All Theses and Dissertations

2014-11-01

Supporting Ongoing Language and Literacy Development of Adolescent English Language Learners

Jason T. Jay
Brigham Young University - Provo

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd

Part of the Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons

Supporting Ongoing Language and Literacy Development of

Adolescent English Language Learners

Jason Travis Jay

A thesis submitted to the faculty of
Brigham Young University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Masters of Arts

Michael J. Richardson, Chair
Alex Rosborough
Brad Wilcox

Department of Teacher Education

Brigham Young University

November 2014

ABSTRACT

Supporting Ongoing Language and Literacy Development of
Adolescent English Language Learners

Jason Travis Jay
Department of Teacher Education, BYU
Master of Arts

Literacy proficiency is critical for success both in and out of school; yet adolescent English language learners (ELLs) are not performing at the level of their English-speaking peers. This qualitative study focused on ways in which one successful high-school teacher facilitated literacy events as a way to provide language and literacy support for these students. The findings describe the actions of the teacher, the affordances made by these actions, and how the students took up those affordances. Teacher actions included creating a safe and comfortable atmosphere, following a routine, and participating in sharing activities. Affordances included opportunities for using vocabulary and language structures, developing and expressing ideas, and reflecting on meaning of texts. Student actions included various forms of engagement in the activities and content such as speaking up during sharing activities, showing interest in what other students had to say, and not wanting the activities to end. This study helps to inform educators of the potential of literacy events to support both language and literacy development for adolescent ELLs.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It took a great deal of effort to complete this thesis and I would be remiss to not mention the assistance of many people who supported and guided me through the process. I am thankful for a wonderfully supportive family that encouraged me every step of the way and never complained about the time I spent in class or working in my office. I am especially grateful for my wife. She never doubted me even when I believed I was not up to the task. She kept me focused and it worked! I would also like to thank my parents for their constant encouragement and their belief that I can accomplish great things.

I would like to thank my committee chair, Michael Richardson, for the many hours he spent reading and offering suggestions, and speaking with me about how to do research. His edits and advice made this project possible. Without him this paper would not be what it is.

I would also like to thank Drs. Rosborough and Wilcox for their time and counsel as part of my thesis committee. Their insights and suggestions helped guide my development as a writer and a researcher and elevated my work to a higher level. My professors offered guidance and instruction. Thanks to Dr. Young for keeping me moving, Dr. Pinnegar for giving me the opportunity to work with her and learn far more about research than many master's programs can teach, and my fellow comrades in the graduate program who challenged my ideas and helped me stretch my understanding on many occasions. I love you all and am eternally grateful for the experiences I have had and the lessons I have learned.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1: Introduction

The impact of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (2002) and the high stakes testing that followed led to rigorous and explicit approaches to teaching across subject areas and age groups. It is well documented, however, that skill-and-drill approaches to teaching and memorization of decontextualized facts are insufficient for adolescent literacy development (e.g., Alvermann, 2002; Kohn, 1999) and lead to a decline in interest in reading during middle school years (Guthrie, Alao, & Rinehart, 1997). Children in such learning environments can become disengaged and unmotivated, as evidenced by the fourth-grade slump (Chall & Jacobs, 2003). This lack of motivation and engagement limits all students' desire and ability to improve skills necessary for future success.

One of the problems facing adolescent students is that their literacy needs often go unnoticed even as their literacy skills are falling behind the changing demands of society (Alvermann, 2002). In an International Reading Association (IRA) position statement (Moore, Bean, Birdyshaw, & Rycik, 1999, p. 1), the then president, Carol Santa stated, "Adolescents [in general] are being short changed," adding that they are largely neglected by policy makers, curricula, and the public. Evidence of this is that funding for adolescent literacy programs and research has decreased in recent years. All adolescent learners are faced with this challenge but the struggle is even greater for those learning English.

English language learners (ELLs) are not only grappling with the need to learn a second language (the language of instruction), they are also simultaneously struggling to master content objectives (Goldenberg, 2012; Perkins-Gough, 2007). If these students are to succeed, they will require ongoing support for their language and literacy development. Although it is important to address the literacy needs of all adolescents, supporting ELLs is especially crucial if we want to

improve their opportunities for success in the future. However, currently there is little research regarding ELLs' motivation to learn and their engagement in and with language and content area objectives (Goldenberg, Rueda, & August, 2006). Phelps (2005) also noted a shortage of research on ELLs' literacy learning, especially with adolescent language learners. The work of Genesee, Lindholm-Leary, Saunders, & Christian (2005) and Perkins-Gough (2007) pointed out that research on ELLs has primarily been focused on elementary children, while the needs of older students have been overlooked. Goldenberg (2008) has added considerably to the body of research in this area, yet he too has acknowledged the lack of literature and has called for more research.

This call comes as the number of ELLs across the country rises to such numbers that policy makers, administrators, and educators can no longer ignore this diverse population. Data from 2002 to 2008 show a 3% increase in total student enrollment across the country, but a 7% increase in enrollment for ELLs for that same period. In addition, this growth is no longer limited to areas typically associated with non-English speakers, such as Southern California. States like Indiana, Georgia, and South Carolina have seen dramatic increases in their ELL populations, with increases upwards of 400% between 1998 and 2008 (National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition, 2011). It is estimated that by 2028, one in four students will be an English language learner, up from one in twenty in 1990, and one in nine in 2008 (Goldenberg, 2008).

With this increasing number of ELL students, it is essential that educators become aware of ways in which they might address these students' ongoing language and literacy development within particular learning contexts. This is especially necessary for adolescent learners in secondary education, where basic literacy skills might be less emphasized, responsibility among

various teachers might be diffused, and students might face a greater risk of falling through the cracks. One way of addressing the needs of these students is through teacher facilitated literacy events that take place within the context of general secondary education courses.

Literacy events were originally defined as "any occasion in which a piece of writing is integral to the nature of the participants' interaction and their interpretive processes" (Heath, 1982, p. 93), however, Barton and Hamilton (1998) expanded this description to include all "observable episodes in which literacy has a role." Examples of literacy events could include, but are not limited to, activities such as silent reading, analysis of a picture or painting, reading and discussing a text, viewing and interpreting a video, or taking notes during a lecture.

