension questions are found directly within the text, while the answers to inferential questions are determined by clues from the text and the reader's background knowledge. These comprehension questions yielded information about students' reading competencies in beyond their ability to retell text. Their reading proficiency levels or text

gradients were calculated according to the percentage of words they read correctly and according to their skill level in answering comprehension questions correctly.

Students who read 95-100% (A-K) or 98-100% (L-Z) of the text correctly were considered to perform at an independent reading level (Fountas & Pinnell, 2006). The independent reading level is the level at which students could read text with minimal support from an adult. Students were considered to be on an instructional reading level when they could read text with 90-94% (A-K) or 95-97% (L-Z) accuracy. The instructional level is the level at which the teacher could more effectively introduce students to new strategies and understandings. Books at this level are read with adult support. The ability to read text at an instructional accuracy level determined students' overall reading levels at school. Text in which students read below 90% (A-K) or 95% (L-Z) accuracy was considered difficult or hard for the student to read successfully even with adult support. Table 4.1 shows how students' independent level, the instructional level, and the hard or frustration level were determined.

Table 11

Reading Accuracy Rate

Fountas & Pinnell Leveling System	Independent Level	Instructional Level	Hard Level
A-K	95%-100%	90%-94%	Below 90%
L-Z	98%-100%	95%-97%	Below 95%

Participants. In keeping with the embedded multiple case study design (Yin, 2003), each of the three groups in this study represented a unit, and each student within a unit was considered a subunit. Table 4.2 shows the three reading proficiency level groups and the students participating within those groups. There were two students in the

above level group, and there were three students in the on-level and below-level reading proficiency groups. The on-level students were on Level P. The below-level students were on Level O, and the students who were above level were on Level Q.

Table 12

Actual Third-grade Sample by Reading Level

	Above-Level (Level Q)	On-Level (or slightly above) (Level P)	Below Reading Level (Level O)
Female Students	Kesha	Linda	0
Male Students	Samuel	Sloane Tevon	Dominique Calvin Sydney

Data collection tasks. In this exploratory study, I collected student data through the implementation of five research tasks. The research tasks were designed to reveal students' control of academic language structures such as literate and written language and to uncover connections between these academic structures, their reading behaviors, and their identities as readers.

Table 4.3 summarizes the purposes of each data collection task within this study. The tasks were administered in two sessions or sittings. Tasks one and two were administered in the first session; while tasks three through five were administered in the second session. Task 4, the comprehension task, was broken into subtasks comprised of retelling the story and answering comprehension questions about the leveled story. Each data collection task took approximately 10 minutes.

Table 13

Data Collection Tasks

	Tasks	**Purpose of Each Task**
Task 1	Burke Reading Interview	Determined how students saw themselves as readers and what they understood about the reading process.
Task 2	Story Reconstruction Using Wordless Picture Book	Uncovered students' abilities to construct a school-based story using literate and written language at the microstructure and macrostructure level.
Task 3	Leveled Story Reading Task	Determined students' level of control in reading text containing literate and written language text structures.
Task 4	Comprehension: Retelling	Revealed students' understanding of how to retell a school-based story in order to reconstruct the author's message.
	Comprehension: Explicit & Inferential Questioning	Showed how well students were able to comprehend the author's message, explicitly and inferentially.
Task 5	Reading Cloze Assessment	Demonstrated students' abilities to predict deleted words embedded in both academic and oral based text structures.

Data analysis. Each task within this study had its own separate analysis, and the results of those analyses were used to learn about each of the students and to answer the research questions. In the Burke Reading Interview, theoretical thematic analysis was employed to identify themes or patterns within students' interview responses. The theoretical approach is used when the codes are predetermined by a specific theory or analytical interest (Braun & Clark, 2006). Since the study was designed to collect data through the lens of Gee's D/discourse level theory, values codes (Saldaña, 2009) were chosen for the analysis of this study. Values codes were used to identify the following response types within the transcribed interviews: Value code (V), Attitude (A), and Belief

(B). The codes were grouped and explored for important patterns and themes in order to draw conclusions about students' identities as readers.

In the wordless picture book task, discourse analysis was employed. In this analysis, select written and literate language features within the transcribed oral wordless picture book data were coded using protocol coding procedures (Saldaña, 2009). Protocol coding procedures are used when the research requires the use of pre-established designations or categories from previous studies. Therefore, written and literate language features, from the research of Leu (1982) and Pellegrini (1985), formed the categories and designations for this study. These language features were coded using a color coding system and were counted. The frequency of these language patterns was recorded on tables. Table 4.4 lists the specific written and literate language features used in this study.

Table 14

Academic Language Features (Syntax)

Leu's Study (1982)	Pellegrini (1985)
Written Language Features	Literate Language Features
subordinate and relative clauses	elaborate noun phrases
appositive phrases	conjunctions
participial phrases	adverbs
passive verbs	mental/linguistic verbs

In addition, Goodman's miscue analysis (Goodman et al., 2005) was used to analyze the oral reading. Five questions were utilized to guide the analysis of students' reading attempts. These questions revealed how students accessed language cues which

106

included semantic, graphophonic, and syntactic information in order to successfully read instructional leveled text. The questions are found in Chapter 3, Table 3.6.

Moreover, Kucer's (2014, 2009, 2010) retelling taxonomy was utilized to determine how closely the students' retelling matched and differed from the author's original version of the story. The taxonomy consisted of the following categories: match, substitution, addition, summary, conflict, rearrangement, and omission. The taxonomy categories were explained in more detail in Chapter 3. This task uncovered what was included in students' retelling and the way in which students organized and sequenced important events from the story.

In order to analyze the comprehension questions, analysis tables were created. These tables allowed me to identify correct and incorrect responses and to categorize the responses according to why the responses were correct or incorrect. Finally, a Cloze analysis table was created to reveal the way students predicted language structures in the Cloze task. This table incorporated aspects of Goodman's (Goodman et al., 2005) miscue analysis and indicated if the unknown text or context of the deleted word was part of the oral or the academic register.

Inductive thematic analysis was used to search for patterns and themes across the five research tasks and across the reading proficiency groups to uncover the general findings of the study and to answer the research questions. These patterns and themes were determined using students' individual profile charts, which were created to summarize student data and using the task summaries for each proficiency group. The data are presented in Appendix G, and a complete let of student data is located in Appendix E.

Study context. All the participants in this study attended a Title I school in a mid-sized city. The participants in the study were all African American students. When data collection began, African Americans made up 32% of the school and 34% of the third grade.   One of the students was considered ESL because a language in addition to English was spoken in his home. All of the students were from low socioeconomic homes (Harwell & LeBeau, 2010) as indicated by their school meal status, receiving free or reduced cost meals. The study consisted of six boys and two girls. Even though I worked on the same campus that these students attended, I did not have a relationship with them. On their campus, I provided instructional support for K-2 teachers and reading intervention for students in grades K-2. Since these students were in the third grade at the time of the study, I did not serve them or their teachers. Also, I had not worked with any of these students when they were in the younger grades. I gave each student a pseudonym during the analysis stage of my study in order to protect his or her identity, and that same pseudonym was used in this report.

General Case Study Findings

The students within the study were alike in some ways; however, they were different in their abilities to use literate and written language to construct a story and to engage in literate behaviors. They showed variability in how they applied their knowledge of these academic discourse structures to assist them in decoding and comprehending text.

The data presented below include three sets of findings: significant commonalities across the reading proficiency groups as indicated in Table 4.5, significant findings within and across the reading proficiency groups as indicated in Table 4.6, and individual

findings, as indicated in Table 4.7. In Appendix F, the individual findings include

answers to one question from the Burke Interview which asked, *Do you think you are a*

good reader and why? This question was included in this table because students'

responses to this question accurately described their attempt to identify with or to acquire

the discourse of reading, even though the other responses provided important information

about students' reading identities as well. The table also includes the frequency of

written and literate language found in students' wordless picture book story constructions

as well as students' literate abilities captured in the way they retold and answered

comprehension questions after reading a fiction story. This chapter contains important

individual and group findings. The individual findings consist of language samples.

Finally, the research questions are answered toward the end of the chapter.

Table 15

Commonalities Across the Reading Proficiency Groups

Commonalities Across the Reading Proficiency Groups
☐ All of the students successfully used familiar oral language features in constructing the oral wordless picture book stories.
☐ Most of the students valued test taking processes and test taking achievements.
☐ During the interview, most of the students mentioned only lower level or inefficient strategies when discussing how to solve reading difficulties.
☐ All of the students had difficulty predicting words embedded within written or literate linguistic patterns.
☐ Many of the students had more difficulty comprehending text which contain both figurative or metaphorical language and written and/or literate text structures.
☐ Most of the students who were able to retell the story were more likely to successfully answer comprehension questions, but students who answered comprehension questions correctly were not always able to construct a retelling of the story.

Table 16

Significant Findings within and Across Each Reading Proficiency Level Group

Tasks	Above-Level Group	On-Level Group	Below-Level Group
Wordless Picture Book Story Construction	Used written and literate language to descibe, infer character motives and feelings, and show cause and effect relatonships during wordless picture book story construction.	Used written and literate language to describe, infer character motives and feelings, and show cause and effect relationships during wordless picture book story construction.	Used written and literate language features less frequently. Features were used mainly to describe characters' physical features or story settings.
Burk Reading Interview	Articulated the importance of understanding the story and understanding word meanings.	Articulated the importance of figuring out a word and sounding out or spelling out the word in order to read it correctly.	Articulated the importance of recognizing a word and chunking it into parts in order to read.
Leveled Story Reading	Made considerably more miscues during oral reading task than the other two groups and were less likely to self-correct incorrect words using syntactic and semantic cues.	Varied results were formed within this group.	Made more miscues during oral reading and were less likely to self-correct syntactically and semantically incorrect words.
Comprehension: Retelling/Questions	Story retellings were either heavily detailed (providing important and unimportant information) or abbreviated (providing basic information about the story). Many comprehension questions were answered incorrectly.	Students who were able to retell the story were also able to answer questions successfully.	Students successfully answered comprehension questions but were unable to reconstruct the story.

On-Level Group Background Information

The students in this group were on instructional Reading Level P, which is the end of the third-grade reading level according to Fountas & Pinnel's (2006) book leveling system. They were at the end of the transitional stage of reading, which spans Level J to Level P. Table 3.1, in chapter three, shows the end of year expectations for each grade level in the students' school district and shows the corresponding reading stages across the grade levels. The transitional stage of reading lies in between the early stage and the fluent/self-extending stage of reading (Szymusiak & Sibberson, 2001). At this stage, the students can recognize many words; can integrate meaning, syntax, and phonics consistently; can read fluently; and can summarize their reading. At this stage, however, they are still learning to read more complex text with more complex sentence structures. The books that they encounter may have more elaborate story plots and more complicated characters. Table 4.7 lists significant individual findings about the on-level reading group. More detailed information about each student can be found in the next section of this chapter.

Table 17

On-Level Group Significant Individual Data Findings

	Tevon	Sloane	Linda
Burke Interview Question: Do you think you are a good reader? Why?	Yes. Because usually the books that I read, I know. But I like to be challenged and can read other books. And usually when I read other books, I'm surprised that I can actually read them very good. I can't wait to read this book. I love to read. I love math and reading.	Yes. Because when I'm stuck on a question I re-read the passage and I skip and if I still don't know I skip question then I can tell the rest that I know, answer the rest of the questions that I know. When I'm all done with that I go back to the one that I don't know and I answer it	Yes. Because ...Because it's easy for me to know that when I read non-fiction books I know more than I used to know because it gives me more info than I know now. And fiction books are just fun for me and I like that they just give me detail and it's just fun.
Academic Language Features (Frequency)	37	21	15
Comprehension Retelling (Matches)	67%	27%	75%
Comprehension Questions (Percentage)	75%	13%	63%

Tevon. Expressive

Burke reading interview. Tevon was very talkative during the sessions. He seemed to be very comfortable with expressing himself. Tevon equated being a good reader with intelligence. It can be inferred from his responses that he believed that books made one smarter. In addition, from his responses, it appeared that he had developed a sense of agency in knowing that there are some books that are readable, and there are some books that are not readable.

Question: How did you learn to read?

Answer: *Well it started at the beginning of kindergarten. That's where I learned how to read. I actually didn't know how to read at all when I was in pre-k. I was very dumb when I was in pre-k. But when first grade and kindergarten came. I started getting a little smarter in those grades. How did I start getting smart? Well...usually books that were in my class, I would I would I would try to read the book, but couldn't read it. I would put it. I would put the book back and try a book that was a little easier for me.*

Also, another significant finding about Tevon was that he seemed to understand that language changes depending on its purpose. When asked, how would you help someone having difficulty reading, he stated:

"How would I? I would usually go up to them and they still know the word is. I would help them. You know I would do that language. You know the language...you try to help someone but you don't really say the whole thing. Like you say the whole thing. Yeah, I kinda do that language that helps you. So I be like, So I probably…"

Wordless picture book oral story construction. Tevon used more written and literate language forms than all of the participants within the wordless picture book oral story construction. Nevertheless, what is significant about Tevon's story was his ability to use those language features to express more abstract literary details such as the characters' feelings,

113

thoughts and motives. For example, he used a subordinate clause and an adjective to narrate an illustration and show time.

Table 18

Tevon's Literate/Written Language Sample 1

Subordinate Clause to Show Time
"Then, <u>when the dinosaur went away</u>, they were all like, they were really <u>confused</u> about what just happened."

Often, his story contained decontextualized language to describe the events in the story. This decontextualized language was embedded within the storybook-like text structures in Tevon's oral narrative. In Table 4.9, Tevon described the feelings of the characters using a mental verb which he embedded within a participial phrase. However, the most significant aspect of this language sample is that there were no pictorial clues which supported his description of the character's feelings. It seemed that Tevon's sense of story enabled him to make a prediction about the character's feelings without the aid of supporting visual images. Moreover, he chose a description that made sense within the context of the story.

Table 19

Tevon's Literate/Written Language Sample 2

Mental Linguistic Verb Embedded Within a Participial Phrase
They walked home, <u>trying to forget what had just happened.</u>

Leveled story reading. During the leveled story reading, Tevon corrected 24 out of the 29 miscues. Initially, about the same number of his miscues were syntactically unacceptable and syntactically acceptable. Tevon's ability to self-correct showed that he may have self-

monitored the text's syntactic structures, decreasing his number of syntactically unacceptable miscues.

Retelling. Tevon's retelling closely matched the author's story. In addition, his retelling conveyed the author's deeper message. However, like many of the other students, he may not have fully understood instances of figurative language or sensory language in the story. Nevertheless, unlike many of the participants within his proficiency group and in both the below-level and above-level groups, he incorporated some of the literate or written language structures (at the microstructure level) in his retelling. For example, in Table 4.10, Tevon incorporated a subordinating conjunction within his retelling. The language sample also shows Tevon's attempt to interpret the sensory language.

Table 20

Tevon's Retelling Language Sample

Text	Tevon's Retelling	Kucer's Analysis Code
He wanted the sweet taste of chocolate on his tongue to last forever. Slowly he spread his arms out wide as if he were flying. At last Desmond knew what it felt like to be free. It was as if he could embrace the whole world in his outstretched arms.	*Desmond took off with the candy in his mouth. <u>Then then close to when he got home</u>, he spread his arms and felt that he could control the world.*	**substitution**

Comprehension questions. Tevon answered six out of eight of the comprehension questions correctly. One of the incorrectly answered questions involved him having to interpret a metaphorical event in the story. The clues to the answer were partly located in a participial clause in the text. However, even though Tevon could not give a more precise

115

interpretation of the message that the author was trying to convey, he showed that he knew that the game was supposed to teach a moral lesson and used his own prior knowledge to construct an answer that came close to the author's interpretation.

Table 21

Tevon's Comprehension Question Language Sample

Text	Question	Answer
Participial Clause <u>Lowering his face close to the floor</u>, Father Trevor lined up a marble in the chalk circle	How was the game of marbles important to the story?	*It doesn't matter if you win or lose...I don't get it.*

Cloze. Finally, during the Cloze task, Tevon was able to predict exactly two out of the seven unknown words within the written and literate text structures and four out of seven of the unknown words in the oral language patterned text structures. Tevon was more likely to predict the author's language when the language was closely related to his own oral structures. However, Tevon did not predict the author's exact word as often in structures that were more book-like or that were embedded within a literate or written language context. Nonetheless, he was often able to choose a word that was both syntactically and semantically correct, even though it was not the author's exact word in the academic structures.

Sloane. Good Test Taker

Burke reading interview. Sloane also equated being smart with reading. However, Sloane also seemed to also equate reading with being a good test taker. Sloane responded "yes" to the question asking if his teacher, the person that he considered a good reader, ever came to something he/she did not know. After responding to the first question, he answered the follow-up question. His response revealed that he had internalized the test-taking genre of reading. In fact, most of his responses centered on being a good test-taker.

Question: When she comes to a word she doesn't know, what do you think she does?

Answer: *She stays on that question and she rereads the paragraph or.... Yeah she rereads the paragraph two times and she still has the question in her head and then she knows the question because she just read, she reread it two times.*

Question: Do you think you are a good reader? Why?

Answer: *Yes. Because when I'm stuck on a question I re-read the passage and I skip and if I still don't know, I skip the question then I can tell the rest that I know, answer the rest of the questions that I know. When I'm all done with that I go back to the one that I don't know and I answer it.*

> **Wordless picture book oral story construction.** Sloane was one of the few students who gave the characters names in his wordless picture book oral story construction. He personified the dinosaur, which he called a dragon, in the story and gave it the ability to talk or to call the other characters by name while it was chasing them.

He used several subordinate clauses in order to show time, cause and effect, place, and outcome relationships between ideas in his story. He also provided description in his story by using elaborate noun phrases and relative clauses. One of the cause and effect relationships did not quite seem to match the story, but it is possible that he used his own experience to form that relationship. The cause and effect relation that he constructed did not completely make sense with the story.

Table 22

Sloane's Literate/Written Language Sample

Relative Clause Showing Description	Elaborate Noun Phrase Showing Description	Subordinate Clause Showing Time	Subordinate Clause Attempting to Show Cause/Effect
Once there was some three kids that found a paper bag that was on a dragon ride.	*It turned into a great a green scary dinosaur and it popped out straight from the ground.*	*When they found that paper bag, they open it.*	*And they was excited that it stop raining because they might of could have got sick and they was not wet, they was dry.*

Leveled story reading. During the reading of the leveled text, seven of his 22 miscues were self-corrected as he read. His miscues were syntactically correct half of the time. Sloane was able to maintain meaning at the sentence level throughout the story. As a result, many of his miscues were semantically acceptable, or they made sense in the context of the sentence in which they occurred.

Retelling. As with many of the students who retold the story that they read orally, much of the retelling at the microstructure level was told in his own oral vernacular. There were very few instances of literate and written language patterns in the retelling of the story, even though his oral wordless picture book story construction had several instances of these academic structures. At times, Sloane had difficulty sequencing the events in the story. Also, one major part of the story was omitted from his retelling. His organization of the retelling did not explicitly reveal a relationship between the events; nor did the events build upon each other in logical ways. In addition, his retelling did not fully recount the main character's emotional changes or feelings throughout the story. Sloane was unable to communicate deeper meanings of the story through his retelling.

Comprehension questions. The majority of Sloan's comprehension questions were answered incorrectly. Specifically, one out of eight questions was answered correctly. During the analysis, many of Sloane's answers were categorized as partially correct, showing that he was able to comprehend the author's message only partially. Like most of the other students, he failed to understand the symbolism or metaphorical reasoning behind the game of marbles. Similar to Tevon's response, it did not seem to be the presence of the participial phrase, in that portion of the text, that caused him to misinterpret the author's message; rather, it was

primarily the presence of the metaphorical event that caused that portion of the text to be less understandable.

Table 23

Sloane's Comprehension Question Language Sample

Text	Question	Answer
Participial Clause <u>**Lowering his face close to the floor**</u>**, Father Trevor lined up a marble in the chalk circle.**	How was the game of marbles important to the story?	*Because that is the only game that they have to play and I think that when he is sad he likes to play with his dad with the marbles.*

Cloze. During the Cloze task, like many of the students within this study, the unknown words in the literate and written language or the unknown words that occurred in the context of the literate and written language phrases were less predictable for Sloane in comparison to the unknown words that occurred in the oral vernacular structures. Sloane predicted exactly one out of the seven words within the written and literate structures and five out of seven unknown words within the oral register in the text.

Linda. Apprentice

Burke reading interview. Linda seemed very excited during the interview to answer questions about reading. She saw herself and her mom as good readers. Much of her interview was about experiences reading with her mom.

Question: Who is a good reader that you know?

Answer: *My Mom*

Question: What makes your mom a good reader?

Answer: *Because when she was in third-grade she was on a Level S.*

Question: Do you think your mom ever comes to something she doesn't know while she is reading?

Answer: *She does sometimes but she asks me sometimes to see if I know it but if we both don't know it we both go back and restart until we get it.*

Question: How did you learn how to read?

Answer: *Well, I first started to read when I was 2 and my mom started cause I was almost going to in daycare. I was in daycare and so they started giving us books to read so she started helping me read by giving me words to ...She started spelling words so I could know the words and I told her the words and it started getting easier and then when I ...when I was four I went to pre-k and it was easy for me to read the books that the teachers gave me.*

   Wordless picture book oral story construction. Linda used a greater number of literate language structures than written language structures in her oral wordless picture book oral story construction. Relative clauses were used to provide more description. She used both mental and linguistic verbs frequently during her story. In addition, subordinate clauses and appositive phrases were used to show characters' feelings, actions, and motives. However, while Tevon seemed to infer casual relationships that did not depend on the picture in order to tell the story, Linda's storytelling relied mainly on the images in the text.

Table 24

Linda's Literate/Written Language Sample

Linguistic Verb Showing Description	Elaborate Noun Phrase and Mental Verb Showing Description	Subordinate Clause Showing Outcome
And then they started <u>screaming </u>and running.	*Then a <u>big dinosaur shadow</u> came and they got <u>scared.</u>*	*Then the little boy went down the slide, <u>but the dinosaur was in front of it.</u>*

   Leveled story reading. During the oral reading, Linda self-corrected sixteen out of thirty miscues. Her miscues indicate that she maintained the overall meaning of the story as she read. However, in her first attempts at reading many of the words, she had about the same number of syntactically acceptable and syntactically unacceptable miscues. Her self-correction showed her cognitive processes of confirming and disconfirming her reading

attempts, also known as monitoring. Linda often read with expression and intonation and engaged well with the text.

Retelling. Linda's retelling closely matched the author's original version of the story. Only one substitution was used during the retelling, as she was unable to more precisely infer meaning from text containing figurative language. Table 4.15 and 4.16 show the relationship between the text and Linda's retelling using Kucer's analysis codes.

