

**NATIONAL LITERACY PANEL ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF LITERACY  
AMONG LANGUAGE MINORITY CHILDREN AND YOUTH**

**DRAFT**

**Update on Activities  
August 26, 2002**

**Diane August**

**SRI INTERNATIONAL  
Menlo Park, California  
CENTER FOR APPLIED LINGUISTICS  
Washington, DC 20016**

**National Literacy Panel on Language Minority Children and Youth**  
**Update on Activities**  
**August 26, 2002**  
**Prepared by Diane August, Project Director**

**Executive Summary**

In the spring of 2002, the National Literacy Panel on Language Minority Children and Youth (NLP) was constituted through a nomination and selection process. Fourteen panel members were identified to undertake a comprehensive, formal, evidence-based analysis of the experimental, quasi-experimental, qualitative, and psychometric research literature relevant to a set of selected problems judged to be of central importance in developing literacy in language-minority children and youth, including English language learners (ELLs). (See Appendix A for a list of panelists.) The panel has met twice since it was constituted, in May and July 2002. To date, the panel has formulated research questions and screening criteria for including research studies in the synthesis. (See Appendices B and C.) The Research Associates have searched the ERIC, PsycInfo, LLBA, Sociological Abstracts, and the British and Australian educational databases using keywords derived from each of the research questions. An additional search was made of MEDLINE and the MLA Bibliography using more general keywords. Relevant references from approximately 50 major reviews were also included. In addition, because journals may not be consistently abstracted through the databases, the indices of the 16 most frequently cited journals were reviewed. The preliminary literature search produced 764 unique citations that were relevant to the research questions and consistent with the criteria selected for including studies in the review and the abstracts of these studies have been coded. The panel is currently acquiring the full studies and developing a coding instrument to code the full studies. The contractors for the project are SRI International and the Center for Applied Linguistics.

## **Update on Activities**

Overall, immigration has brought about significant changes in the U.S. student population. In particular, the number and share of immigrants in schools have increased dramatically since 1970. From 1970 to 1995, the number of immigrant children ages 5 to 20 living in the United States more than doubled, from 3.5 million to 8.6 million. As the number of immigrant children grew, the share they represent of all students in schools also rose sharply, from 6 percent in 1970 to 16 percent in 1995 and 19 percent in 1997 (Ruiz-de Velasco and Fix, 2001, p. 9). While their numbers have increased, English language learners (ELLs) lag significantly behind their fluent English-speaking peers in reading. For example, in California, ELL students participating in state-mandated standardized testing performed worse at all grade levels and were substantially more likely to score below the nationally ranked 25th percentile. In addition, ELLs are substantially less likely than their peers to finish high school. About 20 percent of these children ages 16 to 24, versus 10 percent of their English-speaking counterparts, were not enrolled in school and did not have a high school diploma (Ruiz-de-Velasco and Fix, 2001, p. 16).

For literacy instruction to improve for language minority children and youth, it is critical that a national panel develop an objective research review methodology, apply this methodology to search the research literature on the development of literacy for these children, analyze the research literature, develop a report based on this analysis, and disseminate the information contained in the report to practitioners, policy-makers, and researchers.

To this end, in the spring of 2002, a National Literacy Panel on Language Minority Children and Youth (NLP) was constituted through a nominations and selection process. Fourteen panel members were identified to carry the work of this project forward. The role of panel members, over the course of the project, is to undertake a comprehensive, formal, evidence-based analysis of the experimental, quasi-experimental, qualitative, and psychometric research literature relevant to a set of selected problems judged to be of central importance in developing literacy in language-minority children and youth, including English language learners (ELLs). Accordingly, the panelists are determining the research problems and research methods used in a review, and they will draft and

revise sections of the review in their area of expertise. Appendix A includes a list of panelists.

Two panel meetings have been held thus far. The first full meeting of the NLP took place on May 13-14 at the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) in Washington, DC. The purpose of the meeting was to initiate the review and establish a schedule of major events and milestones consistent with the statement of work. At the meeting, panelists determined the research problems judged to be of central importance in developing literacy in language minority children and youth, determined the initial screening criteria to be used to judge the research (in terms of both content and methodology), and decided which sources to investigate. Appendix B contains a list of the research questions developed at that meeting. Appendix C contains the screening criteria. Panelists also formed tentative subcommittees that were aligned with the research questions.

