


Report of the NLP: Studies of Instruction



Diane August
Center for Applied Linguistics

Nonie Lesaux
Harvard Graduate School of Education

David J. Francis
University of Houston



HARVARD GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION



Overview

- Part IV of the Panel Report--Instructional Approaches and Professional Development
 - Language of Instruction (David Francis)
 - Effective Literacy Teaching
 - Components of Literacy
 - More complex approaches
 - Qualitative Studies of Classroom and School Practices
 - Literacy Instruction for Language-minority Children in Special Education Settings
 - Teacher Beliefs and Professional Development
- Based on research findings develop some guidelines for effective practice

Inclusion Criteria

- Children ages 3-18
- Children from homes where a non-English language was spoken
- Articles appeared in peer-reviewed journals
- Articles had to report research—that is they had to report some systematic analysis of data; no think-pieces, reports of personal experiences or opinion pieces were included as data, only as background
- For the most part, studies reviewed in this presentation include the experimental and quasi-experimental studies focused on effective literacy instruction (a subset of studies included Part IV of the panel report)
- Published between 1980 and 2002; however, this review also includes studies that appeared between 2003-2006 that met same inclusion criteria

1. Effective Instruction for language-minority children emphasizes essential components of literacy

- Explicit instruction in key aspects of literacy – phonemic awareness, phonics, oral reading fluency, vocabulary, reading comprehension, and writing – provides clear learning benefits for students.
- Far fewer studies than located by the NRP
 - Phonemic awareness and phonics (7 NLP versus 52 on PA and 38 on phonics for the NRP; 6 focus on children prek-3)
 - Fluency (4 NLP versus 16 for the NRP; 4 focus on children prek-3);
 - Vocabulary (4 NLP versus 45 for the NRP; 3 focus on children prek-3)
 - Comprehension (1 NLP versus 205 for NRP; 0 focus on children prek-3)
 - Writing (3 NLP versus 0 in NLP; 0 focus on children prek-3)

2. Effective instruction for language-minority students is similar to effective instruction for English-proficient students

- The need to focus on the same components does not necessarily imply exactly the same instructional approaches will be equally effective with both groups.
- However, analysis of research suggests that, indeed, many of the instructional approaches that have been successful with native-English speakers are effective with English learners, too.
 - Students with learning difficulties were provided with supplementary instruction (Gunn studies; Vaughn et al. 2006)
 - Students worked on leveled materials at their own pace and had to reach criterion before they moved on (De la Colina, 2001; Cohen et al. 1980)

3. Effective literacy curriculum and instruction for English learners must be adjusted to meet their needs.

- While instructional approaches that have worked with native English speakers can be a good place to start, using these procedures with no adjustment despite the very real differences that often exist between first- and second-language learners is less effective.
 - Evidence for this is the lower effect sizes for the same interventions used with language-minority students
- The reason that common instructional procedures would be effective with English learners too is probably due to the fact that students are very similar no matter what their language background (similar in perceptual skills, memory capacity, ability to learn, etc.), so the roles of modeling, explanation, and practice in instruction probably do not differ very much from one group to another.

3. Effective literacy curriculum and instruction for English learners must be adjusted to meet their needs (cont.)

- However, as similar as learning mechanisms and capacities are, the role of background experience and prior knowledge in comprehension and learning have been well documented, so the differences that exist in the language and background experiences of English learners must be reflected in the instruction designed for them.

3. Effective literacy curriculum and instruction for English learners must be adjusted to meet their needs (cont.)

Some adjustments include:

- Strategic use of the first language (e.g. modified reciprocal teaching method was used in which Chinese and English were used on alternate days; vocabulary definitions in students' first language; helping students build on cognate knowledge)
- Enhanced instructional delivery routines (e.g. in 6 of the phonics studies, students were in small groups where instruction could be more individualized and interactive.)
- Adjustments for differences in knowledge (e.g. instruction in minimal pairs such as *ch/sh* and *b/v*)
- More scaffolding (e.g. instructional conversations around text; use of visuals—both print and picture)

4. Effective literacy instruction for English learners is comprehensive and multi-dimensional.

- Literacy instruction needs to be thorough and complete; that is to say, it should provide adequate instructional attention to all of the skills and knowledge that must be learned
 - Encouraging reading and writing (6)
 - Reading to children (3)
 - Tutoring and remediation (2)
 - Success for All (3)
 - Instructional Conversations (3)
 - Other interventions (6)

4. Effective literacy instruction for English learners is comprehensive and multi-dimensional (cont).

- For example, in a study that was part of a series of related efforts, an extensive array of improvements to literacy and language arts lessons were explored (Saunders, 1999).
 - Study examined the literacy learning of language minority students in Grades 2 to 5 who were participating in a Spanish transitional bilingual program.
 - Instructional approach included the following instructional components: literature logs, instructional conversations, writing as a process, direct teaching of comprehension strategies, assigned independent reading, dictation, lessons in written conventions, English-language development through literature, pleasure reading, teacher read-alouds, and interactive journals.