Table 25

Linda's Retelling Language Sample 1

Text	Linda's Retelling	Kucer Analysis Code
Slowly he spread his arms out wide as if he were flying. At last, Desmond knew what it felt like to be free. It was as if he could embrace the whole in his outstretched arms	*And Desmond went home with his arms out and he was happy that he got that over with.*	**Substitution**

Table 26

Linda's Retelling Language Sample 2

Text	Linda's Retelling	Kucer Analysis Code
"How can I forgive them? They haven't said they're sorry." "You don't need to wait until someone says they're sorry to forgive them. You have the power to forgive whenever you are ready."	*Father Trevor told him to say sorry and to forgive him without even saying sorry. And you can do it whenever you are ready and you don't have to do it right now.*	**Match**

Comprehension questions. Linda answered five out of eight questions correctly. She was able to answer almost all of the questions that involved inferring characters' feelings correctly. This is significant because it may be linked to her ability to seamlessly incorporate character feelings and motives into her oral wordless picture book story construction.

However, in one of the questions, she was unable to correctly infer from the text why Father

Trevor left the meeting. She could not infer Father Trevor's motives, but instead focused on

the behaviors and feelings of the character Desmond. This is an important finding because her

difficulty in correctly answering this question could be the result of a combination of syntactic

complexity and vocabulary, not just syntax. This may have caused her to make an inference

about Desmond instead of Father Trevor.

Table 27

Linda's Comprehension Question Language Sample

Text	Question	Answer
Participial Phrase "**What's wrong?**" **he asked, <u>excusing himself</u> <u>from a meeting.</u>**	Why did Father Trevor leave his meeting to speak with Desmond?	*Because he kept on thinking about the mean word and he always and he was saying that it was always in his book that he was saying. But it really wasn't it was just hard for him to stop thinking about it.*

Cloze. Linda was more successful at anticipating words within written and literate

language structures that carried more meaning. However, words within literate and written

structures that were less meaningful were harder to predict. Nevertheless, Linda exactly

supplied four out of the seven unknown words within the oral language structures.

Below-Level Group Background Information

The students in this group are also considered transitional readers, even though they

are below grade level in reading. These students are on Level O, which is a middle of the year

third-grade reading level. Since this study took place at the end of the third- grade school year,

these students should at least be on a Level P.   These students received reading intervention

from the school reading specialist and their classroom teacher in addition to their regular

instruction in the classroom. Much of the intervention that they received included preparing

for regular benchmarks and for the STAAR test, which is a standardized test for Texas

students attending elementary, middle or high school. Table 4.18 summarizes important

findings of the on-level group. More detailed information about each student is located in the

next section of this chapter.

Table 28

Below-Level Group Significant Individual Data Findings

	Dominique	Calvin	Sydney
Burke Interview Question Do you think you are a good reader? Why?	Yes. Because I never give up and I always try.	Yes. Because every time I stop. I will think about the word and then I will say the word.	Yes. Because sometimes I pass my test and I figure out stuff and that's how it gets me the question correct and when I'm reading the question, I always have the right question, the right words boxed
Academic Language Features (Frequency)	13	20	8
Comprehension Retelling (Matches)	50%	73%	33%
Comprehension Questions (Percentage)	40%	80%	100%

Sydney. Bilingual

Burke reading interview. Sydney's family is from Africa. However, he speaks English

fluently without a noticeable accent. He speaks and understands Yorouba. Both Yorouba and

English are spoken in his home. During the Burke reading interview, he, like many of the

students in this study, rated his ability to read based on how well he performed on his reading

benchmark tests. The reading benchmarks tests are regularly given on this campus to assess how effectively students are mastering the state standards in a test format. Sydney has an older sister that is in the talented and gifted program at the same school that he attends. His sister is a successful reader within the school and usually performs above average on classroom assignments and benchmark tests. At the time of the study, she was in the fourth grade, a grade above Sydney. In the language sample below, it is clear that the STAAR test is very important. It is also evident that he equated being smart with passing his STAAR benchmark test.

Question: What makes you a good reader?

Answer: *Because I try my best and sometimes I pass my test whenever I'm smart.*

Question: Do you know of anyone else who is a good reader besides you?

Answer: *Um, my teacher and my sister because she's in EXPO*

Question: What do you think makes her a good reader?

Answer: *Because she always passes her reading test.*

   Wordless picture book oral story construction. Sydney had the least amount of literate and written language of all the students in the study as shown in his oral wordless picture book story construction. Even though his oral language was not as complex compared to the other students in the story, he was able to use some mental and linguistic verbs in his story to describe what the character felt, thought, or said. In the language sample below, he also used a mental verb and a participial phrase to describe the behavior of one of the characters in the wordless picture book. His story construction relied heavily on the pictures, unlike that of Tevon (in the on-level group), who used decontextualized language, constructed

through his own his inferences of the character's feelings and thoughts. Also, Sydney's story construction did not sound like a "story." It sounded more like a list of illustrated events logically linked together. Even though the story relationships are sequential, they do not include a lot of cause and effect, outcome, time or other plot building literary tools.

Table 29

Sydney's Literate/Written Language Sample

Mental Verb and Participial Phrase Showing Description	Story Setting Logically Linked Together
And she noticed something about the chalk and then she started writing with it, drawing the sun.	*There was three people. It was a rainy day. They had an umbrella. And it looks like the dinosaur stole somebody's bag*

Leveled story reading. Sydney was able to read the leveled reading text with ease. Many of the structures and vocabulary were easy for him to control with the aid of his knowledge of visual information. Sydney made twenty miscues and self-corrected only three of the miscues. He had about the same number of syntactically and semantically acceptable and unacceptable miscues. Most of his miscues showed high graphic similarity.

Retelling and comprehension questions. Sydney's retelling had instances of story omissions and conflicting information. There were also two instances of summary at the beginning of the retelling. There are few to no literate and written language features in his retelling. Furthermore, the retelling did not capture the full meaning of the story. The retelling was logically sequenced; however, it possessed very few cause and effect relationships, or other logical relational plot events. Sydney's retelling sounded more like a list of events, and in some portions of the retelling, the events appeared to be unrelated. Sydney's ability to retell a story sounded very much like his ability to construct and tell a fiction story. However, even

though Sydney struggled to retell the events in the story, he was able to answer all of the comprehension questions correctly.

Cloze. In the Cloze task, Sydney had difficulty predicting both the academic structures and the oral language structures. His laborious word by word reading and pauses near the unknown words indicated that he had trouble supplying the deleted or unknown words in the book. He seemed to rely on the pictures to help him construct story and meaning and to anticipate words more than on the overall meaning or message of the text. Very rarely did he engage in rereading to gather meaning from the story. It may be that his limited vocabulary and limited understanding of complex text structures made it difficult for him to provide a more syntactically and semantically appropriate word in the place of the unknown word. It also may be that he was unable to gather semantic and syntactic clues from the previous portion of the text in order to supply the author's original word or to predict a semantically and syntactically correct substitution.

Text

Now my babushka, my grandmother, knew lots of_____(things) She knew just how to tell a good_____(story)
She knew how to make ordinary things magical. And she knew how to make the best chocolate_____(cake) in Michigan.
After she told my brother and me a grand_____(tale) from her homeland, we'd always ask, "Bubbie, is that true?"

Student Response Attempt

Now my babushka, my grandmother, knew lots of <u>things.</u> She knew just how to tell a good <u>story.</u>
She knew how to make ordinary things magical. And she knew how to make the best chocolate <u>food</u> in Michigan.
After she told my brother and me a grand <u>place</u> from her homeland, we'd always ask, "Bubbie, is that true?"

126

Dominique. Motivator

Burke reading interview. Dominique was very excited about participating in the study. Even though Dominique struggled as a reader, during the interview, he seemed to have a very positive attitude towards reading. His responses during the interview showed that he might need encouragement as a reader or that he received regular encouragement from others. It also seems that he might have experienced frustration as a reader and might have learned to help himself through his reading struggles. Nevertheless, as the language sample below shows, his difficulty seems to have allowed him to develop a sense of empathy toward others who might be experiencing similar reading problems. Furthermore, this language sample revealed that he also equated being a good reader with answering test questions correctly. Additionally, like many of the other children in the study, he did not mention any reading strategies that would help him take on more advanced texts.

Question: When you're reading and you come to something you don't know, what do you do?

Answer: *You take a deep breath.*

Question: Do you ever do anything else?

Answer: *Then you calm down for a little and then you answer the question.*

Question: *How would you help someone having difficulty?*

Answer: *I would help them sound it out.*

Question: Do you think you are a good reader?

Answer: *Yes, Because I never give up and I always try.*

Wordless picture book oral story construction. During the wordless picture book oral story construction, Dominique gave his story a setting: a park in Philadelphia. He also gave

127

the characters in the story names. He used a combination of third and first person to tell the story. The story is told in present tense. Sometimes his storytelling sounds like a list of events separated by the transition word, "then." He used a mental or linguistic verb one time during his oral story construction. Dominique used some simple descriptions to tell his story: "sharp teeth," "with rain falling," "really bright." These language structures/patterns were more closely related to his own oral language structure. Additionally, he incorporated some literate and written features in his story that showed cause and effect, description, and time.

Table 30

Dominique's Literate/Written Language Sample

Subordinate Clause Showing Time	Appositive Phrase Used To Describe	First Person Point Narrative and Use of Character Names
Then, <u>when I slide down the slide</u>, the dinosaur is waiting for me. And it has sharp teeth.	Then, I draw clouds, <u>with rain falling</u>, to wipe the chalk away. Rain comes.	<u>My</u> friend, <u>my</u> friend <u>Leah</u> found a yellow piece of the chalk. She drew a picture of the sun.

Retelling and comprehension questions. Dominique was able to sequence the events in the retelling of the story that he read. However, he left out important details and as a result his retelling did not fully reveal the impact of the story's message on the main character. Dominique's retelling did not seem to relay his understanding of the story. He performed better in answering comprehension questions. However, his retelling seemed to reflect his personal schema for what a good retelling should contain. Moreover, his inability to include pertinent cause and effect relationships in his retelling was also very consistent with his wordless picture book oral story construction. Nevertheless, Dominique was able to answer many of the comprehension questions correctly after reading the story.

128

Cloze. Like many of the other study participants, Dominique had an easier time predicting oral language structures than literate and written language structures in the Cloze task. He was able to supply an exact match for six out of sixteen of the unknown oral pattern words, but he did not supply any of the unknown words that were more characteristic of literate or written language. Furthermore, his stronger ability to precisely predict these oral patterned structures may have also increased his chances of predicting the exact text match in the context of those structures. Nonetheless, he often had difficulty integrating his ability to construct meaning with choosing the vocabulary word that would best fit the syntactic pattern of the sentence. Therefore, sometimes, it seemed as if he was just guessing and not using semantic and syntactic clues simultaneously in order to predict or to anticipate a word. Furthermore, there were times when his guesses were not semantically or syntactically correct, even in text that was more similar to his own register. These types of attempts could have been attributed to his inability to understand the full meaning of the story.

Text
   And I'm four＿＿＿(years) older than you…"

Student Response
   "And I'm four <u>the</u> older than you…"

Text
   He had orange hair that was like wire; he was＿＿＿＿(covered) in freckles and looked
   like a weasel with glasses.

Student Response
   He had orange hair that was like wire; he was <u>unbelievable/handsome</u> in freckles and
   looked like a weasel with glasses.

Calvin. Emerging

Burke reading interview. During the interview, it was evident that Calvin valued

knowing words. His main strategy when he or a peer had difficulty reading was to "spell it

out." In Calvin's perspective, being a good reader meant that one did not make many

mistakes. However, even though he valued reading the words correctly, he also seemed to

understand that meaning was important to reading.

Question: What makes your regular teacher and Ms. Teacher a good reader?

Answer: *They only mess up once and they...they both used to be reading teachers. So that's how they're good readers.*

Question: How would you help someone having difficulty reading?

Answer: *Uh...I'll help them spell it. If they don't know how to read that good.*

Question: Do you think you are a good reader? Why?

Answer: *Yes. Because every time I stop. I will think about the word and then I will say the word.*

Wordless picture book oral story construction. Calvin's wordless picture book oral

story construction included dialogue and descriptive language. He did not give the characters

names; however, in order to distinguish between the characters as he told the story, he

provided description. Calvin used appositive phrases, participial phrases, and relative clauses

throughout his story. Most of this written language and literate language was used to provide

description and time. In comparison to the other students within his proficiency group, Calvin

incorporated more written and literate language patterns within his oral wordless picture book

construction and used those language patterns in more complex ways more often than the

students in his group. It could be concluded that his knowledge of the complexities of written and literate language was emerging.

Table 31

Calvin's Literate/Written Language Sample

Subordinate Clause Used To Show Time	Relative Clause Used To Give Description	Appositive Phrases Used To Describe
When the sun came out, the kids they took off their hat and they took off their jackets.	*The kid, that was wearing a yellow jacket, he got green chalk and he drew the dinosaur.*	*One day, there was three people, two boys and one girl. There were walking in the rain. They had go some chalk from a fake dinosaur.*

Leveled story reading. Calvin had twenty-six miscues within his leveled text reading. Seventeen of the miscues were uncorrected. Most of Calvin's miscues were names. The miscues never changed the overall meaning of the text.

Retelling. Calvin retold the story sequentially and accurately conveyed the author's message and its impact on the main character. The majority of the retelling matched the original story, even though much of the language was in Calvin's oral vernacular. Calvin gave a very detailed retelling of the story, and the events in his retelling seemed to build upon each other. Even though Calvin did not use as many written and literate language patterns within his retelling in comparison to his wordless picture book oral story construction, he still successfully related the meaning of the story and the impact on the main character using his own personal vernacular.

Table 32

Calvin's Retelling Language Sample

Text	Calvin's Retelling	Kucer's Analysis Code
One morning, as we settled into our seats, the classroom door opened and the principal came in. She had a girl with her, and she said to us, This is Maya. Maya looked down at the floor.	*At the beginning, she... it had a new girl named Maya and she had um. The principal took her into the classroom*	Match
We all stared at her. Her coat was open and the clothes beneath it looked old and ragged. Her shoes were spring shoes, not meant for the snow.	*And the kids they had saw her clothes and they had saw her shoes They said she was wearing Spring shoes and it was Winter and it was snowing outside.*	Match

Comprehension questions. Calvin was able to answer many of the comprehension questions correctly. He gave more precise answers than the other participants in his group. Specifically, his answers more closely matched the information in the story more closely than did the others within his proficiency group. It's interesting that both his retelling and his oral story construction were the strongest in his reading proficiency group.

Cloze. Calvin's attempts demonstrated that he was stronger at creating meaning during the task than maintaining the syntactic structure of the text. Even though he engaged in re-reading to gather more information in order to predict the answer, often his attempts, while showing the story's meaning, were not syntactically correct. His attempts showed that he had a basic understanding of the story, but they also show his limited range of vocabulary. This limited vocabulary made it difficult to access words that were both syntactically and semantically correct.

Above Level Group Background Information

The students within this group were on instructional Level Q. At this level, they were ready to start reading beginning fourth-grade books with instructional support. Usually, students at this level are more fluent readers and are able to read a variety of text genres and structures (Fountas & Pinnell, 2007). They are starting to be more comfortable in reading more complex sentences, higher level vocabulary, and stories having more complicated plots and character development. Also, at this stage they are expected to be more adept at non-fiction text. Table 4.23 summarizes the above-level group findings. More detailed information about the students in this group is found in the next section of this chapter.

Table 33

Above-Level Group Significant Individual Data Findings

	Samuel	Kesha
Burke Interview Question: Do you think you are a good reader? Why?	Yes. Because I never give up and I always try.	Yes. Because every time I stop. I will think about the word and then I will say the word.
Academic Language Features (Frequency)	24	43
Comprehension Retelling (Matches)	50%	44%
Comprehension Questions (Percentage)	60%	20%

Samuel. Flexible Reader

Burke reading interview. Samuel was one of the higher readers in the three groups. However, according to his classroom teachers, at times he struggled to stay focused and motivated to learn and to engage in school activities. Frequently, his lack of motivation and disengagement led to misbehavior in the classroom. His teachers felt that he often worked below his potential.

Nevertheless, during the interview he seemed to have a positive attitude towards reading and learning. The most notable response of his interview was his response concerning reading strategies. Samuel's response showed that he recognized that there were multiple reasons to read and that he saw himself as a reader in those situations.

Question: Do you think you are good reader? Why?

Answer: *Yes. Because I read. I can use my strategies while reading, while I'm taking a test or just for fun and like... reading for fun.*

It is also evident, during the interview, that Samuel valued the knowledge of words. There are other students who also thought words were important to reading. However, Samuel's response seemed to focus not just on recognizing the word, but also on understanding the meaning of words. It can be inferred from the language samples below that he thought that understanding the words was necessary to reading.

Question: What makes Ms. Teacher 1, Ms. Teacher 2 and Ms. Teacher 3 good readers?

Answer: *It's like they can detail like everything and really like ...well they can sum out the words. Like if they haven't taught us them yet. They can tell us what they are. Like detail them...stuff.*

Question: "When they come to a word they don't know, what do you think they do?

Answer: *They use their strategies to think about the word and see what it means.*

Wordless picture book oral story construction. Samuel's oral wordless picture book story construction sounded more like a story compared to that of many of the other participants in the study. His narration sounded like a story because of his phrasing and intonation and because of the more literate and written language features that he incorporated. Furthermore, Samuel's story was very descriptive.   His narration was in the past tense, and this tense was consistent throughout the story. The characters were given names. In addition,

Samuel included some dialogue in the story. Samuel used a combination of mental and

linguistic verbs in order to describe the exchange between two characters in the story. The

conversation revealed one of the character's motives, explaining why he drew the green

dinosaur.

Table 34

Samuel's Literate/Written Language Sample

Conjunction With A Subordinate Clause, An Adverb, and Mental and Linguistic Verbs
<u>When the dinosaur came up</u>, they were <u>very</u> <u>surprised</u>. Rhonda had said Billy why would you draw that, you knew it would come out of the ground and just be real. Billy stuttered for a little while. He was like uh. I don't know. I just wanted to see if it was real.

Leveled story reading. While reading the instructional leveled text orally, Samuel

made forty-three miscues. He corrected only three of the miscues. In this story, uncorrected

miscues at the sentence level may have affected the meaning of the sentence. Also, Samuel

had trouble reading tier two words such as bustle, anxious, preparation, proclaimed, and

silhouetted. These words were most likely not a part of his oral vernacular, making the words

harder to solve even with the aid of semantic or syntactic context clues. Many of these words

were important to understanding the book at the sentence and story level, and the lack of

understanding of these words may have prevented him from being able to comprehend deeply

portions of the story.

Retelling. The most significant feature of Samuel's retelling was that parts of it

sounded more like a summary than a retelling. However, even though he left out specifics, his

retelling included the main events that happened in the story. His ability to sum up the major

events in just a few sentences using main idea statements could be evidence of his use of

higher order thinking or his inability to reconstruct and include story details. The chart below

135

shows how Samuel summarized multiple events that took place over several pages in the book into a few sentences. Also, Samuel, like only a few participants in the study, included some literate language in his retelling in the form of coordinating conjunctions, which he used to transition from one idea to another and to express cause and effect and outcome story relationships.

Table 35

Samuel's Retelling Language Sample

Text	Samuel's Retelling	Kucer's Analysis Code
	One was name Manyara and one was name Nyesha and they um had gotten invited to the king.	**Summary**
	They had gotten invited <u>because they were very beautiful</u> but one was nice <u>and one was mean.</u>	**Summary**
	So they um Manyara she had snuck out and was being mean to everybody so so then when Manyara	**Summary**
	Nyesha woke up she she had been nice to them.	**Summary**

Comprehension questions. Samuel answered only three out of five of the comprehension questions correctly. Samuel answered incorrectly both questions that required the reader to understand cause and effect relationships. Again, it is possible that a combination of a lack of understanding of specific tier two vocabulary words in the story in combination with the academic text structure will have affected his comprehension of the text. The answers to those questions were found in text that contained a relative clause, an adverb, and an appositive phrase.

136

Table 36

Samuel's Comprehension Question Language Sample 1

Text	Question	Answer
Relative Clause, Subordinate Clause and Adverb **<u>That night</u>, <u>when everyone was asleep,</u> Manyara stole <u>quietly</u> out of the village.**	Why didn't the village people realize that Manyara had left the village?	*Because they didn't really Because they didn't really know Because they thought they were both really nice but she always teased her and was being mean to her when her father and nobody else was looking.*

Table 37

Samuel's Comprehension Question Language Sample 2

Text	Question	Answer
Appositive Phrase **"There's a monster there, <u>a snake with five heads".</u>**	Why did Manyara call the snake a monster?	*Because she didn't want Myesha to go in there so that she can meet the real king.*

Cloze. In the Cloze task, most of the time, Samuel was able to predict the syntactically correct word within the written and literate text patterns. However, the chosen word was often not semantically correct. Samuel was more successful in predicting exact matches for oral vernacular language structures but less successful in predicting the exact words embedded in written and literate structures. He often engaged in confirming and disconfirming behaviors by pausing or rereading after he made his attempt. This pausing or rereading was a way for him to monitor his reading. However, several times during this task, he did not vocalize his attempts to solve the unknown word. Nevertheless, it was evident that he was going through the problem solving in his head.

Text

The boys_____(scattered) out of the way, but the tallest, a red-haired boy, spat out a very mean word.

Student Response Attempt

> *The boys <u>walked</u> out of the way, but the tallest, a red-haired boy, spat out a very mean word.*

Kesha. Persistent

Burke reading interview. Kesha was known at the school for being a very helpful student. She often volunteered to assist teachers in the lower grades with bulletin boards or organizing supplies. According to her teachers, even though Kesha was a higher reader, at times she struggled to comprehend the text as she read. Her teachers were baffled as to why her comprehension scores on benchmark test were often much lower. Kesha's consistent work ethic and learning engagement was not enough to eliminate comprehension difficulties. Her teachers attributed her comprehension discrepancies to an inability to process new information quickly and accurately, yet her persistence as a reader was demonstrated in many of her interview responses and exemplified in her main strategy that she shared during the interview, which was to "read it again" until she achieved understanding. She believed that her teacher also used this strategy when helping other students. Furthermore, she considered herself a good reader because she read books. Kesha, like many of the students, valued test taking strategies. PURSE was a test taking acronym that students referred to when reading non-fiction text passages and answering comprehension questions. The acronym's elements are P, preview the questions; U, underline the title; R, read the passage; S search for the answers; and E, every answer underline and prove.

Question: When you're reading and you come to something you don't know, what do you

Answer: *Um I usually stop and read it over again. Or I just keep on reading it until I understand it.*

Question: What would a/your teacher do to help that person [having difficulty reading]?

138

Answer: *They would ask em did you read it twice or they would tell them you got this and that you can do it. Then they would tell them that (I'm not trying to be mean) that you know how to read. And it's And you know how to read and I think you can do this and if they still don't know then she'll help them with the words that they don't know.*

Question: Do you think you are a good reader? Why?

Answer: *Uhuh...Because um sometimes I read books to myself or I act like I'm teaching to someone but that's really not there and I sort of read books I teach them something that's sort of kind of like books like you can use PURSE and stuff to answer questions.*

   Wordless picture book oral story construction. Kesha's wordless picture book oral story construction was mostly in the present tense. It sounded more like a description of a list of events than a story. Her story was longer than the other participants' stories and seemed to be comprised of her own oral structures rather than literate and written language patterns. However, Kesha had a higher number of literate and written language features compared to Samuel and many of the other participants.