Immediately following the first meeting, the CAL Research Associates, with the help of several experts in searching educational databases, searched for and coded the abstracts of relevant research. They built on a preliminary search conducted by CAL during the months of June and July 2001. The researchers searched the ERIC, PsycInfo, LLBA, Sociological Abstracts, and the British and Australian educational databases using keywords derived from each of the research questions. An additional search was made of MEDLINE and the MLA Bibliography using more general keywords. Relevant references from approximately 50 major reviews were also included. In addition, because journals may not be consistently abstracted through the databases, the indices of the 16 most frequently cited journals were reviewed.

Although research published in peer-reviewed journals comprises the bulk of the literature to be included in the synthesis, in the second phase of the search, the publication-type criteria were broadened to include technical reports and dissertations. The electronic databases referenced above were used to search for technical reports. Dissertation Abstracts (UMI ProQuest Digital Dissertation) was searched to gather relevant doctoral dissertations. With regard to dissertations, the citations included in the search were limited to work written in English between the years 1990 and 2002. Dissertations not covered by searching the Dissertation Abstracts but which were found

in other database searches (ERIC, LLBA, PsycInfo, MLA, and Australian Education Index) were also added.

The abstracts of studies that met the criteria described above were imported into a FileMaker database and coded according to a set of criteria that included: author, title, citation, language of article, publication date, reference number, publication type, source, type of study; subject and setting information and literacy components; location of study; relevance to research questions; keywords; and abstract. The preliminary literature search produced 764 citations relevant to the research questions and 249 relevant dissertations.

The second full panel meeting was held July 21-22, 2002 in Menlo Park, California where SRI International, the Prime Contractor, is headquartered. At the second full panel meeting, panelists discussed the initial search and decided which research they would like to review fully. In addition, based on the initial review of abstracts, the review procedures were finalized. Finally, panelists had an opportunity to discuss plans to gather information from the education community. Two outreach meetings for the education community are being planned for September 2002 to elicit comments on the proposed research questions. One meeting will be hosted by SRI International at the L.A. County Office of Education and the other by the Center for Applied Linguistics at its offices in Washington, DC.

Currently, the panel is finalizing the coding instrument that will be used to code the full studies. In developing the instrument, the panel is following the advice of Cooper (1998) an expert in conducting research syntheses. According to Cooper (1998, pp. 85-86), synthesizers have employed two approaches to coding to help them capture differences between good and bad studies: the threats-to-validity approach and the methods-description approach. As an optimal strategy, he recommends a mix of the two approaches. Thus, the synthesizer should code all potentially relevant, objective aspects of a research design (the methods-description approach). However, given that there are threats-to-validity that may not be captured by this information alone, these should be coded directly as threats-to-validity (although deciding whether they are present or absent still will rely heavily on the description of the study resulting from the threats-to-validity approach). The panel is developing different criteria for each methodological research approach: quantitative, qualitative, and psychometric. In addition to the information cited

above, Cooper (1998) recommends that the following also be coded for each study: (1) report identification (authors, source of report, when published, how retrieved); (2) setting of the study (geographic location, institutional surroundings); (3) subjects (characteristics of participants including restrictions placed by the researchers on who could participate); (4) methodology;<sup>1</sup> (5) treatment characteristics for studies where a treatment is involved;<sup>2</sup> (6) statistical outcomes or effect sizes (most importantly, the direction of outcomes of comparisons);<sup>3</sup> and (7) the coding process, including who coded the study, how confident they were of their codes, and how long it took to complete the coding assignment. The panel is using these guidelines in developing their coding instruments.

The CAL Research Associates have continued to search for relevant research and they are obtaining hard copies of all relevant research through the ERIC Clearinghouse on Language and Linguistics and local research libraries. Prior to the third panel meeting scheduled for October, the Research Associates, guided by the panel members on each subcommittee, will code a subset of the research studies as a pilot test to assess the adequacy and reliability of review procedures and to determine the comprehensiveness of the array of data elements specified. Following the coding, a group of panelists representative of each of the subcommittees will revise the coding instrument. Panelists will then have the opportunity to code a subset of the research documents prior to the third meeting.