5. Effective literacy instruction for English learners develops oral proficiency

- It seems clear that in order to provide maximum benefit to language minority students, instruction must do more than develop a complex array of basic literacy skills; it must also develop oral English proficiency along with basic reading skills.
- Oral English proficiency is strongly related to text-level skills such as reading comprehension and writing and these are the skills that English-language learners struggle with most
- Examples include providing oral language activities intended to clarify specific concepts in the basal readers (Perez, 1981); grouping second language learners with fluent English speakers in peer response and conferencing groups and thus providing rich opportunities for students to interact with native English speakers (Carlo et al., 2004); providing additional time after school to read books in English with adult support, as needed (Tudor & Hafiz, 1989)

6. Effective literacy instruction for English learners is differentiated.

- English learners are a heterogeneous group (e.g., age of arrival in a new country, educational history, socioeconomic status, cognitive capacity, English proficiency, reading ability, interests, etc.), and instruction, if it is to be maximally effective, has to be differentiated to address their diverse learning needs.
- Teaching that provides a variety of reading activities and resources matched to students' levels of second language proficiency, domain knowledge (though maintaining high expectations), and special needs can all benefit these students, as can increased amounts or intensity of instruction
- Examples include developing the decoding skills of older recent immigrants (Swanson, 2005); supplemental reading instruction for ELLs with learning difficulties (Gunn studies); individualized mastery learning (Cohen & Rodriguez, 1980)

7. Effective literacy instruction for English Learners requires well-prepared teachers.

- Teacher knowledge and skills, the value of supporting teacher development, and the need for teacher support systems that are intensive, elaborate, and enduring have been documented as important.
 - For example, in the KEEP program (Au & Carroll, 1997), there was intensive mentoring by the KEEP consultants; each consultant worked with only one to three project teachers and observed and mentored in classrooms twice a week over the course of two years

8. Effective literacy instruction for English learners is respectful of the home language.

- Five quantitative syntheses show that compared to immersing children in English, teaching them to read in their native language as well as English produces superior results in English reading achievement (Francis, Lesaux, & August, 2006; Rolstad, Mahoney, and Glass, 2005; Slavin and Cheung, 2004; Greene, 1997; Willig, 1985).

8. Effective literacy instruction for English learners is respectful of the home language (cont).

- Studies indicate that bilingualism itself does not interfere with academic achievement in either language (Yeung, Marsh, & Suliman, 2000) and has other probable benefits including cognitive flexibility (Nagy, Berninger, & Abbott, 2006; Galambos & Hakuta, 1988; Bialysotck, 2001) and improved family cohesion and self-esteem (Portes and Hao, 2002; Von Dorp , 2001).

Additional Information

- Center for Applied Linguistics www.cal.org
 - National Literacy Panel
 - Acquiring Literacy in English
 - Center for Research on the Educational Achievement and Teaching of English Language Learners (CREATE)
 - Optimizing Outcomes for English Language Learners: Project SALL
 - Testing and Assessment: Diagnostic Assessment of Reading Comprehension (DARC)
- References
 - August, D. & Shanahan, T. (2006). *Developing literacy in second-language learners*. Mahway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates
 - August, D. & Shanahan, T. (2008). *Developing Reading and Writing in Second-language Learners*. NY, NY: Routledge in conjunction with the International Reading Association and the Center for Applied Linguistics

APPENDIX

Comparisons of word reading and decoding skills of LM and monolingual students

Study	Weighted Mean Difference	Number of Second-Language Students	Number of First-Language Students
Abu-Rabia & Siegel, 2002	.05	56	65
Chiappe, Siegel, & Wade-Woolley, 2002	-.09	131	727
Chiappe, Siegel, & Gottardo, 2002	.05	59	540
Chiappe & Siegel, 1999	-.22	38	51
D'Angiulli, Siegel, & Serra 2001	-.79*	81	210
Da Fontoura & Siegel, 1995	-.12	37	106
Geva, Yaghoub-Zadeh, & Schuster, 2000	-.02	248	100
Limbos & Geva, 2001	-.04	258	124
Verhoeven, 2000	.05	331	1812
Wade-Woolley & Siegel, 1997	.23	40	33
Total	-.09	1,279	3,768

Comparison of spelling skills of LM and monolingual students

Study	Mean Weighted Effect Size	Number of Language Minority Participants	Number of Monolingual Participants
Chiappe, Siegel, & Gottardo, 2002	0.25	59	540
Abu-Rabia & Siegel, 2002	-0.66	56	65
Chiappe, Siegel, & Wade-Woolley, 2002	0.25	131	727
Da Fontoura & Siegel, 1995	-0.68*	37	106
D'Angiulli, Siegel, & Serra, 2001	-1.45*	45	64
Limbos & Geva, 2001	-0.04	258	124
Tompkins, 1999	-0.07	40	40
Verhoeven, 2000	0.15	331	1812
Wade-Woolley & Siegel, 1997	0.39	40	33
Total	-.13	1,022	3,447