

Theme:

STANDARD 1: FOUNDATIONAL KNOWLEDGE

Description: Candidates have knowledge of the foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction.

Type of evidence: The artifact presented as evidence to support this theme is a Literature Review that served as the rationale for action research conducted in a middle school science classroom where summary writing was used to improve reading comprehension of expository texts.

Master's Course it connects with:

Seminar in Education: Review of Research in Reading
ELED 663
Dr. Sheelah Sweeney

Standards it connects with:

1.1 Refer to major theories in the foundational areas as they relate to reading. They can explain, compare, contrast and critique the theories.

1.2 Summarize seminal reading studies and articulate how these studies impacted reading instruction. They can recount historical developments in the history of reading.

1.3 Identify, explain, compare, and contrasts the theories and research in the areas of language-development and learning to read.

1.4 Are able to determine if students are appropriately integrating the components (Phonemic awareness, word identification and phonics, vocabulary and background knowledge, fluency, comprehension strategies, and motivation) in fluent reading.

2.2 Support classroom teachers and paraprofessionals in the use of a wide range of instructional practices, approaches, and methods including technology-based practices. They help teachers select appropriate options and explain evidence-base for selecting practices to best meet the needs of all students. They demonstrate the options in their own teaching and in demonstration teaching.

2.3 Support classroom teachers and paraprofessionals in the use of a wide range of curriculum materials. They help teachers select appropriate options and explain the evidence base for selecting practices to best need the needs of all students. They demonstrate the options in their own teaching and in demonstration teaching.

5.1 Articulate the theories related to the connections between teaching dispositions and student achievement.

Rationale:

This artifact belongs in a reading specialist's portfolio as evidence of the major theories and research-based studies that support teaching reading and writing strategies as a way to improve summary writing of expository text as demonstrated in standards **1.1** and **1.2**. This document consolidates the recent research on summary writing and explains how incorporating reading and writing strategies into instruction will improve summary writing as well as reading comprehension of all students, relating to standards **1.2**, **1.4**, and **5.1**.

Studies compared in this review indicate that reading comprehension and summary writing is improved when teachers incorporate reading and writing strategies into instruction, meeting standards **1.2**, **1.4** and **5.1**. In addition, this document substantiates the importance of providing feedback in the form of rubrics and checklists to improve student's writing in the future, supporting professional standards **2.2** and **2.3**.

This literature review focused on what the current research says about how to improve content literacy by teaching explicit strategies reflecting standard **1.3** as well as using structural supports as a comprehension tool to write efficient summaries of expository text, also reflected in standard **1.3**.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Seminar in Education: Review of Research in Reading

Summary Writing

Linda Tarantelli

ELED 663-02

December 17, 2008

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The focus of this study is to help struggling as well as proficient readers better understand science concepts by becoming better at writing summaries. Through instruction on the use of literacy strategies, as well as structural supports to comprehend expository text, it is hoped that students will become better at summary writing. Of primary interest is whether the time spent on teaching strategies and summary writing helps the students to become more successful in content area classes such as science. The following literature review focuses on what the current research says about how to improve content literacy by teaching explicit strategies. It also focuses on structural supports as a comprehension tool to write efficient summaries of expository text.

Teaching Reading Comprehension Strategies

There are many thinking processes involved in comprehension of expository texts (Neufeld, 2005). Proficient readers interact with the text before, during, and after reading. They are able to make use of a variety of different reading skills and know which one to use for a particular task (McMackin & Witherell, 2003; Neufeld, 2005). However, many students, both proficient and struggling readers, need explicit strategy instruction before they are able to apply the comprehension skills necessary to reach grade level expectations in content area classes (DiCecco & Gleason, 2002; Neufeld, 2005; Rogevich & Perin, 2008). Teachers of content area classes should integrate the teaching of content as well as reading and writing strategies to increase the levels of student success. All teachers are teachers of reading, not just English teachers (Ferrell, 2007; Knipper & Duggan, 2006; Neufeld, 2005; Radcliffe, Caverly, Hand &

Franke, 2008; Rose, 2000). By incorporating the essential reading strategies into their instruction, teachers of all subject areas will facilitate improvement in reading and writing skills for their students. Only then, can students move to the next level, by using reading strategies to finally become strategic readers.