   Kesha used subordinate clauses to show cause and effect relationships, to give descriptions of the context of events, and to show outcome. Even though she had thirteen occurrences of mental and linguistic verbs**,** a few of the verbs were repeated multiple times in the story. Participial phrases were used to show the character's motives or to give further description about what a character was doing. Appositive phrases were used to rename character actions or to provide descriptions that distinguished them from other characters in the story.

Table 38

Kesha's Literate/Written Language Sample

Subordinate Clauses Showing Time, Mental Verbs Showing Character Feelings, Appositive Phrase Showing Description	Subordinate Clauses Showing Cause and Cause and Effect, Mental Verbs Showing Character Feelings
And, <u>when she drew the sun</u>, it came, it came, like alive. And and there the the two kids in the back are <u>shocked</u> and they're <u>surprised</u>, both the girl, and they drew the sun she, she's like its burning my eyes and so she is closing her eyes and putting her hand in front of it.	And there is the little girl with the braids, she closing her eyes <u>because she really</u> <u>she doesn't want to look</u> and the boy is <u>surprised</u> the other girl next to her she's she <u>shocked</u> and um the T-Rex is really real <u>cuz the shadow is showing.</u>

Leveled story reading. While reading the leveled text, Kesha had a total of ninety-seven miscues. Kesha's miscues were mostly syntactically unacceptable. Many of her miscues seemed to show that she maintained the overall meaning of the story at the sentence level. However, the inordinate number of miscues may have contributed to her inability to understand the overall story. Kesha's miscues included character names, polysyllabic and tier two words, and several high *frequency words inserted into the reading which were often not syntactically correct.*

Retelling. Kesha's retelling of the story included both significant and insignificant details. It appeared that she was unable to focus her attention on what was important in the story. She even incorporated some of the story's dialogue in her retelling. There were a few conflicts in her retelling that may have been a result of her word choice or her inability to use more precise language to describe an event. Her retelling was clearly in her own oral vernacular. It included many false starts and repetitions, which at times made it difficult to reread. One of her more significant conflicts included her description of an event where one of the characters was in awe of the king's castle in the distance.

She either misinterpreted the characters' experience or could not find the right words to retell the event accurately. Her way of retelling the fiction story matched the way she constructed the wordless picture book. Both stories were long, lacked precision, and were constructed primarily using an oral register.

Table 39

Kesha's Retelling Language Sample

Text	Kesha's Retelling	Kucer's Analysis Code
Nyasha ran ahead and topped the rise before the others could catch up with her. She stood transfixed at her first sight of the city. "Oh, my father," she called. "A great spirit must stand guard here! Just look what lies before us. I never in all my life dreamed there could be anything so beautiful!"	*and she then she got that then she got that and then she found her sister at the castle no her father she looked down from the castle right there and she looked up there and she said we need a guard up here cause there is nothing more beautiful*	**Conflict**

Comprehension questions. Kesha answered the majority of the comprehension questions incorrectly. Specifically, four out of the five questions were answered incorrectly. The questions generated from the text containing a subordinate clause were answered accurately. Questions with text containing mental/linguistic verbs, participial phrases, and appositive phrases were answered incorrectly. It appears that Kesha had the same difficulty in answering the questions that she had in retelling the story. The answers to the questions were often partially correct. She seemed to struggle to narrow down the possible answer, or to answer the questions precisely. Her answer was either incomplete or filled with extraneous information that was not important to answering the question. She may also have misinterpreted some story events, contributing to the incorrectness of her responses. When rereading her answers, it was obvious that she had read the story, but it was not so obvious

that she had understood the story in the same way the author or the researcher understood the story.

Table 40

Kesha's Comprehension Question Language Sample

Text	Question	Answer
Appositive Phrase There's a monster there, <u>a snake with five heads.</u>	Why did Manyara call the snake a monster?	*Because she was being disrespectful to him and when she was disrespectful to him, she saw five heads and scared her away and she would have been eaten if she wouldn't have ran out of there.*

Cloze. Kesha was more successful in completing the Cloze task than some of the other tasks. Though she was not able to predict exact matches of the unknown words within the written and literate text structures, she was able to predict one match for the unknown word embedded in the oral language syntactic structures. Although she did not predict the exact word in the written and literate text structures, on a few occasions, she was able to predict or substitute syntactically and semantically correct words (from her own vernacular) for the deleted words in those structures.

Text
> Father Trevor bent down until he was looking⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯(directly) into Desmond's face.

Student Response Attempt
> Father Trevor bent down until he was looking <u>down</u> into Desmond's face

142

Exploratory Question Findings

Exploratory Question One

How do third-grade African American children use their knowledge of literate and written language discourse as a resource in reading as evidenced in their ability to decode, anticipate, retell, and answer comprehension questions?

Researchers who have tried to make links between students' language and reading have acknowledged the complexity of attempting to link these two areas (Snow, 1991; Roth et al., 1996). From my experience with the data, both language and reading are highly complex and individualized. There were eight participants in this study, and they all employed academic language in differing ways to help them decode and comprehend text. Although each student leveraged academic language according to his/her own individual developing reading processing system, there were some general commonalities that were apparent when children were being observed as they engaged in literate behaviors. These commonalities, which revealed how children utilized their linguistic academic resources to assist them as readers, are as follow:

1. Similar to the way students use oral-based text structures, students in this study leveraged literate and written language to aid their reading by using their knowledge of these academic structures as *clues* to inform their predictions and confirmations during their attempts to solve unknown words.

2. Also, children's knowledge of academic features and how they function within text served as linguistic *tools* that enabled students to create their own complex messages when they constructed a story from a wordless picture book as well as when they

reconstructed the author's complex messages during the retelling and comprehension tasks.

3.   Finally, literate language at the macrostructure, or whole text level, provided students with a *mental blueprint* with which to create and recreate a more storybook-like or more academically formed narrative.

Literate and written language as clues. Students engaged in the same problem solving processes in determining the unknown words in oral-based text context as they did in determining words that were embedded within more academic structures. However, all of the children in this study had an easier time predicting and anticipating oral language structures than the literate or written structures within the Cloze and leveled reading tasks. Those students who were able to engage successfully within portions of text containing more academic features were able to use their knowledge of academic language and its functions as clues to make more accurate and/or syntactically and semantically correct predictions. Participants such as Tevon, Samuel, and Sloane often anticipated exact matches for the unknown words. Their attempts that were not exact matches were often both syntactically and semantically correct. These students reread, made an attempt, and read on to confirm their attempt when they came to an unknown word. This process allowed them to check the attempted word against their own prior knowledge or schema, which served as clues to how that word should sound in the context of the sentence. In the checking process, these students read the whole sentence to make sure that the attempt was syntactically and semantically correct or paused to think about the attempt.

The more successful students, like Tevon and Linda, engaged in more than one process or repeated the process in order to supply the unknown word. For example, they

144

would reread the text multiple times before they solved the word. Nevertheless, sometimes students even with a strong presence of written and literate language still had difficulty solving and anticipating text. On occasions, they did not successfully determine a syntactically and/or semantically correct word because they may not have checked the sentence carefully, or because they may not have been able to access both a semantically and syntactically correct word to fit within the sentence. In this case, their academic language still served as clues, but they were not able to use the clues successfully to help them make sense of the text.

However, children like Sydney and Dominique did not demonstrate many attempts that showed that they were successfully predicting or engaging in confirming processes. Sydney often paused when he came to an unknown word in the Cloze text; he would supply a word but fail to reread to confirm his attempt. Both he and Dominique would not read on or reread in order to gather enough context to supply a semantically and syntactically correct word. It is possible that both Sydney and Dominique had difficulty leveraging academic language because, according to the results of the wordless picture book construction, they may not have internalized an adequate sized lexicon of literate language or written language forms to choose from in order to solve or to predict the unknown words successfully, or they may have simply neglected to use the few clues they had to solve or to anticipate unknown words. Therefore, the meager knowledge of the form and functions of academic language may have caused their use of these clues to be less effective. Dominique's attempts during the leveled reading task were mostly graphically similar to the unknown word, which meant that Dominique probably compensated for his weakness in predicting or confirming language structures by relying on his knowledge of graphophonic clues to solve unknown words.

Literate and written language as message constructing tools. The students utilized written and literate language forms in varying ways in the wordless picture book story construction task. These language structures were used as tools to construct a fiction story. These tools were used by the students to build and express ideas and to convey their own messages. Initially, I believed that the frequency of literate language occurring in their creation of the wordless picture book story was enough evidence of their control and level of internalization of literate and written language forms. However, their wordless picture book story constructions revealed that frequency was only one aspect indicating their knowledge of these academic language structures. The ways in which the students used these features were just as important. Usually, appositive phrases, relative clauses, and participial phrases were used to give further description. Subordinate clauses were used to provide information about time, place, character thoughts and feelings, and cause and effect relationships within the stories. The students in the below level group demonstrated the least amount of literate and written language overall, and it was observed that this group used the literate and written features primarily to describe. Only Calvin, a student in the below-level reading proficiency group, showed a few instances where he used the literate and written language to make more complex links. The on-level and above-level groups had greater frequencies of literate and written language and used their knowledge of these academic features not only to describe but also to show inferred character motives, feelings, and thoughts, and to show cause and effect, outcome, and time relationships.

Table 4.31 shows how one student from each of the reading proficiency groups used literate and written language to construct the same portion of the wordless picture book. Kesha's story has greater numbers of vernacular language patterns that she used to construct

146

her story. However, she also used subordinate clauses to explain a cause and effect relationship, and she inferred how a character felt in the story. However, Tevon's version sounds more like a school-based story, as he used more decontextualized language or written and literate language to show cause and effect and to reveal the characters' motives, thoughts, and feelings. Dominique's story primarily described the characters actions that were explicitly illustrated on the page. He also used a subordinate clause to show time.

Table 41

Varied Uses of Written and Literate Language to Tell a Story

Below-Level Group	On-Level Group	Above-Level Group
Dominique	Tevon	Kesha
We climb on the playground and try to hide. I go down the slide. I go down the slide. My friend goes under the bridge and Leah goes to the slide too. Then, <u>when I slide down</u> the slide, the dinosaur is waiting for me. And, it has sharp teeth.	*They tried to hide <u>but they didn't know where to hide, because they were at the park and there's not that much places to stay at the park.</u> They were all scared and frightened of the dinosaur. And there was really no places to hide so they all screamed and they <u>all screamed and panicked</u> and they didn't know what to do. Then, suddenly, the dinosaur found all the kids and the kids were so <u>freaked out they had to</u> crawl through like a tunnel to be safe.*	*and and um getting up from the chalk and its <u>growing from the chalk</u> <u>because it's coming alive</u> and their all in the park, in the playground, in the park, like in the swing, there hiding in the uh slide and under the uh bridge. And then there he look they're all looking at the T-Rex. The girl, under the bridge, she's looking like why she's shocked and and I think she's screaming and the T-Rex is just looking around trying to find them and then....*

It is possible that students' knowledge of the function of these structures assisted them in being able to understand the way the authors used these features in their stories to convey messages. It is also possible that their knowledge of these features was activated when they confronted text during the leveled reading and Cloze tasks that contained similar features, enabling them to more accurately comprehend the author's message. However, the biggest

challenge that students seem to have in leveraging these structures during the leveled text reading was in simultaneously encountering tier two vocabulary, metaphorical or symbolic events, or sensory descriptions within these structures. Thus, even if students had knowledge of the relationships that these academic structures presented in order to reconstruct the authors messages, the lack of experience or familiarity with other literary elements seemed to make comprehension difficult for them.

Literate language as story schema. In this study, children who had a schema for how stories worked, as revealed in their wordless picture book oral story constructions, were more likely to be able to construct a stronger retelling than students who were not able to construct a good oral story. In fact, the flow and organization of some students' retellings resembled their wordless picture book oral story construction. Therefore, it was evident that students activated their schema for how literate stories worked, and applied this literate knowledge to reconstructing the author's story during the retelling task. For example, Kesha's oral story construction was very long and excessively detailed. Her oral story construction included both significant and insignificant information. She struggled to narrow down the most important aspects of the story. Her retelling was organized the same way. It was filled with extraneous events that were not important in the retelling. Meanwhile, in her retelling, she failed to provide greater detail about events that were important to the story.

At the other extreme, Sydney did not have a strong literate oral story constructed from the wordless picture book. His story lacked description and did not give a deeper account of the events. Likewise, his retelling omitted important details and revealed only a surface account of what occurred in the story.

In contrast, students like Tevon, Linda, and Calvin successfully constructed a story using a wordless picture book and successfully reconstructed the authors' message during the retelling.

Exploratory Question Two

How do these students' metalinguistic knowledge (knowledge of their reading processes) and beliefs and values about reading influence their reading behaviors as evidenced by their ability to anticipate, decode, retell and answer comprehension questions?

The purpose of the second research question was to link students' metalinguistic knowledge and students' beliefs and values to their literate behaviors. Carolyn Burke developed the (BRI) in order to assist teachers and researchers in gaining insight into readers' perceptions of the reading process or their metalinguistic knowledge (Goodman et al., 2005). This tool was also designed to help them to make sense of the complex relations between how students read and what they believe about their own reading. I used both of these tacit understandings (students' metalinguistic knowledge and their beliefs and values) to determine what extent students took on the D/discourse of reading (Gee, 2012; Gee & Spack, 1998) and to ascertain their level of membership in the literacy club (Smith, 1988). Therefore, in order to answer this question, students' literate behaviors were viewed through the lens of their responses to the BRI. While Question 10 in Appendix F revealed how students positioned themselves in school literacy, Tables 4.32– 4.34 reveal students' agentive knowledge about how they would help themselves when they had reading difficulties.

The following findings were discovered concerning how students' metalinguistic knowledge as well as their beliefs and values influenced their reading behaviors:

149

1. Most of the students in the on-level and above- level groups revealed metalinguistic knowledge which valued meaning and understanding during their reading process while most of the students in the below- level group emphasized the value of recognizing or pronouncing a word.

2. Students who appeared to adopt less of the test taking culture of school had greater frequencies and more complex uses of written and literate language and also seemed to have stronger literate behaviors than students who had appeared to adopt more of the test taking literacy of school.

Metalinguistic and reading behaviors. The main finding concerning students' metalinguistic knowledge was that Tevon, Linda, Kesha, and Samuel, most of the members of the on-level and above-level groups, gave responses that positioned reading as a meaning making act. However, Samuel's answer to Question 3 and 4 reflected this meaning making position more than his answer to Question 1 did. Furthermore, these students were not merely concerned about saying, spelling, or chunking the word in order to help themselves. They emphasized meaning and not just recognizing or pronouncing a word. They seemed to understand the need to gather meaning by going to the dictionary, rereading, going to the next sentence, and thinking about the word or the tricky part of the text. Dominique and Sydney, members of the below-level group, either focused on trying to pronounce the word or break it into parts, or they didn't give a specific strategy for how they would help themselves. Even though Calvin's main strategy was to spell the word out at difficulty, in his answer to a follow up question, he revealed that it was important to think about the tricky part, which could imply that to some extent he understood that meaning was important to reading.

150

Table 42

On-Level Group Metalinguistic Knowledge

When you're reading and you come to something you don't know, what do you do? Do you ever do anything else?		
Tevon	**Linda**	**Sloane**
I stop then ask this teacher how to spell this word. And then if they tell me how to spell, I will usually go to the dictionary and find out what that word means.	*I would go back and reread it.*	*I skip it.*
I stop and I sound the word out sometimes.	*And then if I still don't get it after I go back and reread it then I skip the word and then I go to the next sentence to see what it is. What the word I don't get.*	*I go to a different question.*

Table 43

Below-Level Group Metalinguistic Knowledge

When you're reading and you come to something you don't know, what do you do? Do you ever do anything else?		
Dominique	**Sydney**	**Calvin**
Take a deep breath.	*Sometimes, I just try saying the word and then I go on.*	*Um...spell it out if it is a word.*
You take a deep breath. Then you calm down for a little and then you answer the question.	*Sometimes, I don't get it the first time, but sometimes when I split the word out, I get it and then I look at it and then I get the word.*	*Look at it and think about it.*

Table 44

Above-Level Group Metalinguistic Knowledge

When you're reading and you come to something you don't know, what do you do? Do you ever do anything else?	
Kesha	**Samuel**
Um I usually stop and read it over again. Or I just keep on reading it until I understand it.	*I usually raise my hand and then ask the teacher if she can help me with it.*
Um..I stop for a second and I try to understand it to see if I know what it is saying.	*Well...sometimes I might think about it and just sit there for a little while.*

Again, the aim of the second research question was to examine literate behaviors such as anticipating, decoding, retelling, and answering comprehension questions through the lens of students' metalinguistic perspectives. However, this question is best answered by focusing more on students' performance on the oral reading and Cloze reading tasks. Reading strategies, recorded as students orally read text during the oral leveled reading task and the Cloze task, indicated that students in the on-level and above-level groups engaged in much more pausing and rereading in order to think about the unknown word and to gather meaning when they encountered difficult parts of the text. Both Sydney and Dominique, specifically, did not reread as often. As a result, their attempts, especially during the Cloze tasks, were often not simultaneously semantically and syntactically correct. The reading behaviors that students actually engaged in during the Cloze and oral leveled reading tasks reflected their responses on the BRI. Sydney and Domonique did not engage in as many meaning-searching behaviors as the other participants, whose metalinguistic responses implied a greater understanding of the role of meaning in reading.

Adopting classroom test-centric values. Several of the students' responses centered around answering test questions correctly, scoring high on standardized testing benchmarks,

152

and using test-taking strategies. As a result, it could be concluded that these students were

consistently immersed in test-centric (Davis & Vehabovic, 2017) literacy practices. Test-

centric practices in the classroom involve students learning specific comprehension stills so

that they can successfully read passages and answer skill-based questions about those

passages. The practice questions and passages are formatted in much the same way as the

final test. According to their teachers, students were instructed predominantly using the

Comprehension Toolkit Literacy Program (Harvey & Goudvis, 2005). In addition, teachers

stated that they incorporated some readers' workshop practices, which also included guided

reading, within their literacy block. The Readers' Workshop allowed students to select and

read books independently for an extended amount of time in order to build students' fluency

and to strengthen students' reading abilities (Calkins, 2001; Fountas & Pinnell, 2009). Guided

reading allowed teachers to work with students in small groups according to their ability

levels. However, much of the instruction after January emphasized preparing students for the

STAAR test. This practice involved students reading fiction and nonfiction passages and

answering questions about those passages. During the interview, none of the students shared

how they used deeper comprehension reading strategies such as questioning, summarizing,

inferring, or making connections, strategies that their teachers indicated were taught using the

Comprehension Toolkit Literacy Program (Harvey & Goudvis, 2005). Nor did the students

mention their experiences within the readers' workshop. Rather, many of them spoke about

the test taking genre, which is also a form of school-based literacy because it involves reading

and writing (Gee, 2012). Based on their responses, it is evident that many of these students, to

some degree, internalized those beliefs and values more associated with test-taking rather than

those beliefs and values closely associated with students having consistent opportunities to read for personal information or enjoyment.

The table in Appendix F reveals students' answers to question 10 of the Burke Interview, "*Do you think you are a good reader?*" Question 10 provided a glimpse into how these students saw themselves as readers and why. All of the students who mentioned reading books for enjoyment had both higher levels of written and literate language or academic language and the ability to use this language in more complex ways when constructing an oral story. Nevertheless, the results varied when reading behaviors such as retelling and answering comprehension questions and anticipating text structures were examined. Readers like Tevon, Linda, and Calvin all gave a response to question 10 that showed the importance of thinking about difficult parts of a text and either enjoying and/or learning from books. These students performed well on the aforementioned behaviors. Whereas Kesha mentioned that she read books to herself and that she pretended that she was a teacher, most of her responses to other questions indicated a higher value for being a successful test taker. While Kesha possessed higher levels of literate and written language at the microstructure level of text, she was not as successful in reconstructing text at its macrostructure or retelling the text and in answering comprehension questions.

Participants in the below-level reading group, Dominique and Sydney, did not mention reading for pleasure or reading to learn new information in answering Question 10 or in answering any of the other interview questions. Based on their answer to Question 10 and the other questions, it seemed that they had essentially adopted the discourse of test taking. Yet, these students performed well on the level book reading task and on the comprehension question task in spite of having lower frequencies of academic language. Nevertheless, they

did not perform well on the retelling task. In this study, retelling or reconstructing text was considered a form of literate language or use of academic language. However, it is important to note that these students read text at an instructional Level N and that their level and specifically the book that they read may not have included a large number of complex written and literate structures in comparison to the text read by students in the on-level and above-level reading groups.   It is also possible that Sydney and Dominique may have stalled at this level because their level of academic language did not allow them to be successful at the higher levels. Even though these students were not able to retell the story, they were able to successfully answer questions about the story. This phenomenon reminds me of the research of Scribner and Cole (1981a, 1981b), who found that learners develop cognitive processes that match the literacy practices in which they are engaged. Therefore, it is possible that these students' stronger ability to answer test questions should be attributed to their immersion in a literacy culture that provided extensive practice in answering standardized reading questions.

Conclusion

In the field of education, there is an understanding that text is complex and that children need to understand text deeply, but there is less attention paid to why students have difficulty engaging successfully in these types of text. Based on the findings of my study, I would venture to say that text is not inherently complex, but its perceived complexity can be attributed to students' lack of schema or their lack of or limited knowledge of academic text structures at the microstructure and/or macrostructural levels. The data suggest that the more background or schema students have about how academic stories (macrostructure) work and how academic structured sentences (microstructure) work to build the author's message, the more leveraging power students

have over a text and in turn, the more successful students will be when engaging in literate behaviors such as decoding, anticipating, retelling, and answering comprehension questions.

The data also revealed that children's journey to becoming literate is complex, and highly individualized. Nevertheless, just as the knowledge of academic language discourse structures are important in the development of students' reading behaviors, how students position themselves as readers and perceive reading, and its processes may also be related to students' ability to develop strong literate behaviors. The results of this study support the idea that teachers must be mindful of students' reading identity. The data suggest that this identity may actually be linked to their ability to develop academic language, which in turn may affect their development into proficient readers.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

"Reading is not just a cognitive skill. It is an identity (the identity of being a reader and making meaning of a certain sort) formed as part of one's early socialization in life and in school"

James Gee

Changes in a person's discourse pattern occur when that person learns a new literacy and as this new literacy is learned, a new identity is constructed (Gee, 2012; Scollon & Scollon, 1989). This study examined the interaction between language, literacy, and identity. The purpose of this study was to explore select African American students' knowledge of literate and written language, also known as academic language, as well as their beliefs, values, behaviors and metalinguistic knowledge. In this exploration, I sought to gain a better understanding of these cognitive aspects and their links to students' capacity to read and to comprehend text as demonstrated in their abilities to engage in literate behaviors.

