
Review of Additional K-2 Reading Instruction Resources

A Supplement to A Literature Review of Explicit, Systematic Phonics Instruction

Region 10 Comprehensive Center

August 2020

The content of this presentation were developed under a grant from the Department of Education through the Office of Program and Grantee Support Services (PGSS) within the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE), by the Region 10 Comprehensive Center at Wisconsin Center for Education Research (WCER), Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement (CAREI), and Education Analytics (EA) under Award #S283B190048. This contains resources that are provided for the reader's convenience. These materials may contain the views and recommendations of various subject matter experts as well as hypertext links, contact addresses, and websites to information created and maintained by other public and private organizations. The U.S. Department of Education does not control or guarantee the accuracy, relevance, timeliness, or completeness of any outside information included in these materials. The views expressed herein do not necessarily represent the positions or policies of the U.S. Department of Education. No official endorsement by the U.S. Department of Education of any product, commodity, service, enterprise, curriculum, or program of instruction mentioned in this document is intended or should be inferred.

About Us

Wisconsin Evaluation Collaborative

The Wisconsin Evaluation Collaborative (WEC) is housed at the Wisconsin Center for Education Research at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. WEC's team of evaluators supports youth-serving organizations and initiatives through culturally responsive and rigorous program evaluation. Learn more at <http://www.wec.wceruw.org>.

Comprehensive Center Network

The Wisconsin-Minnesota Comprehensive Center (WMCC10) aims to improve the academic achievement of elementary and secondary school students in the two-state region by advancing the use of evidence-based practices. The WMCC10 team has extensive experience working with the Wisconsin Department of Instruction (DPI), Minnesota Department of Education (MDE), regional education support organizations, professional associations, and school districts to translate research into practical applications.

Prepared by the Wisconsin-Minnesota Comprehensive Center for Region 10

Carmen Bartley, University of Wisconsin-Madison

Kimberly Gibbons, University of Minnesota

Annalee Good, University of Wisconsin-Madison

Alisia Moutry, University of Wisconsin-Madison

Contact

Carmen Bartley

cbartley2@wisc.edu

Summary of the Knowledge Base on K-2 Reading Instruction Resources

Overview

This document was created in response to a request from the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction to the Wisconsin Minnesota Comprehensive Center (WMCC) Region 10 to provide information on high-quality, qualitative studies about K-2 explicit, systematic phonics instruction. This document is intended to supplement the review document: “Explicit, Systematic Phonics Instruction.” This document contains additional resources and theories that may be useful in creating a comprehensive K-2 reading program. It is meant for internal use by the Department of Public Instruction to inform professional development provided to Wisconsin districts, schools and appropriate stakeholders.

Resource Selection

When possible, this review leans heavily on peer-reviewed articles to ensure that the articles referenced answer meaningful research questions and draw valid conclusions. This review also includes books and book chapters, as well as additional online resources from various reputable sources.

Review Methods

Initially, this section began with a focus specifically on culturally sustaining reading instruction. However, as the search continued, the basis for this section expanded to encompass additional sociocultural views of reading instruction. For the initial search, the following terms were used: “reading instruction culturally sustaining”; “culturally sustaining” AND “reading instruction.” The following databases and journals were searched: Google Scholar; ERIC; *The Reading Teacher*; *Race Ethnicity and Education*; *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*. An * is used to indicate which articles are peer-reviewed.

The Goal of Reading Instruction

Adapted from material provided by Dr. Dawnene Hassett, Professor, UW-Madison

The readings below are examples of chapters and articles that explain what readers do when they read, which also informs us about how to teach the object of reading – *to make meaning, to make sense, and to comprehend*.

Articles Addressing the Goal of Reading Instruction

CITATION

FINDINGS

Goodman, K. S., & Goodman, Y.M. (2011).
Learning to read: A comprehensive model.
In R. J. Meyer & K. F. Whitmore (Eds.),
Reclaiming Reading (pp. 19-41). NY: Routledge.