All literacy events should be viewed in light of the social interactions they entail because literacy events are, in fact, social events (Hamilton, 2000) and literacy itself always exists within social contexts (Barton & Hamilton, 2000). Kasper and Wagner (2011) posited that second language development occurs within social environments; these environments may include a variety of social, cultural, and relational influences. In secondary education contexts, the dynamics of social environments can change by the hour as students move from classroom to classroom. Thus, widely generalizable practices might not be the primary goal of research in these contexts, but rather, descriptions of practices that are responsive to immediate situations and conditions (Bullough, 2012), as well as those that take into account sociocultural influences on the learning process.

Recently there have been calls for more practitioner research that addresses the needs of the ELL population (e.g., Goldenberg, 2012). Awareness, then, of how learning processes unfold through specific literacy events within a single classroom, in ways that are responsive to sociocultural theory, could be beneficial to educators who recognize the need for interaction

between students and adaptability to various contexts. The present research focused on what we can learn about literacy events in a particular secondary education context and how a teacher used them to provide affordances for language and literacy development.

Statement of the Problem

Throughout the country, the number of students who have not yet gained proficiency in the English language is growing (Perkins-Gough, 2007). According to the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) report (2013), only 3% of ELLs were above the basic achievement level for reading by eighth grade. These students have been and continue to be at risk in public schools and other social institutions (Garcia & Cuellar, 2006). There is a growing need for research that addresses this group of students. Especially lacking is research on adolescent ELLs (Perkins-Gough, 2007; Short & Fitzsimmons, 2007) who are often ignored or neglected (Moore et al., 1999). In light of secondary education dynamics, studies that make broad generalizations about this group of learners might be less informative than local, qualitative studies equipped to address the complexity of these immediate contexts. According to Bullough (2012), such studies have the potential to "enrich and enliven the conversation about teaching, produce better, more intelligent and contextually fitting practices, and . . . probably raise test scores, to boot." (p. 335). He also argued that local studies, similar to the present study, do not attempt to make generalizable claims. Instead, they attempt to represent setting-specific approaches that improve, enrich, and redirect practice. Thus a qualitative, in-depth examination of how one high-school teacher facilitated literacy events within his classroom, can add important insights to the body of knowledge about setting-specific ELL instruction.

Statement of the Purpose

The present study focused on what we can learn about literacy events and how one successful, veteran teacher used them to effectively provide affordances for language and literacy development of adolescent ELLs. Specifically, this project examined the ways in which this teacher used texts and other mediating artifacts to facilitate literacy events that fostered language use with and between his students. This project also examined the kinds of student engagement and the learning affordances that emerged during these events. Qualitative analysis of classroom recordings was used to gain insight into part of the process by which ELLs' language and literacy skills might be developed simultaneously within literacy events and how one teacher enacted such events.

Research Questions

In this study I wanted to examine how a high-school teacher implemented literacy events and how those events supported language and literacy development. The questions for this study were:

1. What actions did this teacher take to facilitate literacy development?

2. What affordances for language and literacy were made available by these actions?

3. How did the students engage in taking up affordances for language use and literacy development in this classroom context?

Limitations

As with all research, there are limitations to this study. The first limitation is that the researcher was not present during the filming and was therefore not able to decide what would and would not be recorded and from what viewpoint. Filming took place over the course of two days in one period of a high-school English class. This filming was done previous to the

researcher being involved in the project and was originally filmed for a different purpose. Therefore, the videotaping was not done with literacy events in mind, which may have limited the observance of literacy practices.

Second, the previously recorded material offered limited classroom observations from which to choose. There was only one camera, and recorded observations took place for only two days. Multiple cameras may have given a better view of what was taking place between more students and further observations, conducted at various times during the school year or for longer durations, may have produced extra support for the findings, and may have changed how the data were interpreted.

Third, as with all qualitative research, the implications, conclusions, and applications are not generalizable as they describe only this teacher and these students. However, they can enrich and give insight about how teachers can create learning spaces wherein language and literacy affordances are made.

Finally, the data were evaluated and interpreted through the world-view of the researcher. There may be other interpretations not accounted for and/or alternate ways of understanding the data.

Definitions of Terms

Following is a list of terms and definitions. Although some of the terms may have multiple interpretations or definitions depending on a researcher's background, these are the ones used for the purpose of this study.

- English Language Learner - person who speaks a language other than English in his/her home and is not fully fluent in English (Espinosa, 2008).

- Literacy - the ability to interpret and create the signs, pictures, sounds, and other symbols required for meaning making, which includes all forms of media, both traditional and digital (Gee, 1991; Hull, Mikulecky, St. Clair, & Kerka, 2003; Livingstone, 2004; Street, 1993; Street, 2003;)

- Literacy Events - any activity in which literacy (reading, writing, speaking, listening, presenting, viewing) is integral to participation in the activity and the interpretive processes (Barton & Hamilton, 1998; Heath, 1982).

- Mediating Artifacts - external and internal tools or signs used by humans to carry out a given activity (Vygotsky, 1978).

- Zone of Proximal Development - the difference between what an individual can do without help and what he or she can do with help (Vygotsky, 1978).

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Much of what people do today involves some form of literacy. Whether using a computer, reading a book, interacting socially, filling out a form, or completing a job task, literacy is crucial to success in educational and economic endeavors (August & Shanahan, 2006). In fact, in today's world, reading and writing are required more than ever before. Advanced literacy is required not only for the work place but also for homemaking, acting as a citizen, and conducting our personal lives (Moore et al., 1999). Yet success in the many aspects of literacy can be a real challenge for adolescents, especially ELLs, since little specific emphasis is placed on literacy development after elementary school (Moje & Tysvaer, 2010). This is unfortunate because continued literacy support is exactly what many students need in order to reach the levels of proficiency required to be successful in school and prepare for future success outside of school (IRA, 2002). But what support do adolescent students need with regard to ongoing literacy development?

As digital media and electronic communication have changed, definitions of literacy have changed and expanded as well. Therefore, it is necessary to define modern uses of the term as well as how it is used for this study.