This chapter briefly reviews the study's methodology and discusses the d/discourse and D/discourse findings as well as the central ideas derived from the findings. However, a more detailed presentation of the findings is found in chapter 4. This chapter also includes the study's implications for practice, its limitations, and recommendations for future research. This dissertation reflected Gee's theoretical framework regarding discourse and literacy. Gee (2012) defined discourse as a way of "behaving, interacting, valuing, thinking, believing, speaking and even reading and writing" (p. 3). Gee believed that language and literacy should be studied through the lens of their social context and influences. Therefore, this study investigated the knowledge and use of school-based reading discourse on two levels: D/discourse, at which students' beliefs, values, and metalinguistic knowledge were examined,

157

and d/discourse, at which level the syntactical and lexical components of language-in-use were examined. The research and scholarly concepts of Kenneth and Yetta Goodman, Donald Leu, Frank Smith, James Cummins, Michael Halliday, Marie Clay, Gordon Wells, Victoria Purcell-Gates, Lisa Delpit, Jerome Harste, Catherine Compton-Lilly, and a host of other scholars who recognized the complexity of literacy, language, and identity supported this research.

<div align="center">

Research Design

</div>

Research Questions

Two questions guided this study. Both questions reflected Gee's perspective on discourse. Gee believed that literacy was a type of discourse, a secondary discourse, into which students must be socialized if they are to experience success (Gee, 2012, 2014). This discourse originated from outside of the home and often differed from students' primary discourse, which was constructed within the home.

In order to assist researchers in operationalizing this discourse perspective or theoretical framework, Gee created 28 inquiry tools, or questions intended to direct researchers' attention to significant aspects of discourse (Gee, 2014). This study's research questions made use of two of Gee's inquiry tools. The Social Languages Tool was related to the first research question of this study. This tool was used to explore select written and literate grammatical structures of academic discourse and the overall text structure of students' retellings. The Identities Building Tool was related to the second research question. It focused on how students positioned themselves and others within a particular discourse, in the case of this study, the discourse of school literacy. Each tool also functioned as a lens in which to observe students' reading behaviors. The following questions guided this study:

1.   How do third-grade African American children use their knowledge of literate and
        written language discourse as a resource in reading as evidenced by their ability to
        decode, anticipate, retell, and answer comprehension questions?

2.   How do these students' metalinguistic knowledge (knowledge of their reading
        processes) and beliefs and values about reading influence their reading behaviors as
        evidenced by their ability to anticipate, decode, retell, and answer comprehension
        questions?

Participants

Eight African American children participated in this exploratory qualitative embedded multiple case study. These students were in the third grade and represented three reading proficiency level groups. There were two students in the above-level reading group. These students were on reading Level Q, which is a beginning fourth grade reading level. There were 3 students in the on-level reading group and 3 students in the below-level reading group. The students in the on-level reading group were on Level P, an end of the year third-grade reading level, and the students within the below- level reading group were on Level O, a middle of the third-grade year reading level. All of the students in this study were in the category Le Moine and Soto (2017) identified as SELs. These learners conversed in some variation of African American English. Nevertheless, there was one student who spoke both English and the Yorouba language. This student learned to speak both English and Yorouba simultaneously because both languages were regularly spoken in his home.

Data Collection Tasks

Five research tasks were used to uncover possible links between students' levels of literate and written language (academic language), their ability to engage in reading

behaviors, and their reading identity. In the first task, the Burke Interview, students answered questions about the reading process and how they saw themselves and others as readers. This task provided evidence as to the type of literate identity or discourse that students possessed. In the second research task, students created and told a story using a wordless fiction picture book, *Chalk.* This task allowed me to not only form a sense of students' ability to tell a fiction story, it also revealed the type of literate and written language that these students could control. Their ability to control these linguistic structures indicated that they had internalized these structures. Moreover, I was curious about how students leveraged these structures to help them decode text. Thus, in the third task, students read a portion of a book which contained literate and written structures at their instructional reading level. The fourth task was made up of two different comprehension assessments. Students retold the story and answered comprehension questions about the story that they had read in task three. Students' retellings allowed me to determine how they reconstructed the authors' story. This task was meant to provide insight into how students were able to linguistically reconstruct their understanding of what they read. This task was designed to determine children's ability to use literate language at the macrostructure level. The macrostructure of a story included how the story was organized, or how story elements or story grammar such as character, problem, solution, and other important elements were incorporated within the story. The macrostructure of the story also included the way the story was sequenced or arranged.

However, even though the macrostructure of the story was of greater interest for this portion of the study, children's ability to integrate literate and written language at the microstructure level within the retelling was also notable. Students also answered questions about the story. The answers to the questions were taken from the text containing literate and

160

written text structures in order to determine if students could construct meaning even when the text contained these academic structures. The final task was a Cloze reading task. In this task, children had to supply the deleted words which were either embedded within the context of oral syntactic structures or embedded within literate and written syntactic structures. The goal of this task was to assess how well students anticipated or predicted language embedded within oral or written and literate structures.

Summary of Findings

Exploratory Question One: d/discourse

Exploratory Question One led me to uncover how these select African American children used their knowledge of literate and written language or academic language as a resource in engaging in reading behaviors such as decoding and anticipating text, retelling text, and answering comprehension questions about the text. My observations of the students revealed that they used their knowledge of academic language as clues, tools, and mental blueprints when engaging in literate behaviors. Their knowledge of academic language served as clues that signaled to the students what to expect within the text.

Additionally, this same knowledge of academic language was used as tools, allowing students to construct meanings, even complex meanings. These tools may have also assisted students as they reconstructed the author's messages and as they read the leveled and Cloze text. Finally, their knowledge of academic language at the macrostructure level revealed their understanding of school-based story content, organization, and sequence. This knowledge acted as a mental blueprint that they followed in order to create their own story or to recreate the author's story. Gaining an understanding of the way students used their knowledge of literate and written language increased my understanding of the following ideas and concepts:

161

leveraging of literate and written language through prediction, academic language complexity, and linking of academic knowledge to students' sense of story.

Exploratory Question Two: D/discourse

Exploratory Question Two inquired about how students' metalinguistic knowledge and their beliefs and values about reading influenced their reading behaviors. The findings revealed that more proficient readers who participated in this study valued word meaning and text understanding; whereas the less proficient readers valued recognizing and pronouncing words. Also, students whose responses indicated that they had adopted the test taking culture had fewer frequencies of written and literate language during the wordless picture book story construction, while students who seemed to adopt the test taking culture to a lesser extent, as evidenced by their interview responses, appeared to have greater frequencies of literate and written language and seemed to use the language in more complex ways. Both of these findings led me to consider the influence of learning context on students' adoption of school-based literacy, in particular the possible effects of literacy learning within an authentic classroom context and a test- centered classroom context.

<div align="center">

Discussion of Findings

</div>

Academic d/discourse

Constructing and reconstructing meaning using academic language. In order to answer question one, students' level of written and literate language was shown through the wordless picture book task. This task revealed students' control over academic syntactical and lexical language features at the microstructural level of text (referred to as literate and written language or academic language in this study) as well as how students organized their fiction story at the macrostructure level. Purcell-Gates (1988) incorporated a similar task in her

study, in which 20 kindergarteners and 20 second graders told a personal story and pretended to read a wordless picture book story. Purcell-Gates found that students who were read to tended to incorporated high levels of written language structures in their stories. Purcell-Gates also found that students changed registers when telling the wordless picture book story, suggesting that they understood the expectations of what a school-based story should sound like and what type of language it should contain. Purcell-Gates asserted that students had implicitly learned and internalized "book language" from their previous experiences with text. In this study, she attributed students' higher written and literate language abilities to their exposure to read alouds. Purcell-Gates indicated that students who have internalized these higher levels of "book language" have demonstrated an awareness of specific word choices and word arrangements that are more closely associated with the academic register.

Similarly, in this dissertation, I found that when students constructed their stories, the more proficient readers often had more frequent uses of written and literate language. For example, in my study, generally students in the on-level and above-level reading groups had more occurrences of literate and written language in their wordless picture book stories and in their retellings than the below-level group. In addition, Linda, a student in the on-level group, did not construct her wordless picture book story using much academic language, but she still incorporated this language when she reconstructed or retold the leveled text story. The table in Appendix F shows the frequencies of written and literate language in the stories of students from each of the three reading proficiency groups. This data also support the findings of Craig, Zhang, Hensel, and Quinn (2009), who determined that African American students who were able to dialect shift into more standard and possibly more academic English structures had stronger reading outcomes than those students who could not dialect shift. As a

result, it could be concluded that participants in my study who made this linguistic shift demonstrated their ability to be bi- dialectal.

Additionally, this study also revealed that the more proficient readers used their language in more complex ways as exemplified in Table 4.31. During the wordless picture book task students with higher levels of academic language also more often used these structures to express more abstract ideas from the pictures. The students used language to create inferences about character feelings and motives or cause and effect story relationships. The cause of students' varying academic language frequencies and functions may in some ways be attributed to their values and beliefs about reading as expressed through their responses on the BRI. Alternatively, in keeping with Clay's (2001) assertion of the power of book exposure impacting students' language development, students' varying academic language frequencies and functions may be a result of the complexity level of the text students read in class. Clay (2001) positioned children's language as a resource and a beneficiary, suggesting that students' internalized language structures aid their attempts to read text, but those same internalized structures are slowly extended as students engage in regular reading. Furthermore, Halliday proposed that children learn language as a result of engaging in meaningful situations (1975, 2004). Therefore, as children read meaningful text with more varied language structures, they learn new ways of constructing meaning, and in doing so they acquire and internalize new grammatical features with which to express those meanings. That explains why their knowledge of or lack of knowledge of these structures influences their ability to make sense of text. Halliday stated, "Grammar is as it is because of what it has to do: the kinds of meaning it has to realize, the medium it has to be realized in, and the types of systematic relationship between the two" (Halliday, 2004, p. 205).

164

Leveraging literate and written language through prediction. My study was

inspired by Donald Leu's (1982) classic study, which examined 28 second grade students'

comprehension of two stories. One story was constructed with oral discourse patterns, while

the other story was constructed with written or literate discourse patterns. He found that

written discourse stories were more problematic for these students to comprehend. However,

his study also showed that students who were more familiar with written or literate text

structures were able to comprehend these text more successfully. Leu attributed students'

success in comprehending academic text to their ability to predict or to activate syntactic and

semantic expectations of the text. Predictability is very important in understanding reading

(Goodman et al., 2016). It seems to also be important in understanding why some students

performed more proficiently than others on various literacy tasks in the current study. Smith

stated: "I believe that reading is impossible without prediction and since it is only through

reading that children learn to read, it follows that the opportunity to develop and employ skills

of prediction must be a critical part of learning to read" (1975, p. 305).

The predictions that people produce are based on their prior experience with meaning

and their prior knowledge of syntactic sentence patterns in language. However, the process of

predicting in reading does not mean the ability to predict the exact word as much as it means

the ability to narrow down the options available that would allow the reader to maintain the

syntactic and semantic structures of sentences (Goodman et al., 2016). This process is called

hypothesis testing, and it allows the reader to eliminate unlikely alternatives (Goodman et al.,

2016; Smith, 1975). Thus, in my study, students who predicted the exact words during the

Cloze task demonstrated a stronger ability to narrow down their linguistic options, and

students in my study who made predictions that were not exact, but who still maintained the

syntactic and semantic integrity of the sentence, also exhibited strong abilities in using linguistic tools to aid their reading. These students engaged in problem solving behaviors that increased their likelihood of making a syntactically and semantically correct attempt. Those behaviors included pausing and rereading to confirm, disconfirm, or to correct an attempt.

Nevertheless, as in to Leu's (1981) study, students had difficulty predicting words embedded within written or literate phrases. However, students like Tevon, having greater frequencies of academic language in addition to more problem solving strategies, predicted more of the omitted words that were embedded in the written or literate phrases than students having less knowledge of academic language.

Academic language complexity. One concern with the results of this study is that the students in the above level reading proficiency group, the same students who had higher levels of literate and written language in their story constructions, did not do well on the oral reading task that was on their instructional reading level. My assumption, based on their errors, is that students lost meaning not only because of the more complex text structures at this level, but because of the more complex vocabulary and abstract expressions found in text written at the fourth grade level. Thus, it was not just sentence structure that made this text difficult; it was the unfamiliar words and abstract expressions buried within the written or literate structures. The higher concentration of these linguistic devices, in the more advanced text, determined much of the story's meaning. The difficulty of academic language lies not only in its syntactic structures but also in other elements such as the existence of Latin and Greek vocabulary; morphologically complex words; nouns, adjectives, and prepositions; grammatical metaphors; information density, and abstractness (Nagy & Townsend, 2012).

166

These aspects of academic language often work interdependently in text, decreasing students' abilities to construct accurate meanings from text, as demonstrated in my study.

In the previous chapter, the fourth grade slump (Chall, 1983; Gee, 2012; Hernandez, 2011) was connected to students' difficulty in successfully reading and comprehending text. Oddly, the participants in my study who read at lower instructional reading levels outperformed the above-level group in decoding and comprehending text. The above-level group was not as successful in reading and comprehending beginning fourth grade leveled text. Nevertheless, this phenomenon is aligned with Chall's (1983) assertion that many times students performed as expected in second and third-grade but experienced difficulty in fourth grade, where the text contained much more academic language. It is possible that these two students who were reading fourth grade leveled text were entering into this slump, but not because their language was deficient. This slump may have been a result of the increased linguistic and content demands of the fourth grade text level. This interpretation is supported by Fisher, Frey, and Lapp (2012) who concluded that the complexity of text increases after third-grade. It seemed that the above-level group's stronger ability to predict text accelerated them beyond the reading levels of their peers, initially. Nevertheless, they still lacked the knowledge of the literary and linguistic resources needed for them to decode and comprehend successfully fourth grade level text. Additionally, according to Symusiak and Sibberson (2001), students often struggle to read higher-level books because they have not developed the literary understandings as well as the more advanced reading strategies that are vital for them to read higher-level text proficiently. The students in my study may not be prepared to take on higher-level text, but it is unclear what level of academic language students must have in order to be successful at these levels.

167

Additionally, Snow and Matthews (2016) attributed students' reading success beyond the third grade to their acquisition of unconstrained skills in comparison to constrained skills. Constrained skills are teachable skills such as letters, sight words, phonemes, phonological awareness, while unconstrained skills include: vocabulary, grammar, story structure, and other various forms of discourse. These skills are best acquired gradually through immersion in authentic literacy experiences and not through focused instruction. This conclusion is supported by the work of Gee and Spack (1998) who also asserted that secondary discourses are mastered through acquisition, not learning.

Linking academic story knowledge to students' sense of story. Many studies have proposed that phonemic awareness is the domain of oral language that contributes to literacy success in grades kindergarten through first grade (Poe, Burchinal, & Roberts, 2004; Roth et al., 1996; Storch & Whitehurst, 2002). However, another oral language domain, narrative discourse, has been linked to the comprehension success of students in the upper elementary grades, when reading becomes less about decoding (Roth et al., 1996). In my study, students' narrative knowledge or sense of story could be linked to their ability to retell a story. Students who were able to successfully construct an oral story using a wordless picture book were also able to effectively reconstruct or retell a story. However, some students who had less success constructing an oral story using a wordless picture book also had difficulty retelling a story. It is not clear if their ability to retell a story influenced their ability to construct a well-formed wordless picture book story or if students' knowledge of story influenced their ability retell a story. However, it is clear that the less proficient readers, or the below-level readers in my study, had difficulty using literate language at the macrostructural level to construct a retell. The results of my study support Feagan and Short's (1984) conclusion that struggling readers

168

usually have difficulty constructing narratives. They found that struggling readers often produced fewer complex sentences and words as well as other descriptive linguistic units.

Academic D/Discourse

Authentic vs. test-centric literacy practices. This study attempted to provide insight into the link between students' language, identity and their literacy abilities. I believe that a greater understanding of the intersection between these critical areas within students' academic development will add to the scholarly and professional conversations about educating culturally and linguistically diverse learners more effectively. Nevertheless, in order for this portion of the study to be better understood, it's important that we adopt the perspective that literacy is more than just learning how to read and write; it has both social and cultural influences that should not be ignored if we wish to improve students' reading performance (Gee, 2012; Heath, 1983; Langer, 1991; Street, 2003; Wells, 2009).

According to Langer (1991), literacy in a broader sense involves a person's capability to think and reason like a literate person within a particular society. Literacy is a social practice that is specific to various social groups or discourses (Gee, 2012; Harste, 2003; Heath, 1983; Wells, 2009). It is transmitted by language and is best understood by the members of that social group or discourse. It is important to note that there may be several literacies within one culture. For example, Scribner and Cole (1981a, 1981b) revealed that the Vai people of Liberia had three different social literacies within the country (writing Vai script, speaking Arabic, and speaking and writing English), and the people developed values, beliefs, knowledge, and skills that were directly related or unique to their membership in that particular literacy learning group. The researchers found that there were three different communities of learning that prioritized different aspects of literacy and cognition. Likewise,

169

my study also showed that there could be multiple literacies within one overall culture. For example, there are different types of school-based literacies. Even though at the onset of this study I considered school-based literacy to be one homogenous social discourse in which students would or would not construct their reading identity, I soon learned that that was not the case.

For the sake of better understanding these findings, I divide school-based literacy into two discourse learning types: the natural language learning classroom (Cambourne, 1995) and the test-centric literacy classroom (Davis & Vehabovic, 2018). In a natural learning classroom, children are immersed in a classroom that exposes them to multiple forms of literature. The classroom includes teacher demonstrations, engagement, expectations to succeed, responsibility in self-learning, employment of strategies, freedom to approximate learning, and feedback from more knowledgeable experts (Cambourne, 1995). In a test-centric literacy classroom, students are immersed in test taking strategies where there is limited choice and the main purpose for reading is to answer questions correctly. In both types of classroom discourses, students are exposed to explicit and implicit messages about the nature of reading and comprehending and about who they are as readers.

In this study, based on student' responses, their identities as readers were constructed predominantly as a result of their immersion into test-centric literacy practices. Many of the participants equated being a good reader with their performance on standardized tests or benchmarks. Most of their knowledge of their reading process or their metalinguistic processes centered on word solving, or rereading test questions or passages in order to give more accurate answers. It can be assumed that different schools, and even different classrooms, engage in distinct instructional literacy school-based practices; therefore, students

may be socialized into the secondary discourse of school differently depending on their learning environment. The importance of the learning environment or context was one of the determining factors that shaped students' literacy identities in a study done by Marten and Adamson (2001). Marten and Adamson found that students' literacy identities, how they perceived themselves as readers, were influenced by the literacy events that took place in the learning environment which dictated the culture of that environment. In their study, Marten and Adamson concluded that identities are constructed as a result of the experiences in which they engage.

Authentic reading instruction (Davis & Vehabovic, 2018), where students regularly read books instead of standardized passages and discuss the learning and reading strategies they were gradually acquiring and being apprenticed into, did not seem to make an imprint on many of these students, particularly the students in the below-level reading group. Even though their teachers indicated that these students did engage in some authentic reading opportunities during their reading block, it can be assumed, as a result of their interview responses, that these students may not have engaged in these practices regularly enough. I believe that if they had been socialized into a natural language learning classroom, their interview responses would have reflected the influence of this type of socialization.

Limitations

This qualitative study has a few limitations that may have influenced the results of this study. Data were collected at the end of the year; about three weeks after the students took the reading state standardized test for their grade level. Therefore, the close proximity of the test could have influenced students' responses on the Burke Reading Interview. Also, the wordless picture book oral story construction task was meant to determine students' level of

written and literate language. However, because the task was done with one wordless picture book, there is no way of knowing if students would have performed differently if another wordless picture book had been used or if they had still been learning how to carry out the task.

Implications for Practice

Gee proposed that discourses are not mastered by overt instruction; on the contrary, children or adults must be enculturated into social practices, and these social practices must be scaffolded by experts who have already mastered the discourse (Gee, 2012; Gee & Spack, 1998). In particular, Gee believed that literacy is mastered through acquisition and not just learning and that mastery involves exposure to the discourse in natural and meaningful ways. The findings from this research suggest that educators, administrators, and researchers must work to ensure that students are provided with environments that allow them to be immersed and apprenticed into reading and into the academic language that supports reading. Educators must set up experiences where students are able to see themselves as good readers because they successfully engage in real reading for a variety of authentic purposes. Varied experiences doing different kinds of activities with language aids students' development of academic structures (Schleppegrell, 2012). Even though this study did not fully show the influence of specific complex structures at the microstructure level on comprehension, it still offered evidence that having a stronger knowledge of those structures supports students in comprehending text.

The findings of this study promoted Goodman's assertion that reading is a language process (Goodman et al., 2005). Hence, teachers' awareness of how all students, especially SELs and ELLs, develop an academic language register should be a significant part of

understanding children's growth as readers. Additionally, my study showed the diagnostic benefit of narratives in the classroom and how the presence of academic language structures can be monitored.

Furthermore, this study also demonstrates the importance of educators' being aware of how children position themselves as readers. Teachers' knowledge of their reading identity provides insight into how well students are taking on school-based literacy discourse and how well they truly understand the reading process. Moreover, it is my hope that educators, administrators, and other stakeholders will view academic language and school-based literacy as an essential knowledge that students need to be successful in society, but this knowledge must not diminish the value of students' unique home language and literacy practices.

Recommendations for Future Research

As classrooms become more inundated with test taking practices, more research is needed to determine their effects on children's reading proficiency levels, as well as their reading identity. It would also be beneficial to investigate the academic language patterns of students who are in classrooms that employ more natural learning versus more test-centric learning experiences. Unfortunately, these test centric practices are more prevalent in schools where there is a high proportion of students who are of low socioeconomic status and are culturally and linguistically diverse (Davis & Vehabovic, 2018). Many times, because these students' home language literacy practices differ from the school's language and literacy practices, more schools have attempted to close the gap by expanding their implementation of test-centric instruction in order to increase students' testing performance. A greater amount of research in this area would further our understanding of the effects of test-centric learning

environments on students' academic language, comprehension and reading identity development.

In addition, further research is needed on ways teachers can formally assess students' academic language so that teachers can quickly gauge how well students are internalizing academic language structures that may act as resources in reading and comprehending more advanced text. Finally, more research on how teachers can increase students' awareness of their own language and reading processes would also be beneficial.

Conclusion

According to Cummins and Yee-Fun (2007), students learn best and internalize academic structures when they have the opportunity to read a variety of text intensively. This experience allows them to acquire academic vocabulary, complex syntactic structures, and abstract expressions that are more closely associated with written text than oral language. All the participants in this study leveraged academic language in different ways. Their ability to predict using what they understood about language and reading contributed to their success in all of the literacy tasks. Nevertheless, for some, their inability to predict or to activate their own schema of the complexities of syntax, story structure, and vocabulary made reading more labored, less fluent, and less meaningful.

As we gain new insights into how to instruct and how to assess children, it is my hope that we will not lose sight of the fundamentals of the ways students learn and how we should teach them, especially our SELs and ELLs. More than ever many students are entering school unprepared for the demands of academic learning and are less familiar with both the "d"/discourse and "D"/discourse of school-based discourse. Therefore, it should be our goal, as experts of this discourse, to apprentice them into an active literacy learning environment

174

that recognizes that language learning is the cornerstone of reading and reading is the cornerstone of language learning. I agree with Clay's powerful assertion that language is both a resource and a beneficiary (Clay, 2001) in the reading process. As a result, our classrooms should immerse students into language in meaningful ways so that students can learn the purposes and functions of these academic linguistic devices and begin to use them to reconstruct and construct complex ideas successfully.