- The authors suggest that there are multiple “respects” that are central to reclaiming learning (p. 20):
- *Respect for learners*: Building on language and experience of the learners, whole language teachers start where learners are; linguistic and cultural diversity are valued. Multilingualism and multiliteracy are encouraged.
- *Respect for teachers*: Success in education depends on informed, committed, professionals. Policies can enable teachers but only teachers can turn them into realities that support learners.
- *Respect for curriculum*: The curriculum is one that builds on what the learners know, values their cultures, and moves toward broader content necessary for participation in the many realities of the world. In a real sense in whole language, each learner has a unique curriculum.
- *Respect for language*: Language and literacy are valued not just for themselves but for what they do. Language is learned within and as a result of being used for authentic purposes.
- *Respect for society*: Classrooms and schools are democratic communities with respect for both teachers and students. The focus is on collaboration and problem solving. (p. 20-1)

Goodman, K. S., Fries, P. H., & Strauss, S. L.
(2016). *Reading – The grand illusion: How and why people make sense of print*. NY: Routledge.

Chapter 2 - Learning to Read

- The authors argue that the grand illusion of reading is that *we think we see every letter and every word as we read a text* (p. 15).
- “Effective reading is making sense of what we are reading. Efficient reading is getting the meaning with the least amount of visual input. The speed of reading is not in itself important. Efficiency is what produces the speed and that involves using minimal information from the text” (p. 32).

Chapter 4 – Making Sense: What We Know About Reading

- Research utilizing miscue analysis formed the major basis of the understanding that reading isn’t a process of seeing and identifying each word in order in what you are reading, and it is not a simple process of sounding out words (p. 58).
 - “Reading is a process of constructing meaning from written texts. The reader transacts with a text and through a text with an author who has created the text to be comprehensible to an intended audience. In the course of this transaction, the reader constructs a parallel text to the text written by the author, and it is the reader’s text that the reader is comprehending. In doing so, the reader draws on prior knowledge, conceptual schema, and grammatical schema. In the process, the reader either assimilates the information being constructed to existing schemas or accommodates, changing what was known to be consistent with the new information” (p. 76).
-

CITATION	FINDINGS
<p>Goodman, Y. M. (2015). Miscue analysis: A transformative tool for researchers, teachers, and readers. <i>Literacy Research: Theory, Method, and Practice</i>, 64(1), 92-111.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When teachers engage readers in conversations about reading (retrospective miscue analysis), readers examine their own miscues and build concepts that allow them to discover their own reading strengths which leaders them to revalue their abilities to make sense of print. (p. 92) • Teachers involved in miscue research develop their own knowledge about reading in order to develop curriculum and instruction to support readers’ meaning making. (p. 92)
<p>Fountas, I. C., & Pinnell, G. S. (2001). <i>Guiding Readers and Writers: Grades 3-6</i>. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.</p>	<p>Chapter 18 – Understanding the Reading Process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Reading for meaning—comprehending—is the goal of every reading episode as well as of our teaching. We want students not only to understand what they read but also to enjoy texts, interpret them, and apply their learning from reading to other areas” (p. 302) • “The reader brings understanding to the text, reads the words of the text as continuous language, synthesizes information from the text, and integrates it with existing understandings” (p. 302).
<p>Rosenblatt, L. (2015). <i>Making meaning with text: Selected essays</i>. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Meaning—whether scientific or aesthetic, whether a poem or a scientific report—happens during the interplay between particular signs and a particular reader at a particular time and place” (p. x) • “Every reading act is an event, or a transaction involving a particular reader and a particular pattern of signs, a text, and occurring at a particular time in a particular context. Instead of two fixed entities acting on one another, the reader and the text are two aspects of a total dynamic situation” (p. 7)

Effective Reading Instruction

Adapted from material provided by Dr. Dawnene Hassett, Professor, UW-Madison

Recently, researchers have focused on **comprehensive literacy instruction**, which involves teaching about all of the ways we communicate through language, images, and thoughts: speaking/listening, reading/writing, and viewing/representing. Malloy, Marinak & Gambrell (2019) provide a synthesis of evidence-based research from the late 1990s-2019, offering **10 research-based best practices for comprehensive literacy instruction**:

Ten Research-Based Best Practices for Comprehensive Literacy Instruction

1. Implement practices that invite students to be active, contributing members of a literacy community.
2. Understand that maintaining an engaged reading community requires the ongoing monitoring and adjustment of literacy practices.
3. Promote engagement in your community of learners by planning and delivering literacy instruction through the ARC (access, relevance, and choice).
4. Provide students with small-group differentiated instruction that reflects the complex nature of literacy: reading, writing, listening, speaking, viewing, and representing.
5. Utilize a wider variety of text (fiction, nonfiction, poetry, digital, periodicals, etc.) within and across all content areas.
6. Promote close reading and critical thinking by engaging students in annotation, text-based discussions, and writing with evidence.
7. Use formative and summative assessments that reflect the complex and dynamic nature of literacy.
8. Replace less-relevant guided practice (worksheets, repetitive center-based drills) with more authentic, inquiry-based opportunities to experiment and apply evolving literacy practices.
9. Ensure that all voices are heard and honored by reducing teacher talk and prompting more student-led discussions.
10. Provide instruction in and practice with technologies that expand concepts and modes of communication.

In an additional reading, Richgels (2003) makes the argument for **contextualized and functional literacy instruction**: functional experiences serve real purposes in children's everyday home and classroom lives and contextualized experiences involve whole texts. Richgels (2003), emphasizing the need to differentiate instruction, also says:

The fact that some [children] may need additional help in the forms of direct instruction, does not justify depriving them of functional, contextualized literary experiences... nor does the fact that some kindergarteners need additional help in the form of scripted, direct instruction justify subjecting all children to such instruction. Much of direct

instruction is so divorced from actual reading and writing of authentic texts for real purposes as to be counterproductive for those students who already have phonemic awareness or are on their way to acquiring it in other, more functional and contextualized ways (p. 152).

Further, in a study of a monolingual second grader, Brown and colleagues (2011) findings based on eye-movement and miscue analysis (EMMA) demonstrate that “reading is not about decoding letters and words in linear order but is a more complex activity involving the reader’s decisions with respect to several aspects of their knowledge of their language and how comprehension is key to transacting with texts” (p. x). Further, Brown and colleagues (2011) note that “Often a reading program’s interests distract a reader from, if not devalue, the work and interests of the individual reader, most notably the reader constructively confronting a challenging text that he or she values.”

Malloy and colleagues (2019), Richgels (2003), and Brown and colleagues (2011) all highlight the need for **authentic** literacy opportunities, as reading is a complex, individualized experience. These opportunities should also be **differentiated** based on students’ needs.

References:

Malloy, J. A., Marinak, B. A., & Gambrell, L. B. (2019). Evidence-based best practices for developing literate communities. In L. M. Morrow & L. B. Gambrell (Eds.), *Best practices in literacy instruction, 6th edition* (pp. 3-26). New York: Guilford Press.

Richgels, D. J. (2003). Invented Spelling, Phonemic Awareness, and Reading and Writing Instruction. In Neuman, S. B. & Dickinson, D. K. (Eds.), *Handbook of Early Literacy Research, Volume 1* (pp. 142-155). New York: Guilford Press.

*Brown, J., Kim, K., & Ramirez, K. O. (2011). What a teacher hears, what a reader sees: Eye movements from a phonics-taught second grader. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy, 12*(2), 202-222.

**Indicates the article is peer-reviewed*

Sociocultural Approaches to Teaching

‘Sociocultural theory’ is used to explain that meaning is not merely a cognitive act but is instead socially and culturally constructed. Comprehension involves three elements influenced by the sociocultural context: the reader, the text, and the activity itself. It is argued that we cannot divorce these elements from their sociocultural context; thus, social and cultural contexts must be built into any model of reading. Below are some subsets of sociocultural approaches to teaching reading, each of which help bring readers’ lives into the classroom in meaningful ways.

Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy

Definition

*Paris, D. (2012). Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy: A Needed Change in Stance, Terminology, and Practice. *Educational Researcher*, 41(3), 93-97.

- The term culturally sustaining requires that our pedagogies be more than responsive of or relevant to the cultural experiences and practices of young people—it requires that they support young people in sustaining the cultural and linguistic competence of their communities while simultaneously offering access to dominant cultural competence. (p. 95)
- Culturally sustaining pedagogy, then, has as its explicit goal supporting multilingualism and multiculturalism in practice and perspective for students and teachers. That is, culturally sustaining pedagogy seeks to perpetuate and foster—to sustain—linguistic, literate, and cultural pluralism as part of the democratic project of schooling. (p. 95)

Implementing culturally sustaining practices

*Nash, K., Panther, L. & Elson, K. (2018). Student-Created Book Basket Labels: An Innovative, Culturally Sustaining Literacy Practice.