Literacy Defined

Scholars have long debated the question of what constitutes literacy (Luke, 1989). It is now understood that traditional definitions of literacy, derived from a long tradition of print, are insufficient in the 21st century. Furthermore, new literacies and digital media, such as texting, the Internet, and digital books are reshaping our view of literacy and will continue to do so as information and communication technologies change in the coming years (IRA, 2009). Any definition, from any particular period of time, could become outdated or expanded as new

literacies come into play. For example, in 1989, the Australian Council for Adult Literacy

defined literacy as the integration of listening, speaking, reading, writing, critical thinking, and

numeracy (Campbell, 1990). Gee (1991) stated that the common sense definition of literacy

included the ability to read and write, but that this definition was limited and problematic. He

therefore suggested a broader view of literacy as "[the] control of secondary uses of language"

(p. 6). This referred to the ability to go beyond the primary uses of language (i.e.,

communicating directly with those with whom you have close contact through speaking) by

using language in a secondary setting such as school, the workplace, or other social institutions.

According to him, this use of language in secondary settings would include reading and listening

(i.e., interpreting language) as well writing and speaking (i.e., creating language).

Throughout the next decade, researchers and scholars advanced and elaborated broader

definitions of literacy. The Australian Council's 2001 position statement defined literacy as,

"the ability to understand and employ printed information in daily activities, at home, at work, in

the community—to achieve one's goals, and to develop one's knowledge and potential"

(Australian Council for Adult Literacy, 2001, p. 7). Some researchers argued that there were

multiple literacies (e.g., Cervetti, Damico, & Pearson, 2006; Street, 1993; Tierney, Bond, &

Bresler, 2006) and that literacy is a social practice (e.g., Barton & Hamilton, 2000; Hamilton,

2000; Harste, 2003). These efforts greatly expanded how literacy was defined, and now, another

decade later, the literacy definition debate not only continues but is augmented due to the

emergence of new literacies, such as media literacy, digital literacy, computer literacy, Internet

literacy, informative literacy, cyber literacy, and network literacy (Livingstone, 2004).

Some scholars question whether these are, in fact, types of literacies. They have argued

that the term *literacy* should be consistent with its past usage—as a reference only to printed

material (Williams, 1985). They suggest that other terms would best describe these and other forms of media. Livingstone (2004), of the London School of Economics and Political Science did not agree. She stated that the term literacy provides a framework for all media:

> It is pan-media in that it covers the interpretation of all complex, mediated symbolic texts broadcast or published on electronic communication networks; at the same time, because historically it has been tied to particular media forms and technologies, literacy foregrounds the technological, cultural, and historical specificity of particular media as used in particular times and places. (p. 5)

Based on her definition, literacy includes any and all symbolic and material representations of knowledge, culture, and values, and the skills required to interpret and create such representations.

In other terms, literacies are the tools used for reading the world—for understanding, interpreting, and using the symbol systems of our culture (Street, 1993). These symbols include "signs, pictures, sounds . . . and the world" around us (Hull et al., 2003, p. 2) and being literate is being able to make meaning from one or a combination of these symbols (Street, 2003).

Based on these descriptions, and for the purpose of this study, I define literacy as the ability to interpret and create the signs, pictures, sounds, and other symbols required for meaning making, which include all forms of media, both traditional and digital. Therefore, students need to be taught using a variety of representational symbols and then given ample opportunity to interpret and create meaning with those symbols themselves. Although such a broad definition of literacy can open new avenues for understanding literacy, many classrooms, as well as wider cultural contexts, still heavily emphasize reading, writing, speaking, and listening. These remain foundational even as newer literacies emerge.

English Language Learners

Like any other students, ELLs have to be concerned with literacy development in order to survive and thrive in a literacy-based society (Alexander, 2005). Higher education, career choices, involvement in the political and social aspects of life, and even basic entertainment require literacy skills involving "reading, writing, understanding and interpreting, and discussing multiple texts across multiple contexts" (IRA, 2012, p. 2). Language learners who do not learn to read and write effectively will be limited in their ability to participate in society, and it is not enough to simply be around others who have already mastered these skills (August & Shanahan, 2006; Cummings, 2005; Rosborough, 2010). Adolescent ELLs not only require, they deserve ongoing language and literacy instruction.

International data indicate that elementary readers "get off to a fast start, but . . . falter during adolescence" (IRA, 2002, p. 1). This drop in performance cannot be ignored; adolescents cannot be expected to maintain high levels of literacy without ongoing expectations and support from all teachers across all disciplines (IRA, 2002). The situation is similar for students whose primary language is not English. In fact, it may be even more important for ELLs to receive high expectations and extra support since they may not have had the opportunity to develop basic literacy skills in the elementary grades, and deficiencies in their language development can limit their future ability to read, write, and make meaning.

Lack of support pushes ELL students to the sidelines, which not only limits their progress—it also affects economic competitiveness, innovation, and growth (August & Shanahan, 2006). It is crucial then that educators learn more about addressing the needs of these students who may lack the literacy and language skills necessary to fully comprehend classroom instruction. Fisher and Frey (2008) emphasized that, "Students who cannot comprehend will in

all likelihood fail to achieve in school" (p. 258). ELLs therefore are at great risk of failing unless they receive language support that improves comprehension, and literacy support that gives them the skills necessary to interpret and create the signs and symbols used for meaning making within the changing contexts of adolescence and young adulthood (e.g., secondary and post-secondary education). One way to address both the language and the literacy development of ELLs is through social interaction during literacy events.

Literacy Events

Heath (1982) coined the term *literacy event* by stating that they are moments when writing is a key component of interaction and interpretation. Barton and Hamilton (1998) extended this idea by suggesting that a literacy event is any activity that involves literacy. This broader view allows for other forms of literacy, beyond written text, to play a central role in a literacy event. These could include, but are not limited to, speech, videos, paintings, photographs, audio clips, and web resources. Examples of a literacy event could include activities such as silent reading, watching a video clip and discussing the characters, viewing paintings and photographs, or writing impressions.