REFERENCES

Akinnaso, F. N. (1982). On the differences between spoken and written language. *Language and Speech*, *25*(2), 97-125.

Abodeeb-Gentile, T., & Zawilinski, L. (2013). Reader identity and the common core: Agency and identity in leveled reading. *Language and Literacy Spectrum*, *23*, 34- 45.

African Americans Law and Legal Definition. (2016). In USLegal. Retrieved from https://definitions.uslegal.com/a/african-americans/

Allington, R.L., & Gabriel, R.E. (2012). Every child, every day. *Educational Leadership*, 69(6), 10–15.

Bang-Jensen, V. (2010). A children's choice program: Insights into book selection, social relationships, and reader identity. *Language Arts*, *87*(3), 169-176.

Barone, D., & Barone, R. (2016). Are you a reader? 5th graders respond. *Phi Delta Kappan, 98*(2), 47-51.

Bartee, R. D., & Brown, M. C. (2007). *School matters: Why African American students need multiple forms of capital.* New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing.

Baxter, P., & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative case study methodology: Study design and implementation for novice researchers. *The Qualitative Report*, *13*(4), 544–559.

Benson, S. E. (2009). Understanding literate language: Developmental and clinical issues. *Contemporary Issues in Communication Science and Disorders, 36*, 174- 178.

Bernstein, B. (1964). Elaborated and restricted codes: Their social origins and some consequences. *American Anthropologist*, *66*(6), 55-69.

Betts, E. A. (1946). *Foundations of reading instruction.* NY: American Book Company.

Bolander, B., & Watts, J. 2009. Re-reading and rehabilitating Basil Bernstein. *Multilingual - Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*, *28*, 143-173.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, 241-258. New York: Greenwood.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77-101.

Calkins, L. (2001). *The art of teaching reading*. New York, NY: Longman. Cambourne, B. (1995). Toward an educational relevant theory of literacy learning: Twenty years of inquiry. *Reading Teacher*, *49*(3), 182-90.

Chall, J. (1983) *Stages of reading development*. Ft. Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

Chan, T. C., & Jarman, D. (2004). Departmentalize elementary schools. *Principal*, *84*(1), 70-72.

Cheatham, G. A., & Jimenez-Silva, M. (2011). What makes a good story? Supporting oral narratives of young children from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. *Childhood Education*, *87*(4), 261-268.

Clay, M. (1991). *Becoming literate: The construction of inner control*. Portsmouth, N.H.: Heinemann.

Clay, M. (2001). *Change over time in children's literacy development*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Clay, M. (2016). *Literacy lessons: Designed for individuals*. Auckland, New Zealand: The Marie Clay Literacy Trust.

Compton-Lilly, C. (2005). Nuances of error: Considerations relevant to African American

    vernacular English and learning to read. *Literacy Teaching and Learning*, *10*(1), 43-

    58.

Compton-Lilly, C. (2006). Identity, childhood culture, and literacy learning: A case study.

    Journal of Early Childhood Literacy, *6*(1), 57-76.

Compton-Lilly, C. (2007). What can video games teach us about teaching reading? *Reading*

    Teacher, 60(8), 718-727.

Craig, H. K., Kolenic, G. E., & Hensel, S. L. (2014). African American English-speaking

    students: A longitudinal examination of style shifting from kindergarten through

    second grade. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research, 57*(1), 143- 157.

Craig, H. K., Washington, J. A., & Thompson-Porter, C. (1998). Performances of young

    African American children on two comprehension tasks. *Journal of Speech,*

    Language, and Hearing Research, *41*(2), 445-457.

Craig, H. K., Zhang, L, Hensel, L., & Quinn, J. (2009). African American English- speaking

    students: An examination of the relationship between dialect shifting and reading

    outcomes. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research, 52*(4), 839-855.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five*

    approaches. (3rd ed.). Washington, DC: SAGE Publications.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods*

    approaches (4th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE Publications.

Cummins, J. (1979). Linguistic interdependence and the educational development of bilingual

    children. *Review of Educational Research*, *49*(2), 222-251.

Cummins, J. (2000). Academic language learning, transformative pedagogy, and information technology: Towards a critical balance. *TESOL Quarterly*, *34*(3), 537-548.

Cummins, J., & Yee-Fun, E.M. (2007). Academic language: What is it and how do we acquire it? In J. Cummins & C. Davison (Eds.), *International handbook of English language teaching* (Vol. 2, pp. 797–810). New York: Springer.

Curenton, S. M., Craig, M. J., & Flanigan, N. (2008). Use of decontextualized talk across story contexts: How oral storytelling and emergent reading can scaffold children's development. *Early Education and Development*, *19*(1), 161-187.

Curenton, S. M., & Justice, L. M. (2004). African American and Caucasian preschoolers' use of decontextualized language: Literate language features in oral narratives.

Language, Speech, and Hearing Services, 35(3), 240-253.

Davis, D., & Vehabovic, N. (2017). The dangers of test preparation: What students learn (and don't learn) about reading comprehension from test-centric literacy instruction. *The Reading Teacher, 71*(5), 1-10.

Delpit, L., & Dowdy, J. K. (Eds.). (2008). *The skin that we speak: Thoughts on language and culture in the classroom*. New York, NY: The New Press.

Dickinson, D. K., & Porche, M. V. (2011). Relation between language experiences in preschool classrooms and children's kindergarten and fourth-grade language and reading abilities. *Child Development*, *82*(3), 870-886.

Dombey, H. (2005). Revolutionary reading. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *37*(2), 209-221.

Dymock, S. (2007). Comprehension strategy instruction: Teaching narrative text structure awareness. *The Reading Teacher*, *61*(2), 161-167.

Engel, S. (1995). *The stories children tell: Making sense of the narratives of childhood*. New York: Freeman.

Feagans, L., & Short, E. J. (1984). Developmental differences in the comprehension and production of narratives by reading-disabled and normally achieving children. *Child Development*, *55*, 1727-17.

Ferdman, B. 1990. Literacy and cultural identity. *Harvard Education Review, 60*(10), 179–204.

Fiester, L., & Smith, R. (2010). *Early warning! Why reading by the end of third-grade matters: A kids count Special Report from the Annie E. Casey Foundation.* Retrieved from Annie E. Casey Foundation website:

http://www.aecf.org/m/resourcedoc/AECFEarly_Warning_Full_Report-2010.pdf.

Fillmore, L. W., & Snow, C. (2000). What teachers need to know about language. In C.
T. Adger, C. E. Snow, & D. Christian (Eds.). *What teachers need to know about language* (pp. 7–53). McHenry, IL: Delta Systems and Center for Applied Linguistics.

Fisher, D., Frey, N., & Lapp, D. (2012). *Text complexity: Raising rigor in reading*. Newark, DE: International Reading Assoc.

Flick, U. (2008). *Designing qualitative research*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Fountas, I.C. *(2008). Fountas and Pinnell benchmark assessment system: Grades 3-8, levels L-Z.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Fountas, I. C., & Pinnell, G. S. (2006). *Leveled books (k-8): Matching texts to readers for effective teaching*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Fountas, I.C, & Pinnell, G. S. (2007). *The continuum of literacy learning, grades K-8: A guide to teaching.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Fountas I. C., & Pinnell, G. S. (2009). *When readers struggle: Teaching that works*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Fountas, I. C., & Pinnell, G. S. (2012). Guided reading: The romance and the reality. *The Reading Teacher*, *66*(4), 268-284.

Fountas, I. C., & Pinnell, G. S. (2017). *Guided reading: Responsive teaching across the grades*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Gardner-Neblett, N., & Iruka, I. U. (2015). Oral narrative skills: Explaining the language-emergent literacy link by race/ethnicity and SES. *Developmental Psychology*, *51*(7), 889.

Gardner-Neblett, N., Pungello, E. P., & Iruka, I. U. (2012). Oral narrative skills: Implications for the reading development of African American children. *Child Development Perspectives,* 6(3), 218–224.

Gladsden, V. L., & Harris, D. M. (2009). Enacting a cultural stance on the language, literacies, and schooling of African American youth. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *44*(2), 195-209.

Gee, J. P. (2001). Reading as situated language: A sociocognitive perspective. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, *44*(8), 714-725.

Gee, J. P. (2003). *What video games have to teach us about learning and literacy*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gee, J. P. (2004). *Situated language and learning: A critique of traditional schooling* (Literacies). New York, NY: Routledge.

Gee, J. P. (2005). *An introduction to critical discourse analysis. Theory and method* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Gee, J. P. (2009). "Decontextualized language" and the problem of school failure. In C.

 Compton Lilly (Ed.), *Rethinking the silence: Recognizing the social and cultural*

 resources students bring to the classroom (pp. 24-33). USA: International Reading

 Association.

Gee, J. P. (2011). *How to do discourse analysis: A toolkit*. New York, NY: Routledge. Gee, J.

 P. (2012). *Situated language and learning: A critique of traditional schooling*.

New York, NY: Routledge.

Gee, J. P. (2014). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method*. London:

 Routledge, Taylor, and Francis Group.

Gee, J. P. (2015). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses*. London:

 Routledge.

Gee, J. P., & Spack, R. (1998). What is literacy? In V. Zamel (Ed.), *Negotiating academic*

 literacies: Teaching and learning across languages and cultures (pp. 51-59).

 Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Geva, E., & Olson, D. (1983). Children's story-retelling. *First Language*, *4*(11), 85-109.

 Golden, J. M. (1984). Children's concept of story in reading and writing. *The Reading*

 Teacher, *37*(7), 578-584.

Goodman, K. S. (1976). Miscue analysis: Theory and reality in reading. In *New Directions for*

 Reading Teaching, Selected Proceedings of the 5th New Zealand Conference and 5th

 World Congress on Reading. Wellington: New Zealand Educational Institute.

Goodman, K. S. (1986). *What's whole in whole language? A parent/teacher guide to*

 children's learning. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Educational Books, Inc.

Goodman, K. S. (1996). *On reading*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Goodman, K. S. (2005). Making sense of written language: A lifelong journey. *Journal of Literacy Research*, *37*(1), 1-24.

Goodman, Y. M. (2014). Multiple roads to literacy. In Goodman, K.S. & Goodman, Y.M. (Eds.), *Making sense of learners making sense of written language* (pp. 247- 252). New York, NY: Routledge.

Goodman, K. S., Fries, P. H., & Strauss, S.L. (2016). *Reading--the grand illusion how and why people make sense of print*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Goodman, Y. M., & Goodman, K. S. (1994). To err is human: Learning about language processes by analyzing miscues. In R.B. Ruddell, M. R. Ruddell, & H. Singer (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (pp. 104-123). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Goodman, Y. M., & Goodman, K. S. (2014). Vygotsky in a whole language perspective. In Goodman, K.S. & Goodman, Y.M. (Eds.), *Making sense of learners making sense of written language* (pp. 98-114). New York, NY: Routledge.

Goodman, Y. M., Watson, D. J., & Burke, C. L. (2005). *Reading miscue inventory: From evaluation to instruction*. Katonah, KY: Richard C. Owen.

Gordon, C. J., & Braun, C. (1983). Using story schema as an aid to reading and writing. *The Reading Teacher, 37*, 116-121.

Greenhalgh, K., & Strong, C. (2001). Literate language features in spoken narratives of children with typical language and children with language impairments. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, *32*(2), 114-125.

Gustafsson, J. (2017). Single case studies vs. multiple case studies: A comparative Study. Academy of Business, Engineering and Science, Halmstad University, Halmstad,

Sweden. Retrieved from: http://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1064378/
FULLTEXT01.pdf.

Hall, L. A. (2016). The role of identity in reading comprehension development. *Reading &
Writing Quarterly*, *32*(1), 56-80.

Halliday, M. A. (1975). *Learning how to mean: Explorations in the development of language.*
New York: Elsevier North-Holland, Inc.

Halliday, M. A. (1979). Differences between spoken and written language: Some implications
for literacy teaching. In G. Page, J. Elkins & B. O'Connor (Eds), *Communication
through reading: Proceedings of the 4th Australian reading conference (*Vol. 2).
Adelaide: Australian Reading Association.

Halliday, M. A. (2004). The contribution of developmental linguistics to the interpretation of
language as a system (1980). In J. Webster (Ed.), In *The language of early childhood
(pp. 308-326). M.A.K. Halliday.* NY: Continuum.

Hamilton, K. (2005). The dialect dilemma. *Diverse Issues in Higher Education*, *22*(5), 34-36.

Hammond, Z. L. (2015*). Culturally responsive teaching and the brain: Promoting authentic
engagement and rigor among culturally and linguistically diverse students*. Thousand
Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Harste, J. C. (2003). What do we mean by literacy now? *Voices from the Middle*, *10*(3), 8-12.

Harste, J. C. (2009). Reading as identity. *Journal of Reading Education*, *34*(3), 5-7.

Harwell, M., & LeBeau, B. (2010). Student eligibility for a free lunch as an SES measure in
education research. *Educational Researcher*, *39*(2), 120-131.

Harvey, S., & Goudvis, A. (2005). *The comprehension toolkit.* Portsmouth, NH: Firsthand.

Hasan, R. (2002). Ways of meaning, ways of learning: Code as an explanatory concept.

    British Journal of Sociology of Education, *23*(4), 537-548.

Heath, S. B. (1982). What no bedtime story means: Narrative skills at home and school.

    Language in society, *11*(1), 49-76.

Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life and work in communities and*

    classrooms. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Heppt, B., Haag, N., Böhme, K., & Stanat, P. (2015). The role of academic-language features

    for reading comprehension of language-minority students and students from low-SES

    families. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *50*(1), 61-82.

Hernandez, D. J. (2011). *Double jeopardy: How third-grade reading skills and poverty*

    influence high school graduation. Baltimore, MD: Annie E. Casey Foundation.

Hester, E. J. (2010). Narrative correlates of reading comprehension in African American

    children. *Contemporary Issues in Communication Science and Disorder, 37*, 73– 85.

Hoff, E. (2013). *Language development*. Belmont, CA: Cengage Learning.

Howard, T. C. (2010). *Why race and culture matter in schools: Closing the achievement gap*

    in America's classrooms. NY: Teachers College Press.

Hughes, D. L., MCGillivray, L., & Schmidek, M. (1997). *Guide to narrative language:*

    Procedures for assessment. Eau Claire, WI: Thinking Publications.

Hughes-Hassell, S., Koehler, E., & Barkley, H. (2010). Supporting the literacy needs of

    African American transitional readers. *Teacher Librarian*, *37*(5), 18-23.

Jones, P. E. (2013). Bernstein's 'codes' and the linguistics of 'deficit'. *Language and*

    Education, *27*(2), 161-179.

Kalmbach, J. R. (1986). Evaluating informal methods for the assessment of retellings. *Journal of Reading*, *30*(2), 119-127.

Kucer, S. B. (2001). *Dimensions of literacy a conceptual base for teaching reading and writing in school settings*. Mahwah, NJ: L. Erlbaum.

Kucer, S. B. (2009). Examining the relationship between text processing and text comprehension in fourth grade readers. *Reading Psychology*, *30*(4), 340-358.

Kucer, S. B. (2010). Readers' tellings: Narrators, settings, flashbacks and comprehension. *Journal of Research in Reading*, *33*(3), 320-331.

Kucer, S. B. (2014). What retellings can tell us about the nature of reading comprehension in school children. *The Australian Journal of Language and Literacy, 37*(1), 31.

Labov, W. (1969). *A study of non-standard English*. Champaign, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Labov, W. (1972). *Language in the inner city*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Langer, J. A. (Ed.). (1987). *Language, literacy, and culture: Issues of society and schooling*. New York, NY: Ablex Pub.

Langer, J. A. (1991). Literacy and schooling: A sociocognitive perspective. In E.H. Hiebert (Ed.), *Literacy for a diverse society: Perspectives, practices and policies* (pp. 9-27). New York, NY: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Le Moine, N., & Soto, I. (2017). *Academic language mastery*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Leu, D. J. (1981). The effects of syntactic differences of oral and written discourse on the reading comprehension of 2nd and 5th grade students. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED216320).

Leu, D. J. (1982). Differences between oral and written discourse and the acquisition of reading proficiency. *Journal of reading behavior*, *14*(2), 111-125.

Levey, S. (2011). Typical and atypical language development. In S. Levey & S. Polirstok (Eds.), *Language development: Understanding language diversity in the classroom* (pp. 37–58). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Loban, W. (1963). *The language of elementary school children: A study of the use and control of language and the relations among speaking, reading, writing and listening*. Champaign, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Loban, W. (1976). *Language development: Kindergarten through grade twelve.* Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Luna, S.M. (2017). Academic language in preschool: Research and context. *The Reading Teacher, 71*(1), 89–93.

Mandler, J. M., & Johnson, N. S. (1977). Remembrance of things parsed: Story structure and recall. *Cognitive Psychology*, *9*(1), 111-151.

Mandler, J. M. (1982). Some uses and abuses of a story grammar. *Discourse Processes*, *5*(3-4), 305-318.

Manerikar, V., & Manerikar, S. (2014). A note on exploratory research. *Aweshkar Research Journal*, 17(1), 95-96. Retrieved from http://www.welingkar.org.

Martens, P., & Adamson, S. (2001). Inventing literate identities: The influence of texts and contexts. *Literacy, Teaching and Learning*, *5*(2), 27.

McCarthey, S. J., & Moje, E. B. (2002). Identity matters. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *37*(2), 228-238.

McCabe, A. & L. Bliss (2003) *Patterns of narrative discourse: A multicultural, life span approach*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Mcgee, L. M. (1981). Effects of the cloze procedure on good and poor readers' comprehension. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, *13*(2), 145-156.

McNaughton, S. (2002). *Meeting of minds*. Wellington, New Zealand: Learning Media Limited.

Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. (2016). Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation. *San Francisco*, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mesmer, H. A., & Rose-McCully, M. M. (2018). A closer look at close reading: Three under-the-radar skills needed to comprehend sentences. *The Reading Teacher*, *71*(4), 451-461.

Moje, E. B., & Luke, A. (2009). Literacy and identity: Examining the metaphors in history and contemporary research. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *44*(4), 415-437.

Morrow, L. M. (1985). Retelling stories: A strategy for improving young children's comprehension, concept of story structure, and oral language complexity. *The Elementary School Journal*, *85*(5), 647-661.

Morrow, L. M. (1986). Effects of structural guidance in story retelling on children's dictation of original stories. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, *18*(2), 135-152.

Murray, D. D. (1988). The context of oral and written language: A framework for mode and medium switching. *Language in Society, 17*(3), 351-373.

Nagy, W., & Townsend, D. (2012). Words tools: Learning academic vocabulary as language acquisition. *Reading Research Quarterly, 47*(1), 91-108.

Nippold, M. A. (1998). *Later language development: The school-age and adolescent years*. Austin, TX: Pro-Ed .

Nunnery, J. A., Ross, S. M., & McDonald, A. (2006). A randomized experimental evaluation of the impact of accelerated reader/reading renaissance implementation on reading achievement in grades 3 to 6. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, *11*(1), 1-18.

O'Neal, D., & Ringler, M. (2010). Broadening our view of linguistic diversity. *Phi Delta Kappan Magazine,91*(7), 48-52.

Pappas, C. C. (1991). Young children's strategies in learning the "book language" of information books. *Discourse Processes*, *14*(2), 203-225.

Parker, A., Rakes, L., & Arndt, K. (2017). Departmentalized, self-contained, or somewhere in between: Understanding elementary grade-level organizational decision-making. *The Educational Forum, 81*(3), 236-255. doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/00131725.2017.1314569.

Pellegrini, A. D. (1985). Relations between preschool children's symbolic play and literate behavior. In Galda, L. & Pellegrini, A. D. (Eds), *Play, language and stories: The development of children's literate behavior* (pp.79-99). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Pellegrini, A. D., DeStefano, J. S., & Thompson, D. L. (1983). Research update: Saying what you mean: Using play to teach "literate language." *Language Arts*, *60*(3), 380-384.

Pickering, M. J., & Garrod, S. (2013). An integrated theory of language production and

    comprehension. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *36*(04), 329-347.

Poe, M. D., Burchinal, M. R., & Roberts, J. E. (2004). Early language and the development of

    children's reading skills. *Journal of School Psychology*, *42*(4), 315-332.

Polacco, P. (1994). *My rotten redheaded older brother*. New York, NY: Aladdin Paperbacks.

Pontecorvo, C., & Zucchermaglio, C. (1989). From oral to written language: Preschool

    children dictating stories. *Journal of Reading Behavior, 21*(2), 109-126.

Purcell-Gates, V. (1988). Lexical and syntactic knowledge of written narrative held by well-

    read-to kindergartners and second Graders. *Research in the Teaching of English,*

    22(2), 128-160.

Purcell-Gates, V. (1995). Learning written storybook language in school: A comparison of

    low SES children in skills-based and whole language classrooms. *American*

    Educational Research Journal, 32(3), 659-685.

Purcell-Gates, V. (1996). Stories, coupons, and the TV Guide: Relationships between home

    literacy experiences and emergent literacy knowledge. *Reading Research Quarterly*,

    31(4), 406-428.

Purcell-Gates, V. (2001). Emergent literacy is emerging knowledge of written, not oral,

    language. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development, 2001*(92), 7-22.

Reece, E., Suggate, S., Long, J., & Schaughency, E. (2010). Children's oral narrative and

    reading skills in the first 3 years of reading instruction. *Reading and Writing*, *23*(6),

    627-644.

Rickford, J.R., & Rickford, R. J. (2001). The ubiquity of Ebonics. *American Language*

    Review, 5(2), 20-26.

Riessman, C. K. (1993). *Narrative analysis.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Rosenblatt, L. M. (2005). *Making meaning with texts: Selected essays*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Roth, F. P., Speece, D. L., & Cooper, D. H. (2002). A longitudinal analysis of the connection between oral language and early reading. *The Journal of Educational Research, 95*(5), 259-272.

Roth, F. P., Speece, D. L., Cooper, D. H., & Paz, S. D. L. (1996). Unresolved mysteries: How do metalinguistic and narrative skills connect with early reading? *The Journal of Special Education*, *30*(3), 257-277.

Rowe, M.L. (2013). Decontextualized language input and preschoolers' vocabulary development. *Seminars in Speech and Language, 34,* 260-266.

Rumelhart, D. E. (1975). Notes on a schema for stories. In D. G. Bobrow & A. Collins (Eds.), *Representation and understanding: Studies in cognitive science (pp. 211-236)*. New York: Academic Press.

Saldaña, J. (2009). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Schachter, R. E., & Craig, H. K. (2013). Students' production of narrative and AAE features during an emergent literacy task. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, *44*(3), 227-238.

Schleppegrell, M. J. (2012). Academic language in teaching and learning: Introduction to the special issue. *The Elementary School Journal*, *112*(3), 409-418.

Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. B. (1989). *Narrative, literacy and face in interethnic communication*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Pub.