---

<sup>1</sup> For quantitative studies, Cooper (1998) suggests that studies be coded by the following types of methodology: one-group, pretest-posttest designs; correlational studies; nonequivalent control group or static-group comparison (i.e., treatments are given to groups that existed before the research began); nonequivalent control group comparisons with matching or statistical control; and random assignments. Type of methodology will also have to be coded for qualitative and psychometric studies, and the panel will need to determine how best to define the different types of methodologies used in these kinds of studies.

<sup>2</sup> Treatment characteristics include a careful description of the details of what went into manipulating or measuring the independent variables, as well as the characteristics of how control or comparison groups were treated. For studies involving testing, it is important to obtain information regarding the assessments: whether they were standardized, number of items, and reliability.

<sup>3</sup> According to Cooper (1998), if a quantitative synthesis or meta-analysis is envisioned, the synthesizer will also need to record more precise information on the statistical outcomes of the studies. Because reporting of results varies from article to article and can take different forms, a listing of the most to least desirable is the following: means, standard deviations, and sample sizes for each group in a comparison or hypothesis test; an estimate of the treatment's impact or the association between variables; the exact value of an inference test statistic and its associated degrees of freedom; and an inexact *p* level and sample size.

To facilitate communication among NLP members and key OERI staff, CAL has created a password-protected area on its Web site that will be exclusively accessible to panel members, project staff, OERI staff, and advisory committee members. This area houses an intranet Web page that is capable of hosting drafts of reports or articles and summary discussions by the panel members and the subcommittees. The Project Director and Program Managers will also use this Web site to post new information for the benefit of the panel members and OERI staff. Further, this secure area will eventually host the database of literature on the education of ELLs and allow panel members to upload new data and/or query the database for existing data. An ongoing forum for discussion has also been established as panelists, project staff, and OERI staff ask questions, comment, or otherwise provide feedback to each other via a private e-mail list.

### **Future Plans**

A schedule of meetings has been established to ensure that the NLP completes its work in a timely, efficient, and effective manner. At the third full panel meeting (October, 2002), subcommittee members will present the information they have found in their initial reviews. At this meeting, decisions will be made about how to synthesize the research across studies for each domain. Following the third full meeting, subcommittees will code the research and synthesize the research findings and prepare a first draft of the final report. Subcommittees will meet during this time.

At the fourth full panel meeting, scheduled for March, 2003, panelists will respond to the first draft of the research summary and identify gaps and areas needing clarification. On the basis of the subcommittee reports, they will also determine how the final report will be organized. Following the meeting, subcommittees will meet to prepare final drafts of the report.

At the fifth full panel meeting, tentatively scheduled for October, 2003, panelists will respond to a penultimate draft of the research report, including comments by external reviewers, decide what revisions need to be made, and decide what can be disseminated as research-based knowledge and make recommendations for the next generation of research. They will also make suggestions for dissemination of the report, including the

possibility of preparing additional versions for diverse audiences, such as policy-makers and/or practitioners.

A second set of outreach meetings will also be conducted, and the draft report will be posted on the web, to invite comment from a broad range of stakeholders which will be considered in the revision process. The final report will be submitted to the Department in January 2004.

## **Summary**

In summary, over the course of the project, the panel will employ objective research review methodology to undertake a comprehensive, formal, evidence-based analysis of the experimental, quasi-experimental, qualitative, and psychometric research literature relevant to a set of selected problems judged to be of central importance in developing literacy in English language learners. Characteristics of each study that meet the specified screening criteria will be coded and analyzed. After the search, screening, and coding, it will be determined whether, for a particular question or issue, a meta-analysis can be completed or whether it is more appropriate to conduct a literature analysis of the issue or question without meta-analysis, incorporating all the information gained. When appropriate and feasible, effect sizes will be calculated for each intervention or condition in experimental or quasi-experimental designs. Subcommittee meetings will be used to formulate, draft, revise, and finalize subcommittee reports.