Hamilton (2000) further stated that literacy events are social practices. Likewise, Kasper and Wagner (2011) wrote that second language development occurs in social environments through social interaction. Thus, the current study attempts to view language and literacy development through the lens of sociocultural theory as a way to understand how students' interactions during literacy events made affordances for such development.

Sociocultural Theory

Sociocultural theory is a theory of mental development that can trace its roots to the German scholars Hegel, Marx, and Engels (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006). However, current usage of

the theory is based primarily on the ideas of Russian psychologist L. S. Vygotsky. He posited that learning and development occur within social events where the learner interacts with other people and objects (Vygotsky, 1978). It is within such interactions that human cognition takes place (Wang, Bruce, & Hughs, 2011) and learning is created.

The central idea in sociocultural theory is mediation of the mind in forming human thought (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006; Wertsch, 1985). Vygotsky (1978) argued that humans do not interact with the world directly; instead, they interact through the use of two different systems of tools. Physical tools, like a hammer or a knife are used to interact with the physical or psychological world, and symbolic or psychological tools, such as music, numbers, art, and language are used to interact with other people within a culture (Lantolf, 2000). Vygotsky explained that mediation is the development of higher mental functions through social interactions that occur through cultural tools or artifacts. Some of the higher functions that result from mediation include voluntary attention, planning, problem solving, and learning (Lantolf, 2000). Thus a sociocultural approach to learning and development calls for social interaction through a cultural tool or mediating artifact.

Vygotsky (1986) also stated that learning and development are about making meaning, and that meaning making happens through language. Language then is a particularly important sociocultural artifact for helping ELLs in their learning. As students use language to engage with each other and the teacher in conversation about artifacts, they will not only be making meaning, but will also increase their opportunities to appropriate or acquire more language (van Lier, 2004; Vygotsky, 1986). This improved language will then increase opportunities for other types of learning since learning begins first on the social plane through words and then becomes internalized through thought. Thought is then formulated into more words in an attempt to

extend understanding and the process repeats (Vygotsky, 1986). Thus, a child's ability to learn

is enhanced through interaction with other individuals who are more fluent in the language. This

would include the teacher, other students who are more advanced, and cultural artifacts.

     A challenge in education today is that many programs designed for ELLs fail to consider

culture, identity, and the meaning making process. Thus schools are not as effective as they

could be in helping ELLs (Rosborough, 2010). A sociocultural approach could help improve the

effectiveness of instruction for ELLs because it recognizes learning as a construction between

individuals or groups of individuals (Wang, Bruce, & Hughs, 2011), and the central role of

language in this process. Sociocultural theorists view social activity, language, and other

mediating artifacts as a means of supporting higher mental functions, such as learning, therefore,

this approach may be better suited for the diverse and changing world of today (Lantolf, 2000;

Lantolf & Appel, 1994; Lantolf & Thorne, 2006; Vygotsky, 1978; Wells, 1991) especially in

regard to the multidimensional and diverse nature of classrooms containing ELLs. When viewed

through the lens of sociocultural theory, literacy events become social activities whereby

students can learn through language and other cultural artifacts how to participate in a

community and master "the tools and practices that enable one to do so effectively" (Wells,

1991, p. 9).

     The data for the present study were viewed through a sociocultural lens to provide insight

into how student interaction with the teacher and with other students during literacy events

supported language and literacy development. From a sociocultural perspective, language and

literacy development can be better understood by examining both the nature of social

interactions between students and with the teacher, and the types of tools (e.g., objects, written or

spoken texts, electronic media, gestures, visual aids, etc.) used to mediate those interactions. In

such a way, learning is coauthored through social activity as individuals become ready to form

concepts (Lantolf, 2000; Rosborough, 2010; van Lier, 2004).

Chapter 3: Method

This study focused on what we might learn from literacy events and how they provide affordances for the ongoing language and literacy development of adolescent ELLs. Specifically, this research examined carefully the way one successful teacher facilitated literacy events with his students using social interactions and mediating artifacts, and explored the ways in which these interactions and artifacts provided affordances for language and literacy development. Qualitative analysis of classroom video recordings with a focus on verbal elements of classroom interaction provided insight into how this teacher enacted literacy events, the affordances made during those events, and how students took up the affordances.

The data collection happened previously during a larger study and included teacher interviews, student interviews, classroom video recordings, and student work samples. The focus of the present study was an in-depth analysis of the video recordings of a ninth-grade English classroom that occurred over two days. A basic descriptive analysis (Merriam, 1998) was used to examine how the teacher facilitated the literacy events and the affordances made for language and literacy development, as well as how the students took up these affordances. Interviews and student work samples were not used in the present analysis.

Participants and Setting

The filming took place in a ninth-grade classroom with 17 students and one teacher, Mr. Ordonez. The teacher was selected based on the following criteria: secondary ESL placement, participation in a master's degree program for improving instruction of ELLs, and recommendation of his graduate program advisor.

Mr. Ordonez is a Hispanic male teacher with a master's degree in reading. He began teaching in the elementary grades where he became interested in literacy issues. He worked as a

mentor teacher in the area of language arts and became acquainted with Dr. Roberta Mason's work with secondary students. After a few years, Mr. Ordonez began teaching high school. Due to his success with struggling students, he was selected to teach a ninth-grade English class for struggling students (most of whom were ELLs). At the time of the videotaping, he was still teaching that course and had a total of eight years of teaching experience.

Mr. Ordonez's curriculum involved a variety of literacy events, including silent reading time, shared novel activities (partner work, small-group work, and whole-group discussion), and whole class response to reading. Mr. Ordonez provided many opportunities for students to read and talk about books. Daily silent reading allowed students to choose and read books independently and was followed by small-group discussion about their reading and an invitation to share with the whole class. In addition to these small-group literature responses, whole-group discussions of shared readings provided opportunities to discuss books and to hear language modeled by the teacher as well as other students.

The school was located in a large city in central California and drew its population from the working-class neighborhoods in the surrounding area. The students in Mr. Ordonez's classroom came from a variety of backgrounds. Some were children of migrant workers with English as their second or even third or fourth language (if they came from one of the indigenous groups of Mexico). Other students were third- and fourth-generation descendants of Hispanic immigrants and one was Caucasian. Even though not all of these students were ELLs they were all struggling with literacy issues, low socioeconomic status, and a lack of academic language spoken at home.