Scribner, S., & Cole, M. (1981a). *The psychology of literacy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard

   University Press.

Scribner, S., & Cole, M. (1981b). Unpackaging literacy. In M. Whiteman (Ed.), *Writing: The*

   nature, development, and teaching of written communication (pp. 57-70). Hillsdale,

   NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Shenton, A. K. (2004). Strategies for ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research projects.

   Education for Information, *22*(2), 63-75.

Smith, F. (1975). The role of prediction in reading. *Elementary English*, *52*(3), 305-311.

   Smith, F. (1988). *Joining the literacy club: Further essays into education*. Portsmouth,

   NH: Heinemann Educational Publishers.

Snow, C. E. (1991). The theoretical basis for relationships between language and literacy in

   development. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, *6*(1), 5-10.

Snow, C. E., & Beals, D. E. (2006). Mealtime talk that supports literacy development. *New*

   Directions for Child and Adolescent Development, *2006*(111), 51-66.

Snow, C. E. & Matthews, T. J. (2016). Reading and language in the early grades. *Future of*

   Children, 26(1), 57-74.

Snow, C. E., Tabors, P. O., Nicholson, P. A., & Kurland, B. F. (1995). SHELL: Oral language

   and early literacy skills in kindergarten and first-grade children. *Journal of Research*

   in Childhood Education, *10*(1), 37-48.

Snow, C. E., & Uccelli, P. (2009). The challenge of Academic Language. In D. Olson & N.

   Torrance (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Literacy* (pp. 112-133). New York:

   Cambridge University Press.

Snyder, L. S., & Downey, D. M. (1991). The language-reading relationship in normal and reading-disabled children. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, *34*(1), 129-140.

Stein, N. L., & Glenn, C. G. (1979). An analysis of story comprehension in elementary school children. In R. O. Freedle (Ed.), *Advances in discourse processing* (pp. 53-120). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Steptoe, J. (1999). *Mufaro's beautiful daughters*. Logan, IA: Perfection Learning. Corporation.

Storch, S. A., & Whitehurst, G. J. (2002). Oral language and code-related precursors to reading: Evidence from a longitudinal structural model. *Developmental Psychology*, *38*(6), 934.

Street, B. (2003). What's "new" in New Literacy Studies? Critical approaches to literacy in theory and practice. *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, *5*(2), 77-91.

Street, J., & Street, B. (1995). The schooling of literacy. In J. Bourne, M. Briggs, & M. Selinger (Eds.), *Subject learning in the primary curriculum: Issues in English, science and math* (pp. 72-85). London: Routledge.

Sulzby, E. (1982). Oral and written language mode adaptations in stories by kindergarten children. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, *14*(1), 51-59.

Sulzby, E. (1985). Children's emergent reading of favorite storybooks: A developmental study. *Reading Research Quarterly, 20*, 458–481.

Sulzby, E. (1996). Roles of oral and written language as children approach conventional literacy. In C. Pontecorvo, M. Orsolini, B. Burge, & L. B. Resnick (Eds.), *Early text construction in children* (pp. 25–46). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Sumara, D. J. (1998). Fictionalizing acts: Reading and the making of identity. *Theory into Practice*, *37*(3), 203-210.

Szymusiak, K., & Sibberson, F. (2001). *Beyond leveled books: Supporting transitional readers in grades 2-5*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse Publishers.

Tannen, D. (1984). *Spoken and written language: Exploring orality and literacy*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.

Taylor, D. (1993). Family literacy: Resisting deficit models. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27, 550-553.

Taylor, D., & Dorsey-Gaines, C. (1988). *Growing up literate: Learning from inner-city families*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Terry, N. P., Mills, M. T., Bingham, G. E., Mansour, S., & Marencin, N. (2013). Oral narrative performance of African American pre-kindergartens who speak nonmainstream American English. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools, 44*(3), 291-305.

Thomson, B. (2014). *Chalk: A wordless children's book*. West Hartford, CT: University of Hartford.

Thorndyke, P. W. (1977). Cognitive structures in comprehension and memory of narrative discourse. *Cognitive Psychology*, *9*(1), 77-110.

Tracey, D.H., & Morrow, L.M. (2006). *Lenses on reading*. New York, NY: Guilford.

Trudgill, P. (1999). Standard English: What it isn't. In T. Bex & R. Watts (Eds.), *Standard English: The Widening Debate* (pp. 117-128). New York, NY: Routledge.

Tutu, D., & Abrams, D. C. (2013). *Desmond and the very mean word: A story of forgiveness*. Somerville, MA: Candlewick Press.

Urbach, J. (2012). Beyond story grammar: Looking at stories through cultural lenses. *Education and Urban Society*, *44*(4), 392-411.

Van Kleeck, A., Lange, A., & Schwarz, A. L. (2011). The effects of race and maternal education level on children's retells of the Renfrew Bus Story—North American Edition. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, *54*(6), 1546-1561.

Vogt, M., Hougen, M., Jago, C., Palmer, E., Templeton, S., Valencia, S., & Fountas, I. (2014). *Journeys: My Journeys literacy kit grade 3*. USA: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher mental process.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Washington, J. A. (2001). Early literacy skills in African-American children: Research considerations. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, *16*(4), 213-221.

Weaver, C. (1988). *Reading process and practice: From socio-psycholinguistics to whole language*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Educational Books, Inc.

Wells, G. (2009). *The meaning makers: Learning to talk and talking to learn*. Bristol, England: Multilingual Matters.

Westby, C. (1985). Learning to talk-talking to learn: Oral-literate language differences. In C. Simon (Ed.), *Communication skills and classroom success* (pp. 181-213). San Diego, CA: College-Hill Press.

Wilde, S. (2000). *Miscue analysis made easy: Building on student strengths*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann

Wolfram, W. (2013). Sound effects: Challenging language prejudice in the classroom. *The Education Digest*, *79*(1), 27.

Woodson, J., & Lewis, E. B. (2013). *Each kindness*. Toronto, Canada: CNIB. Wyatt, T.

(1995). Language development in African American English child speech. *Linguistics*

and Education, 7, 7–22.

Yin, R. 2003. *Case study research: Design and methods* (3rd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA:

SAGE.

APPENDIX A

Research Task Orientation Script

Research Task Orientation Script

Hello. My name is Mrs. Loewenstein and I am a Reading Specialist here at Elementary School Name. I am also a student at Texas Woman's University. As you may know, I usually work with children and teachers in grades K-2. But this month I will be working with third-graders and the third-grade teachers on a special research project that I am doing for a course at my school. This project will allow me to learn more about how children, specifically African American children, use different types of language to help them read and understand fiction or make believe stories.

Your parents have given you permission to participate in this study, so I want to speak with you about this study just to make sure that you understand what you will do. The study is divided into five tasks, but these tasks will not all be done in one sitting. I will meet with you at least to two times in order to complete the tasks. All of these tasks are activities that you have probably done in your reading classes. The first task will be an interview. It will allow me to learn what you understand and believe about what makes a good reader. In the second task you will tell a story using a wordless fiction picture book. (Show the child an example of a wordless picture book). Since there are no words in this book, you will make up a story for this book. For the third task, you will read aloud a fiction book. Once you've read the book, in the fourth task you will retell the story and answer questions about the story. In the fifth task, you will read a story where the words have been covered or omitted. (*Show the child an example of story with words omitted from a fiction st*ory). You will need to read the story and determine the unknown words as you read. I will audio record all of the tasks to help me remember your responses, but I will also be taking notes during all of the tasks. Please let me know during the sessions if you need a break or if you need time to stand and stretch. Also, please let me know if you need to stop the testing session completely. Your parents and teachers will inform me of when I can pick you up in order to administer the tasks.

None of your personal information, such as your real name will be used in the final report. Your decision to participate will not affect your grades. When you turned in your consent form, I gave you a chapter book and a bookmark. However, if you choose to participate in this study, you will also get a $10 gift card/certificate to a place of your choice: Pizza Hut, Waterworks Waterpark, or Movie Theater Tickets. Your parents have been given my email address and my phone number, should they need to contact me.

Do you have any questions for me at this time?

Here is a form *(assent form)* that I would like for you to complete. The first part of the form indicates that I have informed you about the study. In the second part of the form, you will mark "yes", if you would like to participate and "no", if you do not want to participate.

Thank you.

APPENDIX B

Research Tasks Prompts

Burke Interview Prompts and Questions TASK # 1

Researcher:
Today, I am going to ask you some questions about your beliefs about reading and about the strategies that you use as you read. Remember, there are no wrong answers. These questions will help me to learn more about you.

Burke Interview

1.   When you are reading and you come to something that gives you trouble, what do you do? Do you ever do anything else?
2.   Who is a good reader you know?
3.   What makes   a good reader?
4.   Do you think   ever comes to something that gives him/her trouble when he/she is reading?
5.   When   does come to something that gives him/her trouble, what do you think he/she does about it?
6.   How would you help someone who was having difficulty reading?
7.   What would a teacher do to help that person?
8.   How did you learn to read?
9.   Is there anything you would like to change about your reading?
10.   Describe yourself as a reader: What kind of reader are you?
11.   What do you read routinely, like every day or every week?
12.   What do you like most of all to read?
13.   Can you remember any special book or the most memorable thing that you have ever read?
14.   What is the most difficult thing you have to read?

Researcher:
Thank you for your answers.

Wordless Picture Book Story Construction Prompts Task #2

Children are asked to view the entire book before generating their story. The sequenced illustrations of the book provide a map for developing and structuring a self-generated fictional narrative. Without sequenced illustrations, preschoolers produce short and unelaborated stories (Shapiro & Hudson, 1991 we recorded in Curenton & Justice, 2004)

<u>**Researcher Introduction:**</u>

Now you are going to tell me make believe story using this book. The book is called <u>Chalk,</u> by Bill Thomson. This book has a lot of pictures, but it doesn't have words. I would like you to use the pictures to tell this story in your own words.
First you will look at the pictures and think about a story that you can tell. Then you will tell a story using each page for your story.

<u>**Preview Pictures:**</u>

Now, look at each of these pictures. I'll turn the pages so that I can see them too. Think about the story that the author might be telling using the pictures. (Preview Entire Story)

<u>**Oral Production:**</u>

Now tell me a make-believe story using the pictures in this book. You can make up a story about anything you want. Use the pictures in this book to tell me a story. You can turn the pages as you tell the story.
(at the end) *Is there anything else that you want to tell me about this story?*

<u>**What "IFs":**</u>

If the child looks away from this book at any point, the examiner says, "Look at this page" to refocus the child's attention to the book.
If the children are hesitant during the narrative production task, the researcher can provide story-eliciting prompts as needed, such as "Tell me about his page" and What about this page?"

Leveled Story Reading Prompts Task #3-#4

Note:

*If the child gets stuck for more than a minute, the researcher will prompt: 'Think about what you usually do when you get stuck. Whatever you usually do will be fine' (Wilde, 2000; p. 36).Never tell the reader the unknown word because the goal is to observe and understand how the reader solves tex*t independently.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2" align="center">Above-Level
Reading Task</td></tr>
</table>

Title:	*Mufaro's Beautiful Daughters: An African Tale*
Author:	John Steptoe
Accelerated Reader:	4.3
Fountas & Pinnell:	Q

<u>**Researcher Instruction:**</u>

You are about to read a fiction story. ' If you come to a word that you don't know, or get stuck in some other way, just do what you'd do if I were not weren't here. Today you will read a story called <u>Mufaro's Beautiful Daughters: An</u> <u>African Tale</u>. In this story, a man named Mufaro, has two beautiful daughters. Each daughter will go before the king because the king wants to choose a wife. Read to find out what happens to the two daughters. At the end of the story you will retell the story and answer questions. I will read the first portion of the story and you will read the last portion of the story.

Title: *Desmond and the Very Mean Word*
Author: Archbishop Desmond Tutu and Douglas Carlton Abrams
Accelerated Reader: 3.9
Fountas & Pinnell: P

Researcher Instruction:

You are about to read a fiction story. If you come to a word that you don't know, or get stuck in some other way, just do what you'd do if I were not weren't here. Today you will read a story called <u>Desmond and the Very Mean Word</u>. In this story Desmond is called a mean word while riding his bike. Read to find out the important lesson that Desmond learned. At the end of this story you will retell the story and answer questions. You will read the first part of the story and I will read the second part of the story.

Title: *Each Kindness*
Author: Jacqueline Woodson
Accelerated Reader: 3.4
Fountas & Pinnell: O

Researcher Instruction:

You are about to read a fiction story. If you come to a word that you don't know, or get stuck in some other way, just do what you'd do if I were not weren't here. Today you will read a story called <u>Each Kindness</u>. In this story, a girl named Maya comes to a new school. She meets another student named Chloe. Read to find out what happens to Maya and Chloe. You will read the first part of the story and I will read the second part of the story. After you read the story you will retell the story and answer questions about what you read.

Researcher Script

Some of the words in this story have been covered. You will determine the unknown words as you read. I will help you with the first blank in the story if you need assistance. You will read the remainder of the story on your own until I tell you when to stop. Think about the story as you read to help you determine the unknown words.

My Rotten Redheaded Older Brother
By Patricia Polacco
Below- Level Reading Group

Now, you will read a small portion of a story called <u>My Rotten Redheaded Older Brother</u>. In this story a little girl complains about some of the things that her older brother does.

Each Kindness
By Jacqueline Woodson
On-Level Reading Group

Now, you will read a small portion of a story called <u>Each Kindness.</u> In this story, a little girl gets an opportunity to make a new friend.

Desmond and the Very Mean Word
By Archbishop Desmond Tutu and Douglas Carlton Abrams
Above- Level Reading Group

Now you will read a small portion of a story called <u>Desmond and the Very Mean Word</u>. In this story Desmond is called a very mean word.

APPENDIX C

Literate and Written Language Explanations, Examples and Codes

Literate and Written Language Explanations and Examples

Literate Language	
Linguistic Form	*Examples*
Elaborated noun phrase-noun phrase with two or more modifiers preceding the noun, or with qualifiers such as prepositional phrases, appositives, and relative clauses following the noun	"**The big, brown dog** chased the cat." **"My friend, Mary**, lives next door." "We saw the **girls in the blue dress.**" "I don't like **people who are mean**"
Conjunction-coordinating (excluding and and then and subordinating)	Coordinating: **but, so, yet** Subordinating: **because, before, after, while, until, if, although**
Adverb-all adverbs, including those that are structurally in error	**here, now, quickly (quick), loudly (loud), soon**
Mental/Linguistic verb-verb expressing cognitive and linguistic processes of humans, animals, or fictional characters	Mental verbs: **decided, thought, knew, forgot, wished** Linguistic verbs: **said, yelled, called, asked**

Frequently identified literate language and features (Benson, 2009).

Written Language Structure		
Written Language Structure	*Description*	*Example*
Subordinate Clause	Begins with a subordinate conjunction or relative pronoun and will contain both a subject and a verb.	**When** school closed, Sally went to the lake.
Appositive Phrase Relative Clause Appositive Phrase/Relative Clause	A noun or noun phrase that renames another noun beside it. Begins with a relative pronoun (who, whom, whose, that or which) or relative adverb (when, where or why). Functions as an adjective answering What kind? How many? Or Which one?	Sally had a boat, **a small one.** Sally had a boat**, a small one, that went fast.**
Passive Verb Passive Verb/Relative Clause	When the subject of a sentence is is no longer active, but it acted upon by the verb. In contrast, to a passive verb, where the subject performs the action.	The letter was **mailed** by **Joan**. (passive) **Joan mailed** the letter (active). It was **used** by **Mary Baker**, **who was Sally's best friend.**
Participial Phrase	Begins with a present or past participle which often ends with "ing" or "ed". Sometimes begins with an irregular past participle.	Mary, **walking to her friend's cabin**, saw Sally. **Washed with soap and water**, the puppy was now clean and satisfied.

(Leu, 1982; Grammar Bytes Retrieved from http://www.chompchomp.com/menu.htm)

Literate and Written Language Color Codes

Literate Language Color Codes
elaborated noun phrase
Conjunction
Adverb
mental/linguistic verbs

Written Language Color Codes
Subordinate Clauses
Appositive Phrases
Relative Clauses
Passive Verb
Participial Phrase

APPENDIX D

Fiction Picture Books Used in the Study

	Fiction Book Used During Oral Picture Book Task (Wordless) Task#2
All Groups	Chalk By Bill Thomson

	Fiction Books Read During….	
	Leveled Reading Task #3-#4	CLOZE Reading Task Task #5
Below-Level Reading Group	Each Kindness By Jacqueline Woodson *Level O*	My Rotten Redheaded Older Brother By Patricia Polacco *Level N*
On-Level Reading Group	Desmond and the Very Mean Word By Archbishop Desmond Tutu and Douglas Carlton Abrams *Level P*	Each Kindness By Jacqueline Woodson *Level O*
Above-Level Reading Group	Mufaro's Beautiful Daughters: An African Tale By John Steptoe *Level Q*	Desmond and the Very Mean Word By Archbishop Desmond and Douglas Carlton Abrams *Level P*

APPENDIX E

Complete Set of Data for One Student

Tevon's Burke Reading Interview Task #1

1.   When you're reading and you come to something you don't know, what do you do?

(1)I stop then ask this teacher how to spell this word. And then if they tell me how to spell, I will usually go to the (2) dictionary and find out what that word means.

Do you ever do anything else?

I stop and I (5) sound the word out sometimes.

2.   Who is a good reader that you know?

A good reader that I know....well that's probably...a good reader that I know...a good reader?.....Does it have to be in my family or can it be in my school? Well a really good reader...I would say is (3) Elijah. I don't think you have Elijah though.... in this group. T-Okay…

3.   What makes Elijah a good reader?

Cause every time I need I need to (4) find a word, he comes up, he sometimes helps me (5) sound it out. He helps me with words a lot. He helps me how to spell and all that. He's a good friend of mine. He's a good friend of mine.

4.   Do you think Elijah ever comes to something he doesn't know?

Yeah! A lot of times. (6) Cause he is actually one of the smart ones in my class. But yeah...sometimes he doesn't know anything. I actually know stuff that he doesn't know. And I don't know stuff that he knows.

5.   "Yes" When Elijah does come to something he doesn't know, what do you think he does?
Actually, I really don't know that. T-Okay, that's fair.

6.   How would you help someone having difficulty reading?

How would I? I would usually go up to them and they still know the word is. I would help them. You know I would do that language. You know the language... you try to help someone but you don't really say the whole thing. Like you say the whole thing.

Yeah, I kinda do that language that helps you. So I be like , So I probably .....” It means to...” Know if that word a chance(???) *(Demonstrating what you would say to help someone having difficulty reading)* ...then I say the word a little bit

7.   What would your teacher do to help that person?

(7)She would usually… My math teacher said just sound it out. My reading teacher says look in the dictionary. My reading teacher says look in the dictionary. My math teacher says sound it out. Or ask a friend.

8.   How did you learn to read?

(11)Well it started at the beginning of kindergarten. That's where I learned how to read. I actually didn't know how to read at all when I was in pre-k.(8) I was very dumb when I was in pre-k. But when first grade and kindergarten came. I started getting a little smarter in those grades.(9) How did I start getting smart? Well...usually books that were in my class,(10) I would I would I would try to read the book, but couldn't read it. I would put it. I would put the book back and try a book that was a little easier for me.

9.   What would you like to do better as a reader?

What would I like to do better as a reader? (12)Usually what I'm bad at doing is paying attention. That's pretty much why. Well readers...you have to pay attention to know what you are doing?   And that's what I need more… paying attention.(13) Because I can pretty much write real... real good. I can pretty much write good. I'm good with words.
And I know how to....Well that's another thing. (14) I kinda don't know how to spell words either. I'm really bad at spelling. Like if I signed up for the spelling bee, I'm really going to loose.T-Think So?   Yes. I suck at spelling.

10.   Do you think you are a good reader? Why?

(15) Yes. Because usually the books that I read, I know. (16) But I like to be challenged and can read other books. And usually when I read other books, I'm surprised that I can actually read them very good.
(17)(I can't wait to read this book. I love to read. I love math and reading).

Assigning Codes and Categorizing Tevon's Responses

233

Value (V)=   Is the <u>importance</u> we attribute to oneself, another person, thing or idea

Attitude (A)= <u>(Opinion)</u> Is the way we think and feel about oneself, another person, thing or idea

Belief (B)=   Is part of a system that includes our values, attitudes, <u>knowledge,</u> <u>experiences,</u> opinions, prejudices, morals, and other interpretive perceptions of the social world

1B: STRATEGY-TEACHER ASSISTANCE TO SPELL WORD

2B: STRATEGY-USE DICTIONARY

3A: PEER AS A GOOD READER

4V: WORD KNOWLEDGE/RECOGNITION ESSENTIAL TO READING

5V: STRATEGY-SOUND IT OUT

6A: INTELLIGENCE IS IMPORTANT TO SOLVING READING PROBLEMS

7A: HELPING-DIFFERENT PEOPLE HAVE DIFFERENT READING STRATEGIES

8A: KNOWING HOW TO READ IS A SIGN OF INTELLIGENCE

9A: BOOKS MAKE YOU INTELLIGENT

10A: PICKING RIGHT BOOKS IMPORTANT TO LEARNING TO READ

11A: LEARNING TO READ HAPPENS IN KINDERGARTEN

12A: WEAKNESS-PAYING ATTENTION

13A: SELF AS A GOOD WRITER

14V: BEING A GOOD SPELLER IMPORTANT TO BEING A GOOD READER

15A: SELF AS A GOOD READER

16A: ABILITY TO READ OTHER BOOKS EQUATES TO BEING A GOOD READER

17V   LOVE TO READ BOOKS

Categorizing and Reflecting On Values Categories

Value (V)=   Is the importance we attribute to oneself, another person, thing or idea

Attitude (A)= Is the way we think and feel about oneself, another person, thing or

idea

**Belief (B)=   Is part of a system that includes our values, attitudes,
        knowledge, experiences, opinions, prejudices, morals, and
        other interpretive perceptions of the social world**

Value (V)

4V: WORD KNOWLEDGE/RECOGNITION ESSENTIAL TO READING

5V: STRATEGY-SOUND IT OUT

14V: BEING A GOOD SPELLER IMPORTANT TO BEING A GOOD READER

17V   LOVE TO READ BOOKS

Attitude (A)

3A: PEER AS A GOOD READER

6A: INTELLIGENCE IS IMPORTANT TO SOLVING READING PROBLEMS

**7A: HELPING-DIFFERENT PEOPLE HAVE DIFFERENT READING
STRATEGIES**

8A: KNOWING HOW TO READ IS A SIGN OF INTELLIGENCE

9A: BOOKS MAKE YOU INTELLIGENT

10A: PICKING RIGHT BOOKS IMPORTANT TO LEARNING TO READ

11A: LEARNING TO READ HAPPENS IN KINDERGARTEN

12A: WEAKNESS-PAYING ATTENTION

 13A: SELF AS A GOOD WRITER

15A: SELF AS A GOOD READER

**16A: ABILITY TO READ OTHER BOOKS EQUATES TO BEING A GOOD
READER**

Belief (B)

1B: STRATEGY-TEACHER ASSISTANCE TO SPELL WORD

2B: STRATEGY-USE DICTIONARY

Tevon's Wordless Picture Book Story Construction Task #2

Page 1

One day there was some some some kids.