- When students create labels for their classroom books, they not only have agency within their classroom library but are also critically centered as real readers and real writers of everyday texts that represent their diverse lives and experiences.
- Student-created book labeling can be a vehicle to critically center students’ agency and language. It creates a space for students to write and draw every day, informal texts and feel sustained by books that reflect their own writing and represent diverse families and authors. (p. 758)
- Table 1 (p. 757) offers a list of “Resources for Creating Culturally Sustaining Classroom Libraries” and Table 3 (p. 759) provides a list of “Culturally Sustaining Author Study and Family-Themed Books for Student-Labeled Classroom Libraries.”

*Wynter-Hoyte, K., Braden, E. G., Rodriguez, S. & Thornton, N. (2019). Disrupting the Status Quo: Exploring Culturally Relevant and Sustaining Pedagogies for Young Diverse Learners. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, (22)3. 428-447.

- This article highlights four qualitative studies that examine young diverse populations (i.e. middle-class African American learners, Latinx immigrant children, emergent bilingual writers, and teachers of low-socioeconomic African American learners) using culturally relevant and culturally sustaining pedagogies (CSP) as the theoretical lens.
- Findings in this paper indicate that (a) children need critical safe spaces to foster CSP, (b) children draw knowledge from varied resources, and (c) teachers must be able to navigate policies to implement practices that utilize students' cultural referents.
- An author of one of the qualitative studies uncovered the potential resources that young multilingual learners can draw upon despite learning in an English-only environment. A greater focus on sustaining students' identities is necessary for contending with deficit perceptions of culturally and linguistically diverse students, thus promoting more equitable and meaningful learning contexts for all.

Recognizing Whose Stories Are Told, Whose Voices Are Heard

*Ward, N. A. & Warren, A. N. (2019). "In Search of Peace": Refugee Experiences in Children's Literature. *The Reading Teacher*, (73)4, 405-413.

- It is important to pay attention to which stories are told, and by whom stories are told, to ensure that the voices shared in our classrooms provide realistic portrayals rather than reproducing stereotypes. When selecting texts, we should ask ourselves two questions: Is this text educative, engaging, and appropriate? Who is it appropriate for, and who is telling the story? (p. 406)
- Literature can provide counternarratives for negative portrayals of refugees visible in the media and increase opportunities for students with refugee backgrounds to connect to academic content and see themselves in their classes (p. 406)
- By carefully selecting books that discuss concepts of human rights, equality, and equity, educators can support students' social and emotional development, promote social imagination, and model empathy and social problem solving. (p. 412)

*Brown, S., Souto-Manning, M. & Laman, T. T. (2010). Seeing the Strange in the Familiar: Unpacking Racialized Practices in Early Childhood Settings. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 13(4), 513-532.

- In this article, three educators share case studies describing racial biases and segregationist practices in early schooling. The authors draw upon critical race theory as a lens and employ critical discourse analysis to uncover classed and raced biases within and across three early childhood contexts. While the cases are situated in specific public-school settings – a parent teacher association (PTA) fundraiser, a mandated literacy program, and a read-aloud – they shed light onto a variety of contexts as these are all common phenomena in many American elementary schools.
- Ignoring the historically hidden messages that are sent to children and that children send us only perpetuates the practices that demean and disenfranchise families, schools, and communities where the privileged few remain in a powerful state oppressing and silencing the others. (p. 530)
- By becoming keenly aware of language use and classroom practices we can begin to examine places where practices affect who students are, how they are privileged, silenced, and even dismissed. We encourage teachers not to silence these voices and conversations but to explore these deep issues that often go unnoticed or ignored in daily classroom life. (p. 527)

*Kibler, A. K., Paulick, J., Palacios, N., & Hill, T. (2020). Shared Book Reading and Bilingual Decoding in Latinx Immigrant Homes. *Journal of Literacy Research*, (52)2, 180-208.