Data Sources

  The focus of this study was to examine video recordings of literacy events in Mr. Ordonez's class over the course of two days. On each day, the entirety of a 45-minute class period was recorded, for a total of 90 minutes. This allowed me to observe how they entered and exited the classroom as well as the activities that took place throughout the period. During small group activities, the camera focused on one group at a time, thus giving me a close-up observation of specific group interactions. Events were determined based on the following criteria: they included students interacting with each other or with the teacher; the interaction involved a mediating artifact (e.g., a picture or piece of writing); and the teacher acted as facilitator of the event by instigating and ending the event and by giving direction for how interaction should take place. For example, the teacher may have said, "Today you will be discussing the chapters you read from your books. You will need to explain what you are reading, who the characters are, and what they did in this chapter. Don't forget to share what you think of their actions." At the end of the event the teacher may say, "Now that you have had a chance to discuss your reading within your groups, are there some of you who would like to share with the whole class?"

  While viewing the data I came to the realization that delineating the start and end of a literacy event can be challenging. A variety of activities often revolve around a specific mediating artifact and thus may be construed to be part of one large literacy event. However, I distinguished different literacy events by noting when there was a change in topic or mediating artifact, or a change in the grouping of students. It was often that a change in grouping meant the start of a new event even though the class had been and continued to work with the same topic or artifact. This allowed for a series of smaller literacy events to take place within the context of a

larger literacy event involving the same topic or artifact. These smaller literacy events became the units of analysis for this study, although it is noteworthy that they often share a topic or mediating artifact and so could be considered parts of a larger event.

These data provided specific examples of how the students and the teacher interacted with each other and with mediating artifacts, within literacy events, to support language and literacy development. Basic descriptive analysis of these data examined practices that provided affordances for language and literacy development in Mr. Ordonez's class.

Data Analysis

A basic descriptive analysis (Merriam, 1998) was used to explore the two days of video recordings. I reviewed the entire data set a total of five times, each time with a different focus or purpose for viewing. Analytic memos were taken throughout the process, most of which were transferred to a matrix for easier analysis (see Appendix). During the first viewing I became familiar with the data, what was taped, who was involved, and the atmosphere of the class. The second viewing allowed me to identify a preliminarily start and end point for each literacy event. During the third viewing I refined the parameters of each literacy event by distinguishing between the larger (macro) literacy events wherein multiple smaller (micro) literacy events took place. The fourth viewing served to describe what was happening during each micro event in detail, thus describing the teacher's and students' actions and the affordances for development made available to the students. I went back to the data a fifth time to recheck for specific actions and words used by the teacher to facilitate each literacy event and specific instances where students took up the opportunities available to them. In this way, new observations were compared with previous observations and relationships and patterns were discovered (LeCompte,

Preissle, & Tesch, 1993). Such a strategy is particularly suited for the examination of social

phenomena and lived experience (Nes Ferrara, 2005).

Chapter 4: Findings

To answer the questions of this study I will first describe the teacher's actions in facilitating literacy events. Then I will explain the affordances that were made available during those events. Next, I will describe student responses to the affordances. Finally, I will briefly describe interactions that exist between various events.

Teacher Actions

Mr. Ordonez required his students to have their materials with them each day. They were responsible for remembering their packets, homework, novels, and presentation materials. He provided reminders at the end of each event as well as at the end of the period but ultimately held the students accountable. At one point, a student named Isaac told his group, "Make sure you don't lose your poems, cause then we're gonna have to rewrite them." Next, each member of the group carefully put away his or her poetry work so that it would be there the next day. These students were aware of their responsibility and helped each other remember class materials.

A second pattern that became apparent was that the teacher assured that the atmosphere of the class was safe and comfortable. He greeted students at the door at the beginning of each class as well as at the end. He spoke to them kindly and offered constant encouragement, even when students missed the point of something. For example, when the students were looking for metaphors in a poem, they often pulled out similes, but instead of just telling them they were wrong, Mr. Ordonez took the time to redefine similes and metaphors and give examples. He did this without making the students feel belittled or unintelligent.

When one boy shared a simile instead of a metaphor, Mr. Ordonez said, "That would be a simile because *like* is there, so she puts a couple of them in there, but a lot of them she didn't do that way. Does someone see another one?" He simply reiterated that similes use *like* and that

Cisneros, the author, did use a few similes then asked for another example. He restated and moved on quickly so as not to dwell on the mistake. Two other students made the same mistake and he responded in similar fashion, reminding them that similes have *like* and that they were looking for examples in which the author removed the word *like* to create a metaphor. It appeared that students were able to internalize their learning while making multiple mistakes. Mr. Ordonez did not say they needed to pay better attention or complain because he had to repeat himself. He always restated and moved forward, letting students come to an understanding at their own pace, thus scaffolding their learning.

Mr. Ordonez also created a comfortable atmosphere and encouraged participation by asking for volunteers, which will be discussed in more detail later in this paper. He set the expectation that for some activities everyone must share (e.g., events 2, 4, 8, 13, 16, 23, 25), which usually happened in small groups. Then typically after sharing in small groups students were asked to share with the whole class, which was almost entirely on a voluntary basis, thus allowing for students to share when they were comfortable with the content and the atmosphere of the class (e.g., events 3, 5, 9, 11, 17, 26, 28).

Another pattern that emerged was that Mr. Ordonez followed a routine so that the students knew what was happening, yet he was not afraid to discard the routine for a good purpose, as seen on day one, event 11. He briefly explained to the class that he was going to change the lesson plan to, "take care of what needed to be taken care of." This flexibility showed the students that their current needs were more important than prescribed lessons and that he would make adjustments as needed. For students that may be adjusting to the cultural and language nuances of a new place, this can create a sense of trust that they are cared about; that

they are being looked after. This may help explain why he also changed the year plan to allow this class to do the poetry-writing unit earlier in the year. At the start of event 9, he explained,

> There's another activity that I've done with students that I've usually waited [until] second semester, but I thought it would be good to do it now—especially since in your learning logs, and even just during your choral presentations, many of you have been writing your own poetry. . . . I've never had that with a class, that a class has been that interested in poetry, so I thought I'd bring that closer to the beginning of the year.