## **References**

- Cooper, H. (1998). *Synthesizing research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ruiz-de-Velasco, J., & Fix, M. (2001). *Overlooked & underserved: Immigrant students in U.S. secondary schools*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

## Appendix A

### Members of the National Literacy Panel on Language Minority Children and Youth

#### Timothy Shanahan

Dr. Shanahan is the Executive Director of the Chicago Reading Initiative for the Chicago Public Schools. He is on leave from the University of Illinois at Chicago where he serves as Professor of Urban Education, Director of the UIC Center for Literacy, and coordinator of graduate programs in reading. He is a member of the National Reading Panel that advises the U.S. Congress on reading research, and a member of the White House Assembly on Reading. Dr. Shanahan has published more than 100 books, articles, and chapters on reading education, and he has received the Albert J. Harris Research Award for his work on reading disabilities. He just completed a term as a member of the Board of Directors of the International Reading Association.

#### Isabel Beck

Dr. Beck is Professor of Education in the School of Education and Senior Scientist in the Learning Research and Development Center at the University of Pittsburgh. Her research interests include a number of facets of reading, among them being: early literacy, vocabulary development, reading instruction, and ways of extracting meaning from text. Among her extensive publications, recent articles have appeared in the *American Educational Research Journal*, *The Reading Teacher*, the *Reading Research Quarterly*, and *Reading Psychology*. She has authored several book chapters and recently co-authored two books, *Bringing Words to Life* (with M. McKeown and L. Kucan, Guilford Press) and (with R. Hamilton) *Beginning Reading Instruction* (American Federation of Teachers). Her awards include election to the Reading Hall of Fame of the International Reading Association. She also received the Contributing Researchers Award from the American Federation of Teachers for “bridging the gap between research and practice.”

#### Margarita Calderon

Dr. Calderon is a Research Scientist at CRESPAR/Johns Hopkins University. She is conducting five-year research projects on language minority schooling in El Paso, Texas regarding: effective instructional processes; two-way bilingual programs; teachers' learning communities; staff development practices in schools with language minority populations; and binational education. She is conducting training and curriculum development for the CRESPAR Success for All program components. She directs the Leadership Enhancement Academy/Texas Teacher Recruitment, Retention and Assistance Program in El Paso funded by the Texas Education Agency. She also conducts research and development in Juárez SFA schools funded by Fundación Rosario Fernández, Juárez, México, and conducts research on the transition from Spanish reading into English reading in collaboration with the Center for Applied Linguistics and Harvard University. She directs the El Paso Adult Bilingual Learning Community sponsored by the Upper Rio Grande Workforce Development Board and the El Paso Chamber of Commerce. Her work is sponsored by the U.S. Department of Labor, in conjunction with the Upper Rio Grande Workforce Development Board and the El Paso Chamber of Commerce.

**David J. Francis**

Dr. Francis is a Professor of Quantitative Methods in the Department of Psychology at the University of Houston, and Director of the Texas Institute for Measurement, Evaluation, and Statistics at the University of Houston. He is the current chair of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) Mental Retardation Research Subcommittee. He is also a recipient of the University of Houston Teaching Excellence Award and a former member of the National Institute of Health's Behavioral Medicine Study Section. His areas of quantitative interest include modeling of individual growth, multi-level and mixture modeling, structural equation modeling, item response theory, and exploratory data analysis. Dr. Francis is currently the Principal Investigator of an NICHD-funded program project grant on oral language and literacy acquisition in Spanish-speaking children, and has collaborated for many years in research on reading and reading disabilities, attention problems, developmental consequences of brain injuries and birth defects, and adolescent alcohol abuse. Presently, Dr. Francis collaborates on multiple contracts and grants funded by NICHD, the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, the National Science Foundation, the National Institute of Mental Health's Office on AIDS, the Texas Education Agency, and the Houston Livestock Show and Rodeo.

**Georgia Earnest Garcia**

Dr. Garcia is an Associate Professor in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction, College of Education, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign. Dr. Garcia's research program focuses on the literacy acquisition, instruction, and assessment of students who traditionally are not well served by American schools. Many of these students are low-income children of color, and/or second-language speakers of English. The specific goals of the research are: (a) to understand student reading performance; (b) to investigate the influence of instructional and assessment factors on student performance; and (c) to identify changes in instruction and assessment that could improve student performance. Pursuit of the latter goal also has resulted in her becoming interested in teacher change. Much of her research has focused on the reading development, instruction, and assessment of Spanish-English bilingual students, and she has also done some work with students from non-Romance language backgrounds.