Strategy instruction should be scaffolded so that over time, responsibility transfers from teacher to students. This is called the gradual release model (Casteel, Isom, Jordan, 2000; Clark & Graves, 2004; Friend, 2001; Neufeld, 2005; Rogevich & Perin, 2008; Vacca & Vacca, 2005). This process begins with the teacher teaching individual strategies explicitly. The teacher should introduce the strategy and explain how and when it should be used. Next, the teacher should model the strategy, followed by guided practice of the strategy. Gradually, teachers put more responsibility on the students until the students can complete the task independently.

Students who use reading strategies automatically without thinking about what they are doing are skillful readers. Skillful readers use reading strategies unconsciously and they do them automatically without thinking (Afflerbach, Pearson & Paris, 2008; Vacca & Vacca, 2005). When skillful readers get stuck they become strategic readers, that is, they come up with a plan on how they can improve their learning by applying a certain strategy (Afflerbach et al, 2008; Harvey & Goudvis, 2007; Keene & Zimmermann, 2007; Vacca & Vacca, 2005). This is the goal teachers should have for all students; that the strategies taught become automatic and students only need to consciously think about them when they get stuck.

In order for students to be able to write a summary of expository text, they must use many reading and writing strategies. Students must employ pre-reading, during reading and after reading strategies to put together an exemplary summary.

Pre-reading Strategies

Pre-reading strategies help set a purpose for reading, so that students can get ready to read in a strategic way (Neufeld, 2005). Through the use of pre-reading strategies students will:

- read with a purpose
- get an overview of the text
- activate prior knowledge
- predict what the text is about

Many strategies are helpful in preparing students for reading assignments. One that is particularly useful in science is a quick write (Knipper & Duggan, 2006). A “quick write” is simply what is implied; students are given a prompt to respond to in about a minute. For instance, in a seventh grade science classroom, a quick write might be, “Explain what you know about the reasons for seasons.” This type of quick write could be a precursor to instruction about seasons.

Another pre-reading strategy of particular interest in content area reading is the use of an anticipation guide (Ferrell, 2007; Kozen, Murray & Windell, 2006; Vacca & Vacca, 2005), which is a pre-reading strategy that combines content area learning with literacy instruction. The guide typically consists of a combination of accurate and inaccurate statements related to the topic of study. Students read through the statements and either agree or disagree with each statement. This is done before the students read the material to get them thinking about the topic. It is a good way to help students activate prior knowledge as well as make predictions about the topic (Daniels & Zemelman, 2004; Kozen et al., 2006; Vacca & Vacca, 2005). After students have completed the assigned reading, they go back and answer the questions again, but this time they must back up their answers with evidence from the text.

Many teachers use the next pre-reading strategy, although they may call it something else. It is commonly called Reading Around the Text (RAT) and is very effective (Casteel et al., 2000; Neufeld, 2005). RAT is a pre-reading strategy used for students to get an overview of what the text is about. Students look at pictures, graphs, tables, and bold print to get an idea of what the text is about. They also read the introductory paragraph and concluding paragraph. After students have completed the activity, they can then make a prediction as to what the text is about.

A modified version of the “Know, Want to Know, Learned” (KWL) called “Know, Think I Know, and Want to Know” (KTW) is a good tool to set the stage for reading about a new topic (Ferrell, 2007). Before reading, students fill out the “Know” column with facts about the topic they are sure of; the “Think I Know” column with things they’re not sure of; and the “Want to Know” with questions they have. Students share their thoughts before learning about a concept or topic (Ferrell, 2007).

During Reading Strategies

Taking notes while reading expository text is an important tool for middle school students (Ferrell, 2007; Knipper & Duggan, 2006). An effective way to take notes is by using the two-column notes strategy. Students divide their paper in half lengthwise; in the left hand column students write the main ideas; in the right hand column students write the subtopics and supporting details. Teachers can scaffold students learning by filling in the main ideas ahead of time, and have the students record the subtopics and details that support the main ideas.