A final pattern that is of interest is that Mr. Ordonez made sure he was part of the sharing; that he was part of the class. He often shared personal stories, anecdotes, or connections he made and how they are part of what was being learned that day. It seemed evident that when he shared first, the students were more willing to participate, yet when he asked them to share without first sharing himself, the students participated less or not at all. An example of this was the difference between events 5 and 11. Event 5 followed a short group sharing about the prompt, "Who belongs here?" and is started by the teacher asking, "Who wants to volunteer to share?" Only two students offered comments and the event ended. However, about 30 minutes later, Mr. Ordonez decided to reopen the prompt for whole class discussion and did so by first sharing about himself.

> As a ground rule, everybody's opinion is important and we try to be understanding and good listeners and know that there's always going to be differences of opinion. I told you that my best friend and I are very different politically but we're best friends. When we have those discussions, they are great discussions and that's what it's truly all about.

Event 11 continued as a handful of students discussed their opinions, much more openly than before. It would appear that Mr. Ordonez's sharing helped the students feel more comfortable with their own participation.

For another example, during the macro event that spanned micro events 20 through 28, Mr. Ordonez introduced the work of Sandra Cisneros by talking about a poem he wrote, and previously shared, about his uncle who had recently passed away. They read a poem together as a class and then went through a series of activities in which they reread the poem silently, marked and wrote down their favorite lines, shared those lines, completed *I felt* and *I saw* sentences, shared those sentences, then made a list of traits about an important person in their own lives. Mr. Ordonez also shared traits of his uncle at this point. Throughout these events, there were two things that illustrated how the teacher's sharing might have helped the students participate more. The first was that during the sharing portion of these events, there were seven students who were eager to share their *I felt* and *I saw* sentences. The second was the energy that went into the work they were doing. During this macro event, the students seemed to be more engaged in writing and discussing than they had been during any other event over the course of the two days of videotaping.

Affordances for Language and Literacy

Throughout the analysis of the videos there were many opportunities for growth in both language and literacy. I chose the categorical labels of reading, writing, speaking, and listening to code these affordances. The next sections will describe each category and give examples of what Mr. Ordonez did to facilitate events within those categories as well as the affordances that were available to the students and how the students took up those opportunities.

Reading. Throughout the recordings, 17 affordances were made for reading growth. These affordances were divided into two categories, silent reading and oral reading. There were nine silent reading events, which included the reading of a novel on four occasions, the reading of poetry on four occasions, and the reading of vocabulary definitions on one occasion. The eight oral reading events included the reading of personal responses on five occasions, the reading of poetry on two occasions, and the oral reading of a novel by a student on one occasion.

Although each silent reading event was slightly different, the affordances provided were similar in that they offered opportunities for language and literacy development by exposing students to vocabulary and language structures. With exception of the vocabulary definitions, each event also exposed the students to various styles of language use within authentic texts (Nunan, 1988). When taken up, these affordances should help improve students' word knowledge and word recognition, which may then support further development in the areas of writing and speaking.

The two oral poetry reading events and the one oral novel reading event might have served the same purpose as silent reading events with one addition; those students who were less proficient in the language might have benefited from hearing the written language as it was read aloud. By following along, then reading aloud themselves, students not only could learn vocabulary; they could improve pronunciation, prosody, and comprehension as well.

Of these reading events, there were two types of silent readings that appeared to be particularly helpful to the students. The first was the daily silent novel reading (e.g., events 1 and 12). The students seemed to enjoy the time they had to read. They appeared to be completely engaged in the reading activity, and as will be discussed later in the speaking and

listening sections, they were eager to share their own novels as well as listen as their peers told what happened in the books they were reading.

There was evidence that Mr. Ordonez worked to make these events effective and productive activities for his students. Every day he greeted his students at the door and welcomed them as they entered the classroom. With some of the students, he reminded them that directions for silent reading were projected on the board, and that upon entering they should quietly get out their books and begin reading. Since he did this with only some of the students it appeared he might have been trying to preempt behavior problems or class disruptions. After greeting the students, Mr. Ordonez started the timer and took a seat at one of the groups to read a book of his own for the allotted time, thus modeling the behavior he expected from his students.

The second type of reading event that stood out involved a student volunteer reading aloud sections of the whole class novel (e.g., event 15). No one was obligated or pushed into reading. Mr. Ordonez had previously explained that volunteers were welcome and that if students wanted to read then they needed to put extra time and effort into practicing a section in order to be well prepared to read that section. When no student wanted to read, Mr. Ordonez did the reading himself, thus setting the example by modeling oral reading.

The offer for students to read aloud might not itself have supported language or literacy development, but when a student took up the opportunity and practiced a section; he or she was then likely to improve language and literacy abilities while rehearsing and studying the language of the passage. The more often a student did this the more benefit it would have been to him or her. Preparation for the choral reading presentations that the students did each week (events 10 and 14) served this same purpose. Students spent time each day discussing, rehearsing, and reviewing a poem that their group would present to the rest of the class on Friday. The teacher

made copies of each poem so that students could practice at home as well. By doing this activity each week, Mr. Ordonez provided students multiple exposures to language patterns and styles. This exposure could have benefited students as they attempted to use language in conversation, creative writing, or addressing prompts.

Writing. During the video recordings there were only a few writing events; there were seven events altogether, two on the first day and five on the second day. These micro events, for the most part, were embedded within three macro events. In two of the events students wrote responses to a story that was read aloud. Four other events took place during a macro event in which they were studying the poetry of Sandra Cisneros. These four events included writing their favorite lines from a poem, completing *I saw* and *I felt* sentences about the poem, writing traits of a person important to them, and finally using the sentences and list of traits to write a poem of their own. Another event included a brief discussion about the definitions to vocabulary words from their homework and the writing of one of the definitions in their own words.

These writing events, although not prolonged, provided affordances for students to improve language use as well as literacy skills. These events gave students a chance to practice written English, yet if taken up, they also gave students opportunities to develop and express ideas and thoughts as well as use new vocabulary encountered during silent reading and other class activities.