**Fred Genesee**

Dr. Genesee is a Professor in the Psychology Department at McGill University. He is interested in basic issues related to language learning, representation, and use in bilinguals. He is also interested in applied issues related to second-language teaching, learning, and testing. He has carried out extensive research on alternative approaches to second-language teaching and on social psychological aspects of second-language learning and usage in bilingual communities. His current work focuses on simultaneous acquisition of two languages during early infancy and childhood; his specific interests include language representation (lexical and syntactic) in early stages of bilingual acquisition, transfer in bilingual development, structural and functional characteristics of child bilingual code-mixing, and communication skills in young bilingual children. His

focus is on language development in children acquiring two languages simultaneously, and the representation of grammar in early bilinguals and monolinguals.

### **Esther Geva**

Dr. Geva is an Associate Professor at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto. Dr. Geva's research interests include: cognitive and linguistic processes in normally achieving and in learning disabled children; reading processes in first and second language; learning disabilities in bilingual/multicultural contexts; and minimizing reading failure through early identification of at-risk ESL children. She has conducted research in the context of ESL and French immersion programs, and with adult second-language learners. She is the co-editor of two recent books, *Interprofessional Practice with Diverse Populations: Cases in Point* and *Basic Processes in Early Second Language Reading*.

### **Claude Goldenberg**

Dr. Goldenberg, a native of Argentina, is a Professor in the Department of Teacher Education and Associate Dean of the College of Education at California State University, Long Beach. He has taught junior high school in San Antonio, TX, and first grade in a bilingual elementary school in the Los Angeles area. He is currently involved in a number of ongoing research projects focusing on Latino children's academic development, home-school connections to improve achievement, home and school factors in Latino children's academic achievement, and the processes and dynamics of school change. His current research is supported by the Spencer Foundation, the U.S. Department of Education, and the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. Dr. Goldenberg was on the National Research Council's Head Start Research Roundtable and on the Council's Committee on the Prevention of Early Reading Difficulties in Young Children. Currently he is on the Reading Subcommittee of the National Academy of Education's Committee on Teacher Education. He has been on the editorial boards of *Language Arts*, *The Elementary School Journal*, and *Literacy, Teaching and Learning* and has served as a reviewer for numerous academic publications, publishers, and funding agencies. Goldenberg's articles have appeared in the *American Educational Research Journal*, *Educational Researcher*, *American Journal of Education*, *The Reading Teacher*, *Language Arts*, *Educational Leadership*, *The Elementary School Journal*, and other professional books and journals. In 1997, he produced *Settings for Change*, a video describing a successful 5-year project to improve teaching and learning in a predominantly Hispanic school. A book based on this project will be published by Teachers College Press. Together with William Saunders, he produced a video and DVD depicting Opportunities through Language Arts (OLA), a middle elementary language arts program that helps English language learners develop English language and literacy skills.

### **Michael Kamil**

Dr. Kamil is a Professor in the School of Education at Stanford University. His work is concerned with the effects of technology on literacy and its acquisition. His research examines the types of materials that are best suited for use in beginning reading instruction and the appropriate balance between applications of technology and the

demands of literacy. He is currently involved in a comparison of processes that readers use when they encounter hypertext, versus the processes they use in reading conventional texts. With the use of computers in the classroom becoming more prominent, these findings will have important implications for the future directions of early reading instruction. His current work builds on classroom instructional research in the use of expository text materials for reading instruction. In addition, Dr. Kamil was a member of the National Reading Panel. He was Chair of the subgroup on comprehension and Chair of the subgroup on Technology.

### **Keiko Koda**

Dr. Koda is an Associate Professor in the Department of Foreign Languages at Carnegie Mellon University. Her major research areas include second language reading and writing, biliteracy development, psycholinguistics, cross-cultural literacy, and foreign language pedagogy. She is widely published in refereed journals and has many book chapters to her name, including two recent chapters that deal with cross-linguistic transfer of orthographic knowledge (Cambridge University Press) and writing systems and learning to read in a second language (Kluwer Academic Press). She is currently on the editorial boards of *Research in Second Language Learning*, the *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, and the *Modern Language Journal*. She has been a consultant to the Educational Testing Service and the U.S. Department of Education in the area of assessment of second language learners.