Well...one day there was some kids, they were walking in the rain when suddenly they came to a playground.

Page 2-Page 3

In the bag, there was a lot of chalk, but they did not know there was a lot of chalk in the bag.

Page 4-Page 5

One of the kids, looked in the bag and pulled out a yellow chalk and they drew the sun to see if it actually works.

Page 6-Page 7

Then out of a sudden, the sun popped out out of the chalk and actually made it real.

Page 8-Page 9

It was really impressed about how that happened. It made the clouds go away.

Page 10-Page 11

Then the other kid grabbed the tan marker out of the bag too. He drew lots of flowers.

Page 12-Page 13

I mean drew lots of butterflies, and the surprising feeling was that the butterflies also came to life too. It was magic.

Page 14-Page 15

Then the third kid, which is the last kid, pulled out a green a green from the bag. He thought that just his friends would come to life he thought his too but it didn't make a good decision.

Page 16-Page 17

 He drew a dinosaur and guess what DOT DOT DOT Its a big shadow. Look at that big shadow leave.

Page 18-Page 19

It's a dinosaur, just like what the third kid drew. It was so scared. They freaked out.

Page 20-Page 21

They tried to hide but, but they didn't know where to hide, because they were at the park and there's not that much places to stay at the park. They were all scared and frightened of the dinosaur.

Page 22-Page 23

And there was really no places to hide so they all screamed and they all screamed and panicked and they didn't know what to do.

Page 24-25

Then suddenly, the dinosaur found all the kids and the kids were so freaked out. They had to crawl through like a tunnel to be safe.

Page 26-Page 27

Then the third boy, he had an idea. He drew the rain. Since he knew the chalk was real ,he drew the rain cloud with rain coming out of it and it started to rain.

Page 28-Page 29

Drops of water hit the ground everywhere and the dinosaur couldn't even believe it.

Page 30-Page 31

Then in a few seconds, all of him was washing off. They didn't believe what they were seeing because the dinosaur was going away, just because of the rain.

Page 32-Page 33

Then, when the dinosaur went away, there were all like, they was really confused about what just happened.

Page 34-Page 35

So they, so they, the bag that they found on the dinosaur on the play dinosaur, put the bag back, put the chalks in the bag, put the bag back and never mess with bag again. Then they walked home, trying to forget what just happened.

Literate Language	
elaborated noun phrase	0
conjunction	8
Adverb	6
mental/linguistic verbs	14
Total	28

Written Language Structures	
Subordinate Clauses	9
Appositive Phrases	4
Relative Clauses	3
Passive Verb	0
Participial Phrase	1
Total	17

Tevon's Miscue Analysis Coding Form Task #3

Title: **Desmond and the Very Mean Word**

Author: **Archbishop Desmond Tutu and Douglas Carlton Abrams**

Line #	Reader	Text	Syntactic Acceptable 1	Semantic Acceptable 2	Meaning Change 3	Graphic Similarity 4 H=High S= Some N=No	Correction 4
001/1	Tere-vor	Trevor	Y	Y	N	H	N
002/2	Treven	Trevor	Y	Y	N	H	N
002/3	_	when	N	N	_	N	N
002/4	Tevor	Trevor	Y	Y	N	H	N
003/5	ne-	didn't	N	N	_	N	Y
005/6	Come	came	Y	Y	N	H	N
006/7	Ameered	admired	N	N	_	H	N
006/8	Bicycle	bicycle's	N	N	_	H	Y
006/9	Strap	stripe	Y	N	_	H	N
006/10	For	on	Y	Y	N	N	N
006/11	Rare	rear	N	N	_	H	N
010/12	Boy	boys	Y	N	N	H	Y

Line #	Reader	Text	Syntactic Acceptable 1	Semantic Acceptable 2	Meaning Change 3	Graphic Similarity 4 H=High S= Some N=No	Correction 4
010/13	The	a	Y	Y	N	N	N
010/14	Spit	spat	Y	N	_	H	N
010/15	Boy	other	Y	Y	N	N	Y
011/16	Paddled	peddled	Y	N	_	H	N
011/17	Pound	pounded	N	Y	_	H	N
014/18	At	as	N	N	_	H	N
015/19	Til	until	Y	Y	N	H	N
017/20	Out	at	N	N	_	S	N
017/21	murdered$	muttered	N	N	_	H	N
019/22	Did	didn't	N	N	_	H	N
020/23	_	Father	N	N	_	N	N
020/24	Ask	asked	N	N	_	N	N
020/25	fi-	fist	N	N	_	N	N
020/26	Side	sides	Y	Y	N	H	N
020/27	And	I	N	N	_	N	N
021/28	_	Father	N	N	_	N	N
021/29	$$$$$	sighed	N	N	_	N	N

Line #	Reader	Text	Syntactic Acceptable 1	Semantic Acceptable 2	Meaning Change 3	Graphic Similarity 4 H=High S= Some N=No	Correction 4
021/30	$$$$$	and	N	N	_	N	N
021/31	su-	soon	N	N	_	N	N
023/32	Layed	lay	Y	Y	N	H	N
027/33	I	he	N	N	_	N	N
027/34	_	got	N	N	_	N	Y
027/35	ra-	raced	N	N	_	S	N
027/36	I	he	N	N	_	N	N
027/37	cha-	chase	N	N	_	H	N
034/38	forned$	frowned	N	N	_	H	Y
036/39	The	a	Y	Y	N	N	N
039/40	Desmond	Desmond's	N	N	_	H	N
041/41	Stairy	starry	N	N	_	H	Y

Syntactically Acceptable		Semantically Acceptable		Meaning Change			Graphic Similarity			Correct	
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	_	H	S	N	Y	N
13	16	9	20	0	10	19	17	1	11	25	4

29 miscues   25 corrections   Uncorrected Miscues: 4

Tevon's Desmond And The Very Mean Word/Comprehension Questions
By Archbishop Desmond Tutu and Douglas Carlton Abrams
Task #4

Literate/Written Language Location Questions
(Thinking Within The Text & Thinking Beyond The Text)

	Written or Literate Language Feature	Text	Within The Text And/Or Beyond The Text Questions	Correct Answer			Incorrect Answer		
				Uses Language of Text	Different From Researchers Expected Answer	Different Surface Structure/Same Deep Structure	Not Found or Supported Within Text	Answer Partially Correct/Slightly Modified	Incomplete Answer
1	Relative Clause	He especially loved the children and would even let them play marbles on the floor of his office, **where he met with the many important people who came to visit.**	What kind of person is Father Trevor? How do you know? *Father Trevor is a really nice man. If you do something he will try to talk it out with you. He won't ….He won't just say don't do that. He'll actually talk it out with you. Then Father Trevor will also figure a key to work something out. He was like a leader.*		√				

				Correct Answer			Incorrect Answer		
				Uses Language of Text	Different From Researchers Expected Answer	Different Surface/Same Deep Structure	Not Found or Supported Within Text	Answer Partially Correct/Slightly Modified	Incomplete Answer
1a	Elaborated Noun Phrases Mental Verb	As Desmond sped down the dirt road, **he admired** the bicycle's **shiny black body** and the **white stripe** on the **rear fender.**	How did Desmond feel about his bike? *Well he felt very proud because he was the only person who had em in this town??*		√				
1b	Conjunction Appositive phrase Linguistic verb	The boys scattered out of the way, **but** the tallest, **a red-haired boy**, **spat** out a very mean word.	What happened to Desmond as he was riding his new bike? *Well there was two parts of that. The first part? T-The first part. Well he was riding his bike and he turned on the block and then he saw some mean. He saw some boys. The boys tried to block his way but, but Desmond didn't let them. He speed past after then the boys, then the* **mean boys they called him a very mean name.**			√			
2	Participial Phrase	"What's wrong?" he asked, **excusing himself from a meeting.**	Why did Father Trevor leave his meeting to speak with Desmond? *Uh because Desmond. That was probably when Desmond he came with his new bike to father Trevors office so he could tell him about what the mean boys said to him.*					√	

244

			Correct Answer			Incorrect Answer		
			Uses Language of Text	Different From Researchers Expected Answer	Different Surface/Same Deep Structure	Not Found Or Supported Within Text	Answer Partially Correct/Slightly Modified	Incomplete Answer
3	Subordinate Clause Participial Phrase	**That night,** Desmond lay in bed, **trying to read his comic book by candlelight.**	Why did Desmond have trouble reading his comic book? *Because he kept thinking about the name and he thought that sense it was in his head so much he thought that it was written everywhere.*	√					
3a	Mental Verbs	At first Desmond **felt** proud, but very soon he began to feel something else.	How did Desmond feel when he first called the boys a mean word? Then how did those feelings change. *His feelings felt more down than the mean kids so he went to father Trevens office. Father Trevor was playing with marbles with some kids and Treven go with the facts??? And then Desmond, he went back on the block.*		√				
4	Participial Clause	**Lowering his face close to the floor,** Father Trevor lined up a marble in the chalk circle.	How was the game of marbles important to the story? *It doesn't matter if you when or lose. I don't get it.*				√		
5	Participial Clause Elaborate noun phrase	**Sitting on the doorstep**, Desmond looked up at the **starry sky**, an **empty ache** in his chest.	Why do you think that Desmond had an "empty ache" in his heart? *His heart was broking about what he said and the mean kids words.*			√			

Text Containing …..	Correct Answers	Incorrect Answers
Relative Clauses (1)	1	
Elaborate Noun Phrase (2)	2	
Mental Verbs (2)	2	
Conjunctions (1)		1
Appositive Phrase (1)		1
Linguistic Verbs (1)		1
Participial Phrases (4)	3	1
Subordinate Clause (1)	1	

Correct Answers	Incorrect Answers
6/8	2/8

Tevon's Retelling Guide
Goodman's Analysis
(Goodman, Watson, & Burke, 2005)

Desmond And The Very Mean Word
By Archbishop Desmond Tutu and Douglas Carlton Abrams

Story Elements (Macrostructure)
Setting & Story Beginning
Well...The story is about a boy named Desmond and one day he had a bike.
Character Analysis: Characters/Description
He was the only person in his town that have one. He was so proud of He was so proud of himself.
Events: Desmond's Encounter With The Mean Word
Then he turned on a block and found some mean kids. The kids tried to block his way, but Desmond didn't let them. And then after Desmond pass them, the boys slid out the way and called him a very mean word.

Events: Desmond's Response To The Encounter
And...then he went to Father Teren and said that the boys called him a mean word. He said the boys called him a mean word and then Father Tern told him some simple (what is the word...I 'm just going to say simple facts). Well Father Teren gave him some simple facts about that bad word so the next day he road his bike down the street and again he wanted to get revenge but he knew that Father Teren said no revenge.
Events: Desmond Retaliates
He still wanted to get even so when he passed by he said the meanest word he could every think of. So he ...So then he realized that that word that he said was even badder it was in his head. It was crazy and he went to find Teren and said that he said the meaner word to them and he and he feels really sorry but had to get them back and you want to know and then he said do you want to know how to get rid of this bad word in your head
Events: Desmond's Change of Heart
So the next day, Desmond road his bike along the same path and saw the red headed boy that called him the mean name. And two older brother and two older kids picking on him. He felt sorry. And then when some lady came out of her house he said she said uh kids stop picking on your little brother. Desmond felt sorry about what had happened.(I forgot what that word is. Can I look back in the back to find out what that word is). (Um... I talked about this page.)(Oh yeah, forgiveness thats the word). Oh yeah forgiveness that's the word. He said the cure is forgiveness. All you have to do is forgive them. But he said I can't forgive them. I have to get them back. They did something mean to me. And Father Teren said. Well you don't have to get them back. Its just it would be nice to. And they don't have to say sorry. Its just whatever you feel like it. And Desmond said he didn't feel like it. So, so Father Teren got up. He said tell me when you do feel like i

248

Conclusion:
So the next day, Desmond rode his bike along the same path and saw the red headed boy that called him the mean name. And two older brother and two older kids picking on him. He felt sorry. And then when some lady came out of her house he said she said uh kids stop picking on your little brother. Desmond felt sorry about what had happened. And then another day. He saw the red headed boy at the store. He was going Desmond was going to buy his father a newspaper but then stopped and saw the red haired boy. He was on the candy stand with suckers and delicious chocolate then Desmond said that I'm so sorry about what I said to you. Then Desmond said that I forgive you. So So the red haired boy sat at a tree and then when nobody was looking, the red headed boy gave Desmond a piece of candy. Desmond took off with the candy in his mouth then then close to when he got home he spread his arms and felt that he could control the world.
Moral/Theme
No answer given during retelling

Desmond and The Very Mean Word
By Archbishop Desmond Tutu and Douglas Carlton Abrams

Text	Retelling	Code
Desmond was very proud of his new bicycle. He was the only child in the whole township who had one, and he couldn't wait to show it Father Trevor.	Well ...The story is about a boy named Desmond and one day he had a bike. He was the only person in his town that have one. He was so proud of he was so proud of himself.	**substitution**
When he turned the corner, he saw a gang of boys-and they saw him. They stepped into the road and blocked his path. He didn't dare stop.	Then he turned on a block and found some mean kids. The kids tried to block his way, but Desmond didn't let them.	**match**
The boys scattered out of the way, but the tallest, a red-haired boy, spat out a very mean word. The other boys laughed and shouted the mean word again and again.	And then after Desmond pass, the boys slid out the way and called him a very mean word.	**match**

Desmond glanced down at his dusty feet and finally muttered," Some boys...they shouted a very mean word at me."	And...then he went to Father Teren and said that the boys called him a mean word. He said the boys called him a mean word and then Father Tern told him some simple (what is the word...I 'm just going to say simple facts).	**match**
Father Trevor sighed. "That is the problem, Desmond. You will get them back, and then they will get you back, and soon our whole world will be filled with nothing but 'getting back.'"	and then Father Tern told him some simple (what is the word...I 'm just going to say simple facts).	**substitution**
As he rode home that afternoon, he saw the boys again. His hands and face felt hot. Maybe, he thought, if he got even he would stop thinking about what they had called him. Se he raced past the boys and shouted the meanest word he could think of.	so the next day he rode his bike down the street and again he wanted to get revenge but he knew that Father Teren said no revenge. He still wanted to get even so when he passed by he said the meanest word he could every think of.	**match**
At first Desmond felt proud, but very soon he began to feel something else. It was not a good feeling. The mean word he had said left a bitter taste in his mouth.	So he ...So then he realized that that word that he said was even badder it was in his head.	**match**
Father Trevor asked as he sat on the floor shooting marbles with the	It was crazy and he went to find Teren and said that he said the meaner word to them	

children"...Desmond shook his head from side to side and frowned."	and he and he feels really sorry but had to get them back and you want to know and then he said do you want to know how to get rid of this bad word in your head (I forgot what that word is. Can I look back in the back to find out what that word is). (Um... I talked about this page.)	**addition**
"You don't need to wait until someone says they're sorry to forgive them. You have to power to forgive whenever you are ready." "I'm not ready," Desmond said.	(Oh yeah, forgiveness that's the word). Oh yeah forgiveness that's the word. He said the cure is forgiveness. All you have to do is forgive them.	**match**
A few days later, Desmond ran into the neighborhood market to buy his father a newspaper. Out of the corner of is eye, he saw a flash of red. Turning Desmond in front of the candy counter. It was filled with lollipops and delicious chocolates...Thinking of the mean word he had shouted at the boy, Desmond finally blurted out, "I'm sorry for what I said.	And then another day. He saw the red headed boy at the store. He was going Desmond was going to buy his father a newspaper but then stopped and saw the red haired boy. He was on the candy stand with suckers and delicious chocolate then Desmond said that I'm so sorry about what i said to you. Then Desmond said that I forgive you.	**match**
The boy looked around to see if anyone was watching and then handed Desmond a pieces of candy.	So So the red haired boy sat at a tree and then when nobody was looking, the red	**match**

	headed boy gave Desmond a piece of candy.	
He wanted the sweet taste of chocolate on his tongue to last forever. Slowly he spread his arms out wide as if he were flying. At last Desmond knew what it felt like to be free. It was as if he could embrace the whole world in his outstretched arms.	Desmond took off with the candy in his mouth. Then then close to when he got home, he spread his arms and felt that he could control the world.	**conflict**

Retelling Comprehension Taxonomy (Kucer)

Category	Occurrences	Percentage
Match	8	67%
Substitution	2	17%
Addition	1	8%
Summary	0	0
Conflict	1	8%
Rearrangement	0	0
Omission	0	0

Student Summary Profile Sheet

Student Name: "Tevon"
Student Group: On-Level

Task 1: **Burke Reading Interview**	Task 2: **Wordless Picture Book Oral Story Construction**	Task 3: **Oral Reading Task**	Task 4: **Comprehension**		Task 5: **CLOZE**
			Retelling	**Questions**	
Guiding Question: *What are the student's values and beliefs about reading and the reading process?*	*Guiding Question:* *What types of literate and written language does the student use when constructing the oral story? How does the student use these features to relay story their message to the audience?*	*Guiding Question:* *Describe the students' reading behaviors. What types of miscues do they make? What are the strengths and weaknesses of the student in reading the story? How does the student respond when reading more literate/written text language versus reading text structures more associated with the oral vernacu*	*Guiding Question:* *Macrostructure* *Using Kucer's analysis, how closely is the child's reconstruction of he story to the original story?* *Written analysis should include level of details, how well the student sequenced story ideas, incorporated description, cause and effect relationships, and details about the characters in the story.*	*Guiding Question:* *What type of questions did the student answer correctly and/or incorrectly? Why?*	*Guiding Question:* What structures are more or less predictable?
This student values word knowledge and word recognition. This understanding is essential to being a good reader. He believes that sounding out words and being able to spell those words are helpful when solving reading problems. He believes that knowing how to read is a sign of intelligence. Therefore not being able to read indicates that one is not as intelligent. He also believes that having the ability to read other books makes him a good reader.	Tevon was very verbal throughout the all the tasks. He seemed to be very comfortable expressing himself. Tevon used more written and literate language structures than many of the participants in this study. The stronger aspects of Tevon's story was his ability to give the characters feelings, thoughts and motives that were appropriate to the story events. Example: *Then when the dinosaur went away, they were all like, they were really <u>confused</u> about what just happened.* Pg. 32-33 *Then they walked home, trying to*	The majority of Tevon's miscues were syntactically and semantically correct. His miscues revealed a high graphic similarity, showing that at point of error he integrates cues to decode. 29 miscues 25 corrections Total Uncorrected Miscues: 4	Tevon's retelling closely matched the author's story. Tevon's retelling included the deeper message that the author was trying to portray in his story. However, he like the other children did not quite understand the figurative language that the author used at the end of the story. **Author:** *At last Desmond knew what it felt like to be. It was as if he could embrace the whole world in his outstretched hands.* **Tevon:** *"...then close to when he go home he spread his arms and felt that he could control the world."*	Six out of eight comprehension questions were answered correctly. The answers to the two questions that were asked incorrectly were found with participial phrases within the text. Like the other students in his group, he was unable to determine or articulate accurately why the game of marbles was important to the story. This part of the text was made more difficult, not solely because of the text structure (participial phrase), but because of the metaphorical symbol, the "marble game", that the author	Within the Cloze task, Tevon predicted the exact omitted word 2 out of seven times (written and literate language) and 4 out of seven times (oral language structures). He like many students within the study have an easier time predicting language structures that are more academic and less like their oral structures. The majority of this attempts were syntactically and

255

	forget what had just happened. Pg. 33- 34-page While many of the other students in the study used explicitly the scenes in the book, to tell their story, Tevon's story rendition often went beyond the illustrated pictures. This ability could be linked to his ability to think deeply about text while he is reading.		*T*evon accurately interpreted the characters feelings and motives, and incorporated motives and feelings within his retelling story did not include in their retelling of the same story. Tevon was able to completely retell the most important events of the story sequentially. Tevon also used written and literate language features within his retelling to	used to teach a moral story. In a addition, Tevon, did not fully explain why Father Trevor left the meeting. Tevon, was correct in providing information about that particular scene in the story, but the answer that he provided did not answer the question. In order to determine the answer, he would have had to infer Father Trevor's motives, and understand the meaning and function of the word "excusing" within the text.	semantically correct.

APPENDIX F

Group and Individual Data Snapshot

Group and Individual Data Snapshot

	On-Level Group			Above-Level Group		Below-Level Group		
	Tevon	Sloane	Linda	Kesha	Samuel	Dominique	Calvin	Sydney
Burke Interview Question Number 10 Do you think you are a good reader?	Yes. Because usually the books that I read, I know. But I like to be challenged and can read other books. And usually when I read other books, I'm surprised that I can actually read them very good. I can't wait to read this book. I love to read. I love math and reading.	Yes. Because when I'm stuck on a question I re-read the passage and I skip and if I still don't know I skip question then I can tell the rest that I know, answer the rest of the questions that I know. When I'm all done with that I go back to the one that I don't know and I answer it.	Yes. Because ...Because it's easy for me to know that when I read non-fiction books I know more than I used to know because it gives me more info than I know now. And fiction books are just fun for me and I like that they just give me detail and it's just fun.	Uh-huh...Because um sometimes I read books to myself or I act like I'm teaching to someone but that's really not there and I sort of read books I teach them something that's sort of kind of like books like you can use PURSE and stuff to answer questions.	Yes. Because I read...I can use my strategies while reading, while I'm taking a test or just for fun and like reading for fun.	Yes. Because I never give up and I always try.	Yes. Because every time I stop. I will think about the word and then I will say the word.	Yes. Because sometimes I pass my test and I figure out stuff and that's how it gets me the question correct and when I'm reading the question, I always have the right question , the right words boxed.
Academic Language Frequency	37	21	15	43	24	13	20	8
Comprehension Retelling "Matches"	67%	27%	75%	44%	50%	50%	73%	33%
Comprehension Questions (Percentage Correct)	75%	13%	63%	20%	60%	40%	80%	100%

APPENDIX G

Data Summary Tables

Interview: Within Group Patterns Task #1

Above-Level Readers

Big Idea: Test Taking Identity/Discourse		
Kesha	**Samuel**	
11V: TEACHING OTHERS TO USE "PURSE" TEST TAKING STRATEGY	**0A: STRATEGIES ARE IMPORTANT TO READING FOR FUN AND TAKING TESTS**	

Big Idea: Beginning Level Reading Strategy		
Kesha	**Samuel**	
B: STRATEGY-STOP AND REREAD	**1B: STRATEGY-ASK TEACHER FOR HELP**	

1B: **STRATEGY-REREAD UNTIL THERE IS UNDERSTANDING** **4B:** **HELP-HAVE THEM REREAD** **Higher Level= **3V:** **UNDERSTANDING FROM TEXT**	**Higher Level= **4V:** **DETAILS AND WORD KNOWLEDGE (MEANING)** **5V:** **STRATEGIES USED TO DETERMINE WORD MEANING**	

Big Idea: Articulating & Internalizing Their Understanding About The Discourse of Reading

This group seemed to identify with the reading discourse more than the other two groups. They mentioned less about test taking strategies. However, the influence of being in a test taking environment was reflected in their responses. Their processing strategies focused more on "meaning" and "understanding" rather than just trying to pronounce the word.