Each of the events offered affordances for students to practice writing in general and use new vocabulary, but the events that allowed for students to share their own thoughts and ideas generated greater interest as they offered more affordances for development. These events asked students to go beyond what they had read—beyond a surface level understanding—to reflect, not just on the words they read, but also on the meaning of those words and to write their thoughts in

relation to the reading event. Having just read from a text helped students have, fresh in their mind, a style of writing as an example of the structure of language. They could then formulate their own style or structure while composing written responses to the text.

It was often during these responses where students made the strongest text-to-self connections as seen in event 19 by Jamie's comment that while writing, "You could do like a text-to-self connection" or by Carlos' comment that, "You're relating yourself as a person to the way they're feeling in the book. . . . You felt a certain way and you felt in tuned." These events appeared to have helped students make connections with the stories and characters of the text, and served as tools in helping them make connections with the language and the structure of the text as well.

One of the ways that Mr. Ordonez supported students in their writing was by circulating the room to answer questions and offer suggestions to students who were struggling to write a response. Another way he supported their writing development was to have each student share his or her written work with peers. First, students shared in small groups. Then he asked if anyone would like to volunteer someone from their group to share with the whole class. By allowing students to volunteer their friends he removed the fear a student may have had of being a "show off" while at the same time motivating students to write well, since they may have to share aloud. Some students were very interested in sharing with their peers and often volunteered themselves and Mr. Ordonez always accepted their comments. Many other students were not so excited about the prospect of speaking up. Nevertheless, these students were often given opportunities to share when their peers volunteered them, which Mr. Ordonez encouraged as a tool to bring them into the conversation.

For example, at the start of event 26, Mr. Ordonez asked if there were any responses that the whole class should hear, which in his class meant students could volunteer each other. Immediately, Juan volunteered himself and another student volunteered Mateo. After their comments, Maria was prompted by a friend to volunteer. Then a student volunteered Lucas. At that point the teacher moved on for the sake of time but we still heard a couple students in the background volunteering their friends.

Speaking and listening. Examination of Mr. Ordonez's methods demonstrated that he highly valued speaking and listening as tools for mediation and learning. He made sure that every reading and writing event was coupled with a speaking-listening event. Since speaking and listening go hand in hand and can rarely be separated, Mr. Ordonez designed each event in such a way that every student had the opportunity to share his or her thoughts, ideas, and opinions while also listening to those of their peers. For small group events he required that every student take a turn sharing, yet for whole class speaking-listening events, he invited all students to share but did not make it mandatory. Although, occasionally he did ask students to volunteer another student whom they felt had something everyone should hear.

In total, there were 15 speaking-listening events; the majority (9) were events in which students shared with each other their thoughts on a prompt. These nine events took place either just before or just after the reading of a text and were focused by a prompt or question assigned by the teacher. They also had the opportunity to comment on each other's statements, although for the most part, students did not comment on others' ideas except in two instances that will be described later. The other events included two opportunities for students to share what they had read during silent reading, two discussions about definitions and examples of the words being

defined, and two informal conversations that took place while groups of students planned their poetry presentations.

The affordances made during these speaking-listening events included opportunities to express and hear ideas or opinions, a chance to hear and practice academic vocabulary and oral language structures (in both formal and informal registers), and a chance to experience and practice public speaking and communication skills. As will be seen in the following section, for some of the students, the listening portion of the event seemed crucial. Since literacy is a social practice (Barton & Hamilton, 2000) and learning occurs through social interaction (Vygotsky, 1978), speaking with and listening to other students provides opportunities to learn how to form responses to text and how to properly communicate their thoughts, ideas, and opinions.

Student Responses

It became clear through analysis of the videos that students did not take up all of the same affordances, nor did they respond the same to any given event. Some events seemed better suited to particular students at the moment, or they were possibly drawn into that event by their particular developmental needs. Regardless of the reason behind their choice to engage fully or partially, it became evident that any affordance can and will serve different purposes for different students. Thus a teacher must be ready and willing to make adjustments as he or she becomes aware of student levels of participation.

For each of the different types of literacy events, students interacted with artifacts, other students, or the teacher in various ways. Each interaction was an affordance, or an opportunity for growth and development. When a student interacts with an artifact by reading it, he or she can benefit from exposure to language structure and vocabulary. When a student writes about or speaks about an artifact, he or she can benefit from practice with language styles and

pronunciation. When a student listens to others ideas and opinions he or she is learning how to form opinions of his or her own and how to express ideas in English (Vygotsky, 1986).

Several students appeared quite willing or even eager to communicate with each other about a given artifact. Language learners can benefit greatly from speaking and listening affordances, yet their participation is necessary for such affordances to take effect. Vygotsky (1986) argued that speaking and listening are important tools for learning and thinking and that language and social development depend greatly on speaking and listening. Therefore, each speaking-listening event, which was often linked to a reading and writing event, provided a particularly strong opportunity for students to think, to learn, and to develop language, literacy, and social skills that will be important for success in and out of school. In the present study it was through speaking-listening events that it became most evident how students were taking up the available affordances for literacy development. Four examples are provided in this section: events 15, 13, 2, and 11.

Event 15. At the start of event 15, various students could be heard talking about how much they enjoyed the book. One student said, "I wanted to read it all." Isaac then explained that he read ahead because, "It was a good book." Lucas and another student were then heard asking if they could read to the class:

Lucas: Can I read?

Mr. Ordonez: Did you practice this?

Lucas: Yea.

Mr. Ordonez: You did?

Lucas: (Shakes head yes)

Sofia: Can I go up there Mr. Ordonez?

Mr. Ordonez: Lucas said he practiced it so I'm going to let him.

This speaking-listening event revealed ways in which the students were taking up a reading event. Several students were talking about how much they were enjoying their books, while two volunteered to read aloud. This only happened once during the video recordings but the fact that there were multiple students who seemed to enjoy talking about their books, and that at least two of them wanted to read aloud, demonstrated that there was a strong affordance made for both silent and oral reading. At least some of the students were taking up the opportunity and thus improving their language ability as well as their literacy skills. Mr. Ordonez had apparently established a comfortable and engaging routine for silent and oral reading as well as for talking about books. This often required modeling, encouragement, affirmation of students' capability, and setting clear expectations and attainable goals for all students.