- This work suggests the importance of (a) acknowledging the major focus on decoding during shared reading in families, and reconceptualizing that work as complex and nuanced, particularly across languages and cultures, and (b) considering siblings as cultural and linguistic mediators in family literacy practices.
- Views of reading, and decoding in particular, that do not account for the social practices in and through which they occur, and the rich local knowledge they require (Compton- Lilly et al., 2012), can limit how we view families. (p. 202)
- Ignoring such practices and contexts comes at a considerable cost: Without time spent examining home language and literacy practices, neither educators nor researchers are able to fully respect or build upon children’s and their families’ linguistic, academic, and cultural assets. (p. 203)

*Reyhner, J. & Hurtado, D.S. (2008). Reading First, Literacy, and American Indian/Alaska Native Students. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 47(1), 82-95.

- This article suggests there are “serious flaws in NCLB’s approach because it overlooks the role of poverty, motivation, and cultural differences that are major contributors to the achievement gap and because its Reading First provisions have strayed from the ‘balanced approach’ recommended in the National Reading Panel’s report, leading to an overemphasis on phonics approaches to reading instruction” (p. 82).
- “Educators need to realize that commercial reading programs commonly used in schools tend to be one-size-fits-all approaches targeted toward a ‘standard’ dialect of English and a White, middle-class knowledge of the world that American Indian and other ethnic minority students often do not share” (p. 88).

[A Reading Strategies Program for Native American Students](#), Walker, B.J. (1990). Chapter 9 In *Effective Language Education Practices and Native Language Survival* (pp. 121-132), edited by Jon Reyhner. Choctaw, OK: Native American Language Issues.

- Repeated failure to bridge the gap between the culture of the school and the culture of the family complicates these students' response to instruction; however, few instructional programs address these complications and the resultant needs of these students.
- The author suggests an instructional design that sets the goal of interactive reading--strategically combining text and personal knowledge.

A Multidynamic Literacy Theory

There are three basic tenets of a multidynamic literacy theory: Literacy is multifaceted; literacy is socially constructed; and literacy skills must be relevant within the lived worlds of children.

*Hassett, D. D. (2008). Teacher Flexibility and Judgement: A Multidynamic Literacy Theory. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, 8(3), 295-327.

- The analysis overall (re)situates talk, play, and the instructional use of children’s literature as essential components of early literacy programming. More importantly, a multidynamic literacy theory offers teachers the pedagogical basis to insist upon a great deal of flexibility and judgment in choosing the best materials and approaches to meet their students’ early literacy needs as well as their sociocultural contexts for learning. (p. 295)
- Viewing literacy as constructed and socially practiced (the second tenet of a multidynamic literacy theory) means that, pedagogically, teachers understand that children bring individual knowledge (skills) and identity (sociocultural) resources to any reading situation, and that comprehension is the construction of meaning based on those backgrounds and resources within the social situation of the classroom. (p. 311)
- We must take the social and cultural contexts of students into account as they learn the essentials of early reading instruction, so that learning is attached to something meaningful.

Additional and Related Information

- When readers read, they decode words in sentences using graphophonics. Dr. Dawnene Hassett (UW-Madison) recommends [Words Their Way: Word Study for Phonics, Vocabulary, and Spelling Instruction](#) as a resource for teaching word knowledge and phoneme-grapheme relations through phonology and orthography (graphophonics)
- *Teach Decoding: Why and How* (Eldredge, 2005) offers readers information on: decoding; phonemic awareness and the alphabetic principle; and phonics and the alphabetic principle.
- Columbia University Teachers College Reading and Writing Project: [Research base underlying the Teachers College Reading and Writing Workshop's Approach to Literacy Instruction](#)
 - This webpage includes extensive citations (over 140) on, including but not limited to, the following topics:
 - The relationship between amount of reading and literacy outcomes
 - Students reading nonfiction to gain knowledge
 - The interactive read aloud as an instructional vehicle to support reader's growth
 - Students learning phonics within a balanced literacy curriculum
 - Literacy rich content area instruction
 - The effectiveness of small group instruction in promoting achievement
 - Supporting all learners in accessing the curriculum
- Harvard Graduate School of Education: Lead for Literacy Initiative
 - A series of [one-page memos](#) written for leaders dedicated to children's literacy development