# Utah State Office of Education Reading Endorsement Course Framework

Requirement:	Foundations of Literacy Instruction: Theories and Models (1)
Revision Date:	2016

The intent of this framework is (1) to ensure a level of consistency statewide among all institutions providing courses for the Reading Endorsement, and (2) to provide criteria for reviewing and approving coursework from out-of-state submitted to meet this requirement. This framework should be used as the basis for curricular and instructional planning for the required area named above.

### **Course Description**

This purpose of this graduate-level course is to help practicing teachers acquire foundational understandings about literacy. This involves an examination of the historical and theoretical perspectives and underlying premises of literacy (e.g., oral language, phonemic awareness, and organizational structures). A knowledge of historical and contemporary theories and models provides a framework for analyzing research and practice to make well-informed curricular and instructional decisions.

### Prerequisite: Level 1, 2, or 3 Teacher Certification

## ILA Standards for Reading Professionals (2010) to be addressed in this course

### STANDARD 1: FOUNDATIONAL KNOWLEDGE

Candidates understand the theoretical and evidence-based foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction.

Element 1.1 Candidates understand major theories and empirical research that describe the cognitive, linguistic, motivational, and sociocultural foundations of reading and writing development, processes, and components, including word recognition, language comprehension, strategic knowledge, and reading–writing connections.

Element 1.2 Candidates understand the historically shared knowledge of the profession and changes over time in the perceptions of reading and writing development, processes, and components.

Element 1.3 Candidates understand the role of professional judgment and practical knowledge for improving all students' reading development and achievement.

### **STANDARD 4: DIVERSITY**

Candidates create and engage their students in literacy practices that develop awareness, understanding, respect, and a valuing of differences in our society.

Element 4.1 Candidates recognize, understand, and value the forms of diversity that exist in society and their importance in learning to read and write.

Element 4.3 Candidates develop and implement strategies to advocate for equity.

## STANDARD 6: PROFESSIONAL LEARNING AND LEADERSHIP

Candidates recognize the importance of, demonstrate, and facilitate professional learning and leadership as a career-long effort and responsibility.

Element 6.2 Candidates display positive dispositions related to their own reading and writing and the teaching of reading and writing, and pursue the development of individual professional knowledge and behaviors.

# Participant Objectives

As a result of this course, participants will:

- Use a critical stance to interpret and discuss literacy research relative to the theoretical perspective of the author(s) (1.1).
- Analyze the historical and theoretical foundations of literacy issues and their influence on educational practices (1.1).
- Interpret, summarize, and apply historically shared knowledge (e.g., instructional strategies and theories) that addresses the needs of all K-12 readers and writers (1.2, 1.3).
- Transfer theories of literacy acquisition and research into practice for students in grades K-12 (1.2, 1.3).
- Demonstrate a research-based understanding of how diversity influences the literacy achievement of all students (4.1, 4.3).
- Consider the potential of individual and collective theories and models to promote differentiation and the enhancement of instruction for all students (4.1, 4.3).
- Continue to refine professional knowledge of the foundations of literacy as guides for professional behavior (6.2).

## **Required Course Topics**

- 1. Historical foundations of literacy processes
  - a. Seminal research, including Durkin., D, (1978); Anderson, R.C., Reynolds, R.E., & Schallert, D.L. (1977); LaBerge, D. & Samuels, S.J. (1974); Goldenberg, C. (2008); Neuman, S.B. & Roskos, K., (1993); Au, K.H. (1997); and Flower & Hayes (1981).
  - b. Influential reports (e.g., *Preventing Reading Difficulties, National Reading Panel, Becoming a Nation of Readers, National Early Literacy Panel, Developing Literacy in Second-Language Leaners: Report of the National Literacy Panel on Language Minority Children and Youth*)
- 2. Theories and models of literacy
  - a. Behaviorism
  - b. Constructivism (e.g., schema theory, transactional/reader response theory)