Another effective way to take notes is by using the double-entry journal (Daniels & Zemelman, 2004). This strategy is similar to the two-column notes in that important facts and ideas are recorded in the first column. The major difference is that in the second column,

students record questions and connections they have about the text. This type of note taking helps the students comprehend what they are reading because they are required to slow down. It also requires students' attention to key facts and ideas (Knipper & Duggan, 2006; Wallace, Pearman, Hail & Hurst, 2007).

Learning how to highlight important ideas in a text is another worthwhile reading strategy. One way for teachers to scaffold students effective use of this strategy is to share with students what should be highlighted as well as why (Harvey & Goudvis, 2007; Kozen et al., 2006).

Another during reading strategy is think/read alouds. This process is helpful to demonstrate to students the kinds of thought processes good readers use to monitor their comprehension (Clark & Graves, 2004; Daniels & Zimelman, 2004; Harvey & Goudvis, 2007; McMackin & Witherell, 2005; Rose, 2000). In this strategy, the teacher reads the text aloud and models her thinking.

After Reading Strategies

After students read, it is important for the teacher to assess what students understand and what is still confusing (Ferrell, 2007; Knipper & Duggan, 2006). To do this, teachers must employ writing-to-learn strategies. These strategies are useful tools to help middle school students understand content area reading (Friend, 2001; Knipper & Duggan, 2006; Neufeld, 2005; Wallace et al., 2007).

One way to do this is to have students fill out a graphic organizer of some sort. Graphic organizers help students organize the information they are reading about.

For several decades, researchers have been examining the effectiveness of graphic organizers for aiding in the comprehension of expository text. Recent studies report a positive effect on comprehension (DiCecco & Gleason, 2002).

Summary writing is also writing for comprehension and provides students with an opportunity to recall, clarify, as well as question what they have read (Kissner, 2006; Knipper & Duggan, 2006; Wallace et al., 2007). This strategy is difficult for students to do on their own, but it can be taught directly (Friend, 2001). Writing summaries improves students' comprehension and requires readers to distinguish important from unimportant information (Kissner, 2006; Wallace et al., 2007). It also helps students to paraphrase expository text by putting it in their own words. Teaching students to summarize is a strategy that has been shown to improve overall comprehension and should therefore, be taught explicitly (Kissner, 2006; Knipper & Duggan, 2006; Neufeld, 2005; Wallace et al., 2007).

Rubrics and Checklist

It is important that teachers provide feedback to students "writing to learn" piece. Using rubrics and checklists are an excellent way to provide feedback (Kissner, 2006; Knipper & Duggan, 2006). The rubric/checklist explains what will be graded and explains the criteria on which the students work will be judged. It is important for teachers to share good as well as bad examples of completed writing artifacts (Knipper & Duggan, 2006). Feedback provided by the rubric/checklist can improve students' writing in the future. Good writing does not just happen, students need goals for writing and rubric/checklists are a step in the right direction.

Summary

Summarizing is an excellent way to improve students' reading comprehension of expository text (Kissner, 2006). In order to write a proficient summary, it is important to remember to scaffold instruction throughout the process and provide guidance when needed. Reading and writing strategies must be integrated into content area classes to improve summary writing as well as reading comprehension of all students (Ferrell, 2007). In addition to strategy instruction, instructional supports such as graphic organizers should be used as a tool to help students organize their thoughts for writing a proficient summary. Feedback should be provided to the students using rubrics and checklists in order to improve their writing. The strategies, structural supports, and rubrics/checklists described in this literature review are tools used to scaffold students' instruction so that they can write a proficient summary and are the basis for the action research that follows.