### **Gail McKoon**

Dr. McKoon is Professor of Cognition, Psychology, and Psycholinguistics at Northwestern University. Her primary research interests are in psycholinguistics, reading, human memory, and knowledge representation. She is the author or co-author of numerous articles in the *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, the *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, and others in the field. A significant number of her articles deal with comprehension and memory in the context of the processing of written text.

### **Robert S. Rueda**

Dr. Rueda is a Professor in the Rossier School of Education at the University of Southern California. His research interests center on the sociocultural basis of learning and instruction, with a focus on academic achievement (especially reading) in students in at-risk conditions, English language learners, and students with mild learning handicaps; children's acquisition and uses of literacy; and teaching/learning issues related to academic achievement in public school settings, including literacy-related assessment and instruction, educational decision making, and instructional issues related to English language learners. Much of his recent research has been funded through the Office of Educational Research and Improvement in the National Center for the Improvement of Early Reading Achievement (CIERA) and the National Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence (CREDE). His articles have appeared in journals such as the *Journal of Research in Education*, *Remedial and Special Education*, *Exceptional Children*, and the *Elementary School Journal*. Recently, in monographs and book chapters, he has collaborated with others in treating the sociocultural issues involved in the teaching of diverse learners.

**Linda S. Siegel**

Dr. Siegel is a Professor on the Faculty of Education at the University of British Columbia, where she holds the Dorothy C. Lam Chair in Special Education and is the Director of the Problem-Based Learning Program in Teacher Education. Her research interests include learning disabilities, dyslexia, attention deficit disorder, detection of children at risk for learning and behavior problems, cognitive development, and language development. She has published extensively. Recent articles have appeared in *Applied Psycholinguistics*, the *Journal of Educational Psychology*, the *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, *The Reading Teacher*, and *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*. Recent book chapters have appeared in I. Schultz (Ed.) *Handbook of Psychological Injuries*, R. J. Sternberg and L. Swerling (Eds.) *Perspective on Learning Disabilities*, and L. Ehri and J. Metsala (Eds.) *Word Recognition in Beginning Literacy*. She serves on the editorial board of the *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, the *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, the *Learning Disabilities Quarterly*, and *Dyslexia*.

**Robert E. Slavin**

Dr. Slavin is the Principal Research Scientist and Co-Director of the Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk, Johns Hopkins University. He is also Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Success for All Foundation, Baltimore. His research interests focus on the education of children at risk of failure in school, including English language learners; the development of interventions for the teaching of reading and writing; and the design and implementation of models for schoolwide reform. He has received the Charles S. Dana Award, the James Bryant Conant Award, and the Outstanding Educator Award from the Horace Mann League. His journal articles have appeared in the *American Educational Research Journal*, the *Educational Researcher*, the *Elementary School Journal*, and *Educational Leadership*. He has authored book chapters in S. Stahl and D. Hayes (Eds.) *Instructional Models in Reading*, G. J. Cizek (Ed.) *Handbook of Educational Policy*, R. J. Stevens (Ed.) *Teaching in American Schools*, and L. Elderling and P. P. M. Leseman (Eds.) *Effective Early Education*.

## **Appendix B**

### **Preliminary Research Questions**

The panel identified five domains that need to be addressed in the review synthesis. Each domain has one or two over-arching research questions as well as sub-questions. In addressing the research questions, panelists thought it was important to consider and document, to the extent feasible, the student, contextual, linguistic, and cultural variables that impact language and literacy development for ELLS and language minority children and youth.<sup>4</sup> The panel also defined literacy in terms of the following component skills: word recognition, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension, spelling, writing, metalinguistic knowledge (concepts of print, for example), and orthographic knowledge. Variables that influence literacy include: phonological awareness, cultural knowledge, background knowledge, metacognitive strategies, concepts of print, and motivation.

#### **1. Relationship Between Oracy and Literacy**

A. What is the relationship between first language oracy and second language literacy?

B. What is the relationship between second language oracy and second language literacy?

How do you define English language development?

What is the role of English language development for English-language learners learning to read in English? What should be the relationship between ESL development and the development of English literacy?

#### **2. Literacy Development**

A. What is the relationship between first and second language literacy?

What literacy components are transferred from the first language to the second?

How are these components transferred from the first language to the second?