- c. Psycholinguistics
- d. Social learning perspectives (e.g., socio-linguistics, socio-cultural, social construction)
- e. Cognitive-processing perspective (e.g., information processing theory, LaBerge and Samuel's Automatic Information Processing, cognitive flexibility theory, cognitive process theory of writing)
- f. Critical or digital literacy (e.g., four resources model, multiliteracies)
- 3. Application of Theories to Instructional Decision-Making
  - a. Critical analysis of research and their theoretical influences
  - b. Compare and contrast published materials (e.g., core reading programs, reading anthologies, textbooks) and their approaches
  - c. Consideration of culturally-relevant materials and pedagogy

### **Suggested Assignments**

This suggested assignments section is provided to give instructors a sense of the type, length, and depth of assignments appropriate for this class and is not to be viewed as a required list or as a complete list of assignments.

- **Case studies**. Critical application of theories and ideas applied to specific student(s) demonstrating the application of course topics.
- **History of American Reading Instruction Timeline.** Each student will create a timeline that shows the major events, individuals, and texts in American reading instruction from the 1700s to the present.
- **Theoretical Models of Reading.** Each student will write a paper that describes three major classes of reading models, making reference to the major figures in each model and possible classroom implications of each. The paper will also compare and contrast the three types of reading models chosen.
- Literature Review. Each student will select a line of literacy research and prepare a paper that describes this body of work. This paper will examine and summarize research that results in in-depth knowledge about one aspect of literacy instruction.

### • Suggested Paper Topics

• Prepare a paper describing the "educational pendulum" as it has influenced reading instruction over the past centuries.

- A life-story of the literacy development and opportunities of someone you know or come to know through interviews. Include an analysis of the following issues: What economic, regional, social, and technological transformations occurred during this person's life? How did literacy change in terms of what was valued and what lost value? What literacy sponsors enabled this person to gain literacy over his or her lifespan? What did the literacy sponsors ask for in return (either implicitly or explicitly)? You should also include an examination of writing as well as reading. In your life-story, include parallels to any of the people Deborah Brandt has described, as appropriate, and include any of the other course readings that might be relevant.
- Analytic paper examining one of the topics covered in this course, such as familyhome connections, emergent literacy, spelling, phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, approaches to beginning reading instruction, comprehension, learning strategies and metacognition, critical literacy, reader response, Vygotsky, or interest and motivation as they relate to reading.

#### **Core Texts**

- National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. (2000). *Report of the National Reading Panel. Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction* (NIH Publication No. 00-4769). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Tracey, D.H. & Morrow, L.M. (2012). Lenses on reading: An introduction to theories and models (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). New York: Guilford.
- Utah Core Standards for English/Language Arts (2010). Utah State Office of Education. Retrieved February 22, 2013 from <u>http://www.schools.utah.gov/CURR/main/Core-</u> <u>Curriculum/By-Subject.aspx</u> (*Common Core State Standards*).
- Graham, S., & MacArthur, C. A. (Eds.). (2013). *Best practices in writing instruction*. New York, NY: Guilford.

#### **Suggested Resources**

- Anderson, R. C., Reynolds, R. E., Schallert, D. L., & Goetz, E. T. (1977). Frameworks for comprehending discourse. *American Educational Research Journal*, 14(4), 367-381.
- Au, K. H. (1997). A sociocultural model of reading instruction: The Kamehameha Elementary Education Program. In S. A. Stahl & D. A. Hayes (Eds.), *Instructional models in reading*, (pp. 181-202). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