References

- Afflerbach, P., Pearson, P. D., & Paris, S. (2008). Clarifying differences between reading skills and reading strategies. *The Reading Teacher, 61*, 364-373.
- Casteel, C. P., Isom, B. A., & Jordan, K. F. (2000). Creating confident and competent readers. *Intervention in School and Clinic, 36*, 67-74.
- Clark, K. F., & Graves, M. F. (2004). Scaffolding students' comprehension of text. *The Reading Teacher, 58*, 570-580.
- Daniels, D., & Zemelman, S. (2004). *Subjects matter: Every teacher's guide to content-area Reading*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- DiCecco, V. V., & Gleason, M. M. (2002). Using graphic organizers to attain relational Knowledge from expository text. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 35*, 306-320.
- Ferrell, K. (2007). May I go to the bathroom. *Science Scope, 31*, 31-37.
- Friend, R. (2001). Teaching summarization as a content area reading strategy. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 44*, 320-329.
- Harvey, S., & Goudvis, A. (2000). *Strategies that work: Teaching comprehension to enhance Understanding*. York, ME: Stenhouse.
- Keene, E. L., & Zimmermann, S. (1997). *Mosaic of thought: Comprehension in a reader's Workshop*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Kissner, E. (2006). *Summarizing, paraphrasing, and retelling*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Knipper, K. J., & Duggan, T. J. (2006). Writing to learn across the curriculum: Tools for Comprehension in content area classes. *The Reading Teacher, 59*, 462-470.
- Kozen, A. A., Murray, R. K., & Windell, I. (2006). Increasing all students' chance to achieve:

Using and adapting anticipation guides with middle school learners. *Intervention in School and Clinic, 41*, 195-200.

McMackin, M. C., & Witherell, N. L. (2005). Different routes to the same destination:

Drawing conclusions with tiered graphic organizers. *The Reading Teacher, 59*, 242-252.

Neufeld, P. (2005). Comprehension instruction in content area classes. *The Reading Teacher, 59*, 302-312.

Radcliffe, R., Caverly, D., Hand, J., & Franke, D. (2008). Improving reading in a middle school Science classroom. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 51*, 398-408.

Rogevich, M. E., & Perin, D. (2008). Effects on science summarization of a reading Comprehension intervention for adolescents with behavior and attention disorders. *Exceptional Children, 74*, 135-154.

Rose, A. (2000). Literacy strategies at the secondary level. *Leadership, 30*, 12-16.

Vacca, R. T., & Vacca, J. L. (2005). *Content area reading: Literacy and learning across the Curriculum*. (8th ed.). New York: Longman.

Wallace, R., Pearman, C., Hail, C., & Hurst, B. (2007). Writing for comprehension. *Reading Horizons, 48*, 41-56.

ELED 663 Literature Review Rubric

| Criteria | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| Review uses research-based resources | Most resources are research-based ✓ | Resources are evenly represented by research & trade publications | Some resources are research-based | Most resources are not research-based |
| Theories/concepts establish contextual/rationale for the literature review | Literature review is situated within a theoretical or conceptual framework ✓ | Literature review is mostly situated within a theoretical or conceptual framework | Some evidence of connection to theory or concepts | Little or no evidence of connection to theory or concepts |
| Analysis of major theoretical, conceptual, and/or practical idea(s) | Idea(s) analyzed, grouped together in coherent manner, & clear conclusions drawn ✓ | Idea(s) analyzed, grouped together in somewhat coherent manner, & somewhat clear conclusions drawn | Idea(s) not fully explored, weak analysis & unclear conclusions drawn | Idea(s) not presented clearly, poor analysis & weak conclusions drawn |
| Knowledge of the research literature and synthesis of information found | Demonstrates command of research literature and applicability to teaching practice ✓ | Demonstrates understanding of research literature and applicability to teaching practice | Some familiarity with research literature and applicability to teaching practice | Limited familiarity with research literature and applicability to teaching practice |
| Conclusion/ | Theories and research ideas succinctly summarized and connected to research ✓ | Theories and research ideas reviewed and connected to research study | Theories and research ideas reviewed and somewhat connected to research study | Theories and research ideas not reviewed or not connected to research study |
| Written Expression | Well written with coherent, clear structure that supports the research question(s) ✓ | Mostly well written with some coherent structure that supports the research question(s) | Writing and structure somewhat problematic and/or weak support for research question(s) | Poorly written or conceptualized and/or little evidence of support for research question(s) |

*Articles sorted 12/3/2015
Articles 5/10/2015
(3/15)*

| | | |
|---------------------|----------------|---------------|
| Grade Ranges | A 19-24 | C 7-12 |
| | B 13-18 | D < 7 |

24

Kimela, you need excellent resources for this literature review. You reviews were thorough and covered all applicable topics for your research plan. Well done!