---

<sup>4</sup> These factors include: student factors (level of first and second language proficiency, prior schooling, gender, SES, generational status, impairment, age of exposure to L2, dialect, home language use, preschool experience, family literacy levels, family education, sibling status); contextual factors (classroom, school, home, community, and societal contexts in which literacy is acquired); linguistic factors (the native and target languages involved); and cultural factors.

Is learning to read in a second language like learning to read in a first language?

B. What do we know about the development of literacy in second language learners?

What are the child, contextual, social, and cultural factors that impact the development of literacy in English-language learners and language-minority children and youth?

What are the course and rate of development that signal a child is at risk for English literacy development? What are the course and rate of development that signal proficient English literacy development?

What do we know about the reading and writing skills of successful second language readers?

### **3. Context for Literacy Development**

A. What is the range of instructional and organizational contexts for English-language learners and language minority students acquiring English?

In what ways is mainstream English reading instruction modified for English-language learners?

B. How does the relative status of the first and second languages, and the extent to which second-language learning is circumstantial versus elective, influence literacy outcomes for language-minority children?

C. How do teacher beliefs and knowledge affect literacy acquisition for English-language learners and language-minority children and youth?

### **4. Effective Instruction**

A. What do we know about the role of the primary language in the development of literacy in the second language?

Is there research that supports the use of the primary language when initial literacy instruction is in English? If language-minority students are taught in their second language, what should be the role of their first language?

What should be the language of initial literacy instruction for ELLs?

If children are taught in L1 first, at what age or stage are they ready for transition to L2?

Is there a mix of first- and second-language use that is appropriate (how the languages are arranged, time allotted for each) and if so, what is it? What is the appropriate role of L1 and L2 in each stage of literacy development?

What is the appropriate language of instruction for preschool and kindergarten children before formal literacy instruction begins?

B. What do we know about effective instruction designed to develop various components of literacy (including literacy in the content areas) in English-language learners and language-minority children and youth?

Is good English reading instruction the same for all students whether or not they are proficient in English? If not, what kinds of adaptations need to be made? To what degree can the findings from the *Report of the National Reading Panel* and *Preventing Reading Difficulties in Young Children* be generalized to English-language learners?

What classroom practices provide the most challenge and/or opportunity in teaching English learners to read in English?

If teaching in L2 initially, what are effective strategies for children with different levels of English oracy?

What strategies are effective in family literacy instruction for promoting literacy development among language-minority children and youth?

How can technology be used effectively to promote literacy in language-minority students?

If children are taught initially in their L1, what strategies increase the likelihood of a successful transition to second-language literacy?

For students who are taught in the in L2 from the beginning, what are ways to make them orally proficient in English?

What are successful strategies for promoting literacy in preschool and kindergarten children English-language learners and language-minority children and youth?

What supports are most effective in helping ELLs progress in literacy (kind of text, tutoring, special education)?

C. What types of professional development are most effective in helping teachers to develop various components of literacy (including literacy in the content areas) in English-language learners and language-minority children and youth?

What must a teacher know and be able to do to teach English reading to English-language learners?

## 5. Assessment

A. What are the best measures/methods for assessing the course and rate of development of literacy in English language learners and language minority children and youth?<sup>5</sup>

How are assessment tools designed for native English-speaking students being used with English-language learners? Are they effective in providing instructional insight? Why or why not?

The preliminary review examines qualitative, quantitative, and psychometric studies, as appropriate for each research question.

---

<sup>5</sup> Assessment is construed in terms of research needs, for informing instruction, for informing placement, and for incorporating ELLs into state assessment and accountability systems. Assessment domains include both literacy and language proficiency and assessment in English for ELLs and in first languages of groups in the U.S. with large numbers of speakers.

## **Appendix C**

### **Preliminary Parameters for Including Research Studies in the Review**

For the review of the literature to be systematic, the criteria for the search need to be clearly explicated so that the study can be replicated. The following parameters guided the researchers in their initial search of the literature:

1. Literacy includes reading and writing, as well as oral proficiency as it relates to reading and writing. It includes content knowledge if relevant to reading comprehension.
2. The preliminary focus of the work was on the acquisition of literacy in the societal language by language-minority children and youth.
3. Only the literature written in English was examined.
4. The focus was on children from age 3 to age 18, although if the study concerned adults and children it was included.
5. The researchers searched for research studies dating back to 1980.