Overall Reflection:

The significant similarity between the two children in this group is their emphasis on "meaning" and "understanding". When many of the students in the other groups mentioned the strategy "reread", their goal was to reread to figure out how to decode/recode a word. It wasn't to reread to gain meaning or understanding. According to their responses, this group seems to recognize that the most important aspect of reading is to understand or gain meaning from text.

Below-Level Readers

Big Idea: Test Taking Identity/Discourse		
Sydney	**Dominique**	**Calvin**
5V: PASSING TESTS **9V: PASSING READING TESTS** **11V: STRATEGY-LOOK AT THE ANSWER** **12V: BEING A GOOD READER MEANS LOOKING CAREFULLY AT THE ANSWER** **15V: PASSING TESTS** **13A: EQUATES READING STRATEGY WITH TEST TAKING STRATEGIES**	**1B: STRATEGY-TAKE A DEEP BREATH** **2B: CALM DOWN AND ANSWER THE QUESTION**	

Big Idea: Beginning Level Reading Strategy		
Sydney	**Dominique**	**Calvin**
1B: STRATEGY-TRY SAY THE WORD AND GO ON 2B: STRATEGY-SPLIT THE WORD OUT 10B: SISTER STRATEGY-FIGURE IT OUT 10B: SISTER STRATEGY-CHOP IT OUT	6V: ADULT READER STRATEGY-SOUND IT OUT 7V: ADULT READER STRATEGY-TRY IT AGAIN 8B: HELPING OTHERS-SOUND IT OUT	4V: STRATEGY-SPELL IT OUT 2B: STRATEGY-LOOK AT & THINK ABOUT IT

Big Idea: Articulating & Internalizing Their Understanding About The Discourse of Reading

The third big idea reveals students' abilities to articulate what they have actually *internalized.* Based on the responses, these students have internalized a test taking discourse more than a readers' discourse. They're ability to articulate test taking strategies or lower or beginning level reading strategies may indicate that the majority of their classroom learning experiences in the area of reading is comprised of test taking experiences and more repetitive surface level experiences in reading text. Theoretically, a reader who has had many opportunities to read and discuss authentic and interesting text on a regular basis would have probably internalized a language that reflects that level of text understandings.

263

Overall Reflection: Students in group one seem to have a very surface level understanding of how to read books. Their strategies are mostly lower level or beginning reading strategies, not reflecting the complexity of text that they are required to read in third-grade and not reflecting their exposure to comprehension toolkit (Stephanie Harvey) learning experiences. Also, two out of the three students in this group identified more with being a reading test taker than with being a reader based their interview responses.

Interview: Within Group Patterns Task #1

On-Level Readers

Big Idea: Test Taking Identity/Discourse		
Tevon	**Linda**	**Sloane**
		12V: ANSWERING THE QUESTIONS **3A:** READING IS EQUATED WITH TEST TAKING **8A:** STRATEGY-SKIP THE QUESTION **2B:** STRATEGY-GO TO A DIFFERENT QUESTION **10B:** STRATEGY-REREAD QUESTION AND PASSAGE

Big Idea: Beginning Level Reading Strategies		
Tevon	**Linda**	**Sloane**
V: WORD KNOWLEDGE/RECOGNITION ESSENTIAL TO READING **5V: STRATEGY-SOUND IT OUT** **14V: BEING A GOOD SPELLER IMPORTANT TO BEING A GOOD READER** **1B: STRATEGY-TEACHER ASSISTANCE TO SPELL WORD** **2B: STRATEGY-USE DICTIONARY**	**1B: STRATEGY-REREADING AT POINT OF DIFFICULTY** **2B: STRATEGY-SKIP IT** **3B: STRATEGY-NEXT SENTENCE** **B: STRATEGY-SOUND IT OUT**	

Overall Reflection: Two out of three of the students in group one appeared to not have adopted the test taking genre discourse. In addition, these same two students appeared to have beginning level learning strategies, not reflective of the Comprehension Toolkit Lessons (Stephanie Harvey) that these students were reported to have been exposed to within their literacy instruction in the classroom.

Story Construction Literate Language & Written Language Analysis Task #1

Below-Level Readers

Literate Language	Calvin	Sydney	Dominique	Total
elaborated noun phrase	1	0	0	1
conjunction	5	0	3	**<u>8</u>**
adverb	1	0	1	2
mental/linguistic verbs	2	5	1	8
Total	9	5	5	19

Written Language Structures	Calvin	Sydney	Dominique	Total
Subordinate Clauses	4	0	4	<u>8</u>
Appositive Phrases	3	0	3	6
Relative Clauses	3	1	1	5
Passive Verb	0	0	0	0
Participial Phrase	1	2	0	3
Total	11	3	8	22

This group mostly has literate language/written language structures that gives description using appositive phrases, relative clauses, participial phrases, and elaborated noun phrases. Subordinate clauses are used to provide context for an event. Students mostly tell stories based on what is explicitly shown within the illustrations. Character descriptions are mostly about the characters physical descriptions. Very few inferences are made about character feelings are motivations as a result there are very few mental or linguistic verbs used within their oral story construction. Calvin has more written and literate language patterns emerging than the other two participants.

On-Level Readers

Literate Language	Linda	Sloane	Tevon	Totals
elaborated noun phrase	2	2	0	4
conjunction	4	5	7	16
Adverb	0	1	6	7
mental/linguistic verbs	4	4	13	21
Total	10	12	28	50

Written Language Structures	Linda	Sloane	Tevon	Totals
Subordinate Clauses	3	5	3	<u>11</u>
Appositive Phrases	1	0	3	4
Relative Clauses	1	3	4	8
Passive Verb	0	0	0	0
Participial Phrase	0	1	1	2
Total	5	9	11	25

This group utilizes literate and written language features such as including subordinate and relative clauses and appositive phrases to provide descriptions of a specific context of an event, as well as some physical descriptions of characters. However this group also uses these features, in particular the subordinate clauses to show contrast, cause and effect relationships, and to provide explanations of character motives, thoughts, beliefs or feelings. There are more occurrences of adverbs, and mental and linguistic verbs that show character motives, thoughts feelings or beliefs.

Literate Language	Samuel	Kesha	Total
elaborated noun phrase	1	1	2
conjunction	8	10	18
adverb	1	2	3
mental/linguistic verbs	7	13	__20__
Total	17	26	43

Written Language Structures	Samuel	Kesha	Total
Subordinate Clauses	5	10	<u>15</u>
Appositive Phrases	1	5	6
Relative Clauses	1	0	1
Passive Verb	0	0	0
Participial Phrase	0	2	2
Total	7	17	24

This group is very similar to group two however there seems to be more frequency of the uses of literate written language structures with their oral story constructions.

On-Level Readers

Title: **Desmond and the Very Mean Word**
Author: **Archbishop Desmond Tutu and Douglas Carlton Abrams Tevon**

Syntactically Acceptable		Semantically Acceptable		Meaning Change			Graphic Similarity			Correct	
Y	**N**	**Y**	**N**	**Y**	**N**	**_**	**H**	**S**	**N**	**Y**	**N**
13	16	9	20	0	10	19	17	1	11	25	4

29 miscues   25 corrections   Total Uncorrected Miscues: 4

Sloane

Syntactically Acceptable		Semantically Acceptable		Meaning Change			Graphic Similarity			Correct	
Y	**N**	**Y**	**N**	**Y**	**N**	**_**	**H**	**S**	**N**	**Y**	**N**
7	15	15	7	0	7	15	11	3	8	7	15

22 miscues   7 corrections   Total Uncorrected Miscues: 15

Linda

Syntactically Acceptable		Semantically Acceptable		Meaning Change			Graphic Similarity			Correct	
Y	**N**	**Y**	**N**	**Y**	**N**	**_**	**H**	**S**	**N**	**Y**	**N**
16	14	12	18	0	12	18	4	8	18	11	19

30 miscues   19 corrections   Total Uncorrected Miscues: 11

Above-Level Readers

Title: *Mufaro's Beautiful Daughters: An African Tale*
Author: **John Steptoe**

Kesha

Syntactically Acceptable		Semantically Acceptable		Meaning Change			Graphic Similarity			Correct	
Y	**N**	**Y**	**N**	**Y**	**N**	**_**	**H**	**S**	**N**	**Y**	**N**
40	57	33	64	0	30	67	37	8	52	19	78

97 miscues   19 corrections   Total Uncorrected Miscues: 78

Samuel

Syntactically Acceptable		Semantically Acceptable		Meaning Change			Graphic Similarity			Correct	
Y	**N**	**Y**	**N**	**Y**	**N**	**_**	**H**	**S**	**N**	**Y**	**N**
24	19	24	19	0	23	20	19	7	17	3	40

43 miscues   3 corrections   Total Uncorrected Miscues: 40

Title: *Each Kindness*
Author: **Jacqueline Woodson**

Dominique

Syntactically Acceptable		Semantically Acceptable		Meaning Change			Graphic Similarity			Correct	
Y	**N**	**Y**	**N**	**Y**	**N**	**_**	**H**	**S**	**N**	**Y**	**N**
13	14	11	16	0	12	15	22	2	3	10	17

27 miscues   10 corrections   Total Uncorrected Miscues: 17

Sydney

Syntactically Acceptable		Semantically Acceptable		Meaning Change			Graphic Similarity			Correct	
Y	**N**	**Y**	**N**	**Y**	**N**	**_**	**H**	**S**	**N**	**Y**	**N**
9	11	9	11	0	9	11	16	2	2	3	17

20 miscues   3 corrections   Total Uncorrected Miscues: 17

Calvin

Syntactically Acceptable		Semantically Acceptable		Meaning Change			Graphic Similarity			Correct	
Y	**N**	**Y**	**N**	**Y**	**N**	**_**	**H**	**S**	**N**	**Y**	**N**
13	13	12	14	0	13	13	21	5	0	9	17

26 miscues   9 corrections   Total Uncorrected Miscues: 17

Retelling Comprehension Taxonomy (Kucer)
Group Retelling Analysis Task #4

Below-Level Readers

Dominique

Category	Occurrences	Percentage
Match	6	50%
Substitution	3	25%
Addition	0	0
Summary	0	0
Conflict	1	8%
Rearrangement	0	0
Omission	2	17%

Calvin

Category	Occurrences	Percentage
Match	8	73%
Substitution	2	18%
Addition	0	0
Summary	0	0
Conflict	1	9%
Rearrangement	0	0
Omission	0	0

Sydney

Category	Occurrences	Percentage
Match	3	33%
Substitution	0	0
Addition	1	11%
Summary	2	22%
Conflict	1	11%
Rearrangement	0	0
Omission	2	22%

On-Level Readers Tevon

Category	Occurrences	Percentage
Match	8	67%
Substitution	2	17%
Addition	1	8%
Summary	0	0
Conflict	1	8%
Rearrangement	0	0
Omission	0	0

Sloane

Category	Occurrences	Percentage
Match	3	27%
Substitution	1	9%
Addition	0	0
Summary	0	0
Conflict	3	27%
Rearrangement	3	27%
Omission	1	9%

Linda

Category	Occurrences	Percentage
Match	9	75%
Substitution	1	8%
Addition	0	0
Summary	0	0
Conflict	1	8%
Rearrangement	1	8%
Omission	0	0

Above-Level Readers

Samuel

Category	Occurrences	Percentage
Match	4	50%
Substitution	0	0
Addition	0	0
Summary	4	50%
Conflict	0	0
Rearrangement	0	0
Omission	0	0

Kesha

Category	Occurrences	Percentage
Match	11	44%
Substitution	0	0
Addition	1	4%
Summary	0	0
Conflict	10	40%
Rearrangement	2	8%
Omission	1	4%

Comprehension Questions
Task #4

Below-Level Readers

Dominique

Correct Answer			Incorrect Answer		
Uses Language of Text	Different From Researchers Expected Answer	Different Surface Structure/Same Deep Structure	Not Found or Supported Within Text	Answer Partially Correct/Slightly Modified	Incomplete Answer
0	0	2	1	2	0

⅖=40%

Calvin

Correct Answer			Incorrect Answer		
Uses Language of Text	Different From Researchers Expected Answer	Different Surface Structure/Same Deep Structure	Not Found or Supported Within Text	Answer Partially Correct/Slightly Modified	Incomplete Answer
0	2	2	1	0	0

⅘ =80%

Sydney

Correct Answer			Incorrect Answer		
Uses Language of Text	Different From Researchers Expected Answer	Different Surface Structure/Same Deep Structure	Not Found or Supported Within Text	Answer Partially Correct/Slightly Modified	Incomplete Answer
2	0	3	0	0	0

5/5 =100%

On-Level Readers

Sloane

Correct Answer			Incorrect Answer		
Uses Language of Text	Different From Researchers Expected Answer	Different Surface Structure/Same Deep Structure	Not Found or Supported Within Text	Answer Partially Correct/Slightly Modified	Incomplete Answer
0	1	0	2	5	0

⅛=13%

Linda

Correct Answer			Incorrect Answer		
Uses Language of Text	Different From Researchers Expected Answer	Different Surface Structure/Same Deep Structure	Not Found or Supported Within Text	Answer Partially Correct/Slightly Modified	Incomplete Answer
0	1	4	1	1	1

⅝=63%

Tevon

Correct Answer			Incorrect Answer		
Uses Language of Text	Different From Researchers Expected Answer	Different Surface Structure/Same Deep Structure	Not Found or Supported Within Text	Answer Partially Correct/Slightly Modified	Incomplete Answer
1	3	2	1	1	0

6/8=75%

Above-Level Readers

Samuel

Correct Answer			Incorrect Answer		
Uses Language of Text	**Different From Researchers Expected Answer**	**Different Surface Structure/Same Deep Structure**	**Not Found or Supported Within Text**	**Answer Partially Correct/Slightly Modified**	**Incomplete Answer**
0	2	1	1	1	0

⅗=60%

Kesha

Correct Answer			Incorrect Answer		
Uses Language of Text	**Different From Researchers Expected Answer**	**Different Surface Structure/Same Deep Structure**	**Not Found or Supported Within Text**	**Answer Partially Correct/Slightly Modified**	**Incomplete Answer**
0	1	0	0	4	0

⅕=20%

Cloze Analysis Task #5

Above -Level Readers

Desmond and the Very Mean Word
By Archbishop Desmond Tutu and Douglas Carlton Abrams

Kesha

Written/Literate Language Structures								Oral Language Structures							
Exact	Omitted	Mismatch	Syntactically Correct		Semantically Correct			Exact	Omitted	Mismatch	Syntactically Correct		Semantically Correct		
0/7	0/7	7/7	**Y**	**N**	**Y**	**N**		1/3	0/3	2/3	**Y**	**N**	**Y**	**N**	
			4	3	4	3					0	2	0	2	

Samuel

Written/Literate Language Structures								Oral Language Structures							
Exact	Omitted	Mismatch	Syntactically Correct		Semantically Correct			Exact	Omitted	Mismatch	Syntactically Correct		Semantically Correct		
0/7	1/7	6/7	**Y**	**N**	**Y**	**N**		3/3	0/3	0/3	**Y**	**N**	**Y**	**N**	
			5	1	4	2					-	-	-	-	

291

On-Level Readers

Each Kindness
By Jacqueline Woodson

Linda

Written/Literate Language Structures								Oral Language Structures							
Exact	Omitted	Mismatch	Syntactical ly Correct		Semantical ly Correct		Exact	Omitted	Mismatch	Syntactical ly Correct		Semantical ly Correct	
0/7	0/7	7/7	**Y**	**N**	**Y**	**N**	4/7	0/7	3/7	**Y**	**N**	**Y**	**N**
			4	3	3	4				2	1	1	2

Tevon

Written/Literate Language Structures								Oral Language Structures							
Exact	Omitted	Mismatch	Syntactical ly Correct		Semantical ly Correct		Exact	Omitted	Mismatch	Syntactical ly Correct		Semantical ly Correct	
2/7	0/7	5/7	**Y**	**N**	**Y**	**N**	4/7	0/7	3/7	**Y**	**N**	**Y**	**N**
			4	1	4	1				3	0	2	1

Sloane

Written/Literate Language Structures								Oral Language Structures							
Exact	Omitted	Mismatch	Syntactical ly Correct		Semantical ly Correct		Exact	Omitted	Mismatch	Syntactically Correct		Semanticall y Correct	
1/7	0/7	6/7	**Y**	**N**	**Y**	**N**	5/7	0/7	2/7	**Y**	**N**	**Y**	**N**
			5	1	5	1				2	0	2	0

Below-Level Readers

Sydney

Written/Literate Language Structures							Oral Language Structures						
Exact	Omitted	Mismatch	Syntactically Correct		Semantically Correct		Exact	Omitted	Mismatch	Syntactically Correct		Semantically Correct	
			Y	**N**	**Y**	**N**				**Y**	**N**	**Y**	**N**
0/10	2/10	8/10	1	7	8	0	3/16	1/16	12/16	7	5	8	4

Dominique

Written/Literate Language Structures							Oral Language Structures						
Exact	Omitted	Mismatch	Syntactically Correct		Semantically Correct		Exact	Omitted	Mismatch	Syntactically Correct		Semantically Correct	
			Y	**N**	**Y**	**N**				**Y**	**N**	**Y**	**N**
0/10	2/10	8/10	1	7	6	2	6/16	1/16	9/16	5	4	4	5

Calvin

Written/Literate Language Structures							Oral Language Structures						
Exact	Omitted	Mismatch	Syntactically Correct		Semantically Correct		Exact	Omitted	Mismatch	Syntactically Correct		Semantically Correct	
1/10	0/10	9/10	**Y**	**N**	**Y**	**N**	7/16	0/16	9/16	**Y**	**N**	**Y**	**N**
			5	4	7	2				3	6	7	2

APPENDIX H

Analytic Memo Examples

Analytic Memo Examples

Code Explanation/Definition: Interview

I initially loved the thought of using values coding to code the interview data. However, I noticed that the values code definitions according to Saldana were very similar.

So I'm changing the code definitions slightly or rather I'm making them more distinct so that I can tell them a part

Value (V)=

Is the importance we attribute to oneself, another person, thing or idea

(This code signals anything that the student thinks is important)

Attitude (A)=

(Opinion) Is the way we think and feel about oneself, another person, thing

or idea

(This code signals anything that indicates the students opinion of something)

Belief (B)= Is part of a system that includes our values, attitudes, knowledge,

experiences, opinions, prejudices, morals, and other interpretive

perceptions of the social world

(This code signals anything that indicates the students' knowledge or experiences: what they understand or what they have experienced)

Code Explanation/Definition   Edited Sep 24, 2017

CLOSE

Pinned

CW1F

This student relies on what seems to be very inefficient strategies to help him as a reader: spelling it out; stopping thinking and saying the word. His level of reading strategy does not seem to be strong enough to help him him be successful a his current grade level. His most notable response of his interview was that "playing sports and being a doctor" are needed for him to become a better...

Interview: Individual Reflecions

KH3F

This student values reading books and sharing her knowledge of how to read books with other people so that they may enjoy reading books too. Her grandma taught her how to read by giving her little books to read when she was younger. Sometimes she still reads when she goes to her grandma's house. It is unclear if she is doing school "reading" homework or "reading" that her grandma gives her. Most...

Interview: Individual Reflecions

SD3M

The most notable aspect of this students interview was his ability to note that reading strategies can be used during casual ("just for fun") reading and during test taking situations. He seemed to understand that these were two different genres. Another notable part of this students' interview was his indication of needing to a more efficient reader in order to be a better reader. He seems...

Interview: Individual Reflecions

TH2M

This student values word knowledge and word recognition. This understanding is essential to being a good reader. He believes that sounding out words and being able to spell those words are helpful when solving reading problems. He believes that knowing how to read is a sign of intelligence. Therefore not being able to read indicates that one is not as intelligent. He also believes that having...

Interview: Individual Reflecions

297

Emerging Themes While Creating Summary Profiles & Reviewing Other Data 📌

1. I've a gained a greater understanding significance of literate and written language structures. I'm understanding that the presence of those structures indicate students' understanding of the relationships of thoughts and ideas in a story.

2. Students use of literate and written text structures when constructing a story may indicate their level level of comprehension of that story. Students who are able to articulate literate and written language structures to express significant story relations may have an easier time comprehending those relationships when reading text. However, students who are unable to use those relationships to create a story, may have a harder time comprehending those relationships when reading text.

3. Students use of written and literate language forms in their own story constructions are resources that can be leveraged to teach students to recognize this type of language in the text. Students may have a beginning knowledge of how to use written and literate structures to tell their own stories, providing descriptions, sequence or other logical plot relationships, but it may be harder to interpret other text that use written and literate language because the author may also use vocabulary that may not be familiar to the student or may refer to experiences or concepts that may not be recognizable or relateable to the student.

Retelling Task

1. When creating the oral construction students use more literate and written language patterns. However, when retelling the story, many students did not use as many written or literate structures. As a result there seem to be less emphasis were logical story relationships or ideas were reveal. (cause/effect, time, contrasting, ...)

2. I'm not sure that students truly understood the symbolic or metaphorical language at the end of the text. "At last Desmond knew what it felt like to be free. It was as if he could embrace the whole world in his outstretch arms." It was evident in students retelling that they were trying to approximate understanding of the text.

3. I should really take a look at language and structure of the wordless picture book oral story construction and the retelling...the relationship between these these two forms of data may provide more significant information and the relation ship between the wordless picture book oral story construction and the other tasks.

CLOSE

APPENDIX I

IRB Approval Letter

Institutional Review Board
Office of Research and Sponsored Programs
P.O. Box 425619, Denton, TX 76204-5619
940-898-3378
email: IRB@twu.edu
http://www.twu.edu/irb.html

DATE: May 19, 2017

TO: Ms. Melanie Loewenstein
            Reading

FROM: Institutional Review Board (IRB) - Denton

Re: *Approval for African American Children's Use of Literate Discourse in the Decoding and Comprehending of Text (Protocol #: 19554)*

The above referenced study was reviewed at a fully convened meeting of the Denton IRB (operating under FWA00000178). The study was approved on 5/19/2017. This approval is valid for one year and expires on 5/19/2018. The IRB will send an email notification 45 days prior to the expiration date with instructions to extend or close the study. It is your responsibility to request an extension for the study if it is not yet complete, to close the protocol file when the study is complete, and to make certain that the study is not conducted beyond the expiration date.

If applicable, agency approval letters must be submitted to the IRB upon receipt prior to any data collection at that agency. A copy of the approved consent form with the IRB approval stamp is enclosed. Please use the consent form with the most recent approval date stamp when obtaining consent from your participants. A copy of the signed consent forms must be submitted with the request to close the study file at the completion of the study.

Any modifications to this study must be submitted for review to the IRB using the Modification Request Form. Additionally, the IRB must be notified immediately of any adverse events or unanticipated problems. All forms are located on the IRB website. If you have any questions, please contact the TWU IRB.

cc. Dr. Connie Briggs, Reading
     Dr. Patricia Watson, Reading
     Graduate School