- Au, K. H. P. (1980). Participation structures in a reading lesson with Hawaiian children: Analysis of a culturally appropriate instructional event. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 11(2), 91-115.
- Baumann, J., Hoffman, J., Duffy-Hester, A., & Moon Ro, J. (2000). The first R yesterday and today: U.S. elementary reading instruction practices reported by teachers and administrators. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *35*(3), 338-377.
- Biancarosa, G. & Snow, C.E. (2004). Reading next: A vision for action and research middle and high school literacy. A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education. Cached at www.all4ed.org/publication\_material/reports
- Brandt, D. (2001). Literacy in American lives. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Cartwright, K. B. (Ed.). (2008). *Literacy processes: Cognitive flexibility in learning and teaching.* New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Chall, J. S. (1967). Learning to read: The great debate. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Dixon-Krauss, L. (1996). *Vygotsky in the classroom: Mediated literacy instruction and assessment*. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Durkin, D. (1978). What classroom observations reveal about reading comprehension instruction. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 14, 481-533.
- Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, *32*, 365-387.
- Gee, J. P. (2001). Reading as situated language: A sociocognitive perspective. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 44*(8), 714-725.
- Goldenberg, C. (2008). Teaching English language learners. American Educator, 32(2), 8-44.
- Goldenberg, C. & Coleman, R. (2010). Promoting academic achievement among English learners: A guide to the research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Graham, S, & Perin, D. (2007). Writing next: Effective strategies to improve writing of adolescents in middle and high schools. A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education. Cached at <a href="http://www.all4ed.org/publication\_material/reports">www.all4ed.org/publication\_material/reports</a>
- Griffin, P., Burns, M. S., & Snow, C. E. (Eds.). (1998). *Preventing reading difficulties in young children*. Washington, D.C., National Academy Press.

- Hall, K. (2003). *Listening to Stephen read: Multiple perspectives on literacy*. London, UK: Open University Press.
- Handsfield, L. (2015). *Literacy theory as practice: Connecting theory and instruction in K-12 classrooms.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Jetton, T.L., & Dole. J. A. (Eds.) (2004). *Adolescent literacy research and practice*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- LaBerge, D., & Samuels, S. J. (1974). Toward a theory of automatic information processing in reading. *Cognitive Psychology*, 6(2), 293-323.
- Lewis, C. (2001). *Literary practices as social acts: Power, status, and cultural norms in the classroom.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Luke, A. (2000). Critical literacy in Australia: A matter of context and standpoint. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 43*(5), 448-461.
- Moll, L. C. (2013). L. S. Vygotsky and education. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Moats, L.C. (2000). *Speech to print: Language essentials for teachers*. New York, NY: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.
- Morrow, L.M., Gambrell, L.B., & Pressley, M. (2014). Best practices in literacy instruction (5<sup>th</sup> Edition). New York: Guilford Press.
- Neuman, S. & Dickinson, D. (2011). *Handbook of early literacy research*, Vol. 3. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Neuman, S. B., & Roskos, K. (1993). Access to print for children of poverty: Differential effects of adult *mediation and literacy-enriched play settings on environmental and functional print tasks. American Educational Research Journal, 30(1), 95-122.*
- New London Group. (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard Educational Review, 66,* 60-92.
- Robinson, R.D., McKenna, M.C., & Wedman, J.M. (2000). *Issues and trends in literacy education*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Ruddell, R., Ruddell, M., Unrau N.J., & Alvermann, D.E. (2013). *Theoretical models and processes* of reading (6th Ed.). Newark, DE: International Reading Association. (appropriate chapters)

- Samuels, S. J., & Farstrup, A. E. (Eds.). (2011). What research has to say about reading instruction (4<sup>th</sup> Ed.). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Short, D., & Fitzsimmons, S. (2007). Double the work: Challenges and solutions to acquiring language and academic literacy for adolescent English language learners. *A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York.* Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education. Cached at www.all4ed.org/publication\_material/reports
- Smith, N. B. (2002). American Reading Instruction, Special Edition. Newark, DE: IRA.
- Stanovich, K.E. (2000). Understanding reading: Scientific Foundations and New Frontiers. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Tudge, J. R. H., & Scrimsher, S. (2003). Lev S. Vygotsky on education: A cultural-historical, interpersonal, and individual approach to development. *Educational psychology: A century of contributions*, 207-228.