Event 13. Event 13 took place at the beginning of day 2, just after silent reading. The teacher had established a routine wherein students in each group took turns sharing about the book he/she read that day. Some students spoke about the book in general, e.g., characters, setting, and conflict. Other students summarized particular aspects of the stories they had just read.

During this event, Juan told about a drive-by shooting in his novel where some gang members went after a new kid for no apparent reason. Miguel became interested and wanted to know more.

Miguel: Did anybody get shot?

Juan: The boy's little sister got hit in the leg and was rushed to the hospital.

Miguel: Is she okay or did she die?

Juan: No she was all right but they had to chop her leg off.

Miguel: Ohhh!

Juan: Cause they hit the bone and it couldn't recover, so that was pretty sad too.

Miguel: (pause) That is sad, you know what I mean!

Juan: Cause he came from Mexico, so he didn't know anything about the world, like you know, problems about the gangs and all that.

It was evident by the students' engagement in the conversation that both Juan and Miguel were taking up this reading affordance. They empathized with the family in the story and appeared to be saddened by the girl's plight. The retelling of this part of the story by Miguel, and Juan's response, indicate that there was high engagement during the reading event as well as during this speaking-listening event. These boys seemed very interested in their stories and effectively shared that interest with each other. This shared interest likely gave the boys a stronger desire to continue reading and sharing as a way of connecting with the thoughts, ideas, and opinions of the author, as well as those of other people, such as family and friends. Although not seen explicitly, it was evident that Mr. Ordonez had likely taken time on previous occasions to model text-to-self connections. He also likely made sure students felt comfortable speaking with each other and sharing their feelings or thoughts. Without this sense of safety and security, the sharing of such connections may not have taken place or have been as common.

Event 2. Like the previous example, event 2 demonstrated that some students did in fact take up the affordances provided from sharing about their novels. Toward the end of event 2, Mr. Ordonez joined in on a discussion and spoke with Mateo about the Harry Potter book he was reading. Before Mateo finished his comment, Lucas interrupted to interject a comment about his own book.

Lucas: Mine's interesting because there's this boy and he's interested in, like, he wants to look good for this girl, but his parents can't afford much. Like he needs braces but instead of asking his mom he tries to fix his teeth with his hands and he cuts his hair like, like the people in the magazines and it comes out all wrong and he dyed his hair purple.

Mr. Ordonez: He's a local author. Did you recognize any of the places he talked about?

Lucas: Yea.

Mr. Ordonez: I think, doesn't he talk about um,

Lucas: King's Canyon School.

Mr. Ordonez: King's Canyon and school and Dickey's playground.

Lucas: Um huh, yea.

The above example suggested that this student was highly interested in both reading the story and in sharing about it. Rather than waiting to be called on, or risk being passed over, he interjected his thoughts, and drew a supportive response out of the teacher. These activities represented the taking up of different affordances for literacy development; taken together, their effectiveness is likely enhanced.

Event 11. Leading up to this event, Mr. Ordonez asked the students to discuss, in groups, the prompt "Who Belongs Here?" He then asked for volunteers to share their opinions with the whole class. Two students, who had been arguing during the group discussion, were the only two willing to share, so the teacher moved on to a reading event. After the reading, he asked students to write their thoughts in their reading logs. He then started event 10, during which the students worked to plan their poetry presentations, which were completely unrelated to the prompt they had previously discussed or the story they had read. What was particularly noteworthy about this event was that the emotions students felt and the discussions they started

did not end simply because the teacher had moved on. Several students continued their discussion and the teacher had to decide how to respond.

Mr. Ordonez explained to the class that a teacher sometimes has to make a tough decision between following through with the lesson plan or adjusting the plan to "take care of what needs to be taken care of." He then acknowledged that the prompt elicited feelings and opinions that were affecting the students' ability to move forward and that they needed to let those feelings and opinions be spoken, heard, and responded to so they could have closure and move forward. He invited the students to bring their chairs and form a discussion circle, which marked the start of event 11. He then explained that everyone's opinion was important and that they needed to learn to be good listeners, accept differences of opinion, and try to gain an understanding of each other's views. Next he invited them to listen to each other as they expressed their opinions.

At first the students were reluctant; there was a moment of silence before Mr. Ordonez gently said, "Come on, let's be honest. Let's do it honestly instead of under our breath." With that prompting, Lucas tried to play it safe by expressing an opinion about a situation from the story they had read.

Lucas: Okay then, um I think that they shouldn't, like, judge the boy, the farm boy, for going to, for coming over here, because um, like the way he is or like understand his religion or his tribe whatever. Just because he doesn't know English does not mean anything. Instead of like being mean and rude to him they could help him out instead and they'll be good friends now instead of having to like, having hate between each other.

Sofia apparently saw Lucas' opinion as an allusion to a comment she had made during the discussion they had been carrying on before Mr. Ordonez extended their private learning to include the whole class. She returned to that conversation in this more public context suggesting

that Mr. Ordonez was successful in encouraging the students to make this an inclusive, rather than private, learning event.

> Sofia: But I never, when I said that I didn't mean for you, people to pick on them. The only thing I said was that they should know the English language, and the only reason I said that was because it would take away time from the other students in the classroom.

At this point Mr. Ordonez seemed to sense discomfort from the students and tried to mitigate by asking about their experiences with ESL classrooms in previous schools. A few students commented about their experience in ESL settings, which eventually led back to Lucas and Sofia discussing their differences of opinion.

> Maria: What about opinions Lucas? Did you have something to say to Sofia?

> Lucas: About what? (class snickers) Regarding her poem, I mean her writing?

> Sofia: What made me think about this a lot is cause my sister . . . she had the same opinion and I was thinking about it and it kind of does make sense. And like in my kindergarten year, my whole class was all spoke Spanish except for me and my teacher would speak in Spanish and I don't know Spanish and so I mean, I can see how they feel and stuff but maybe they should have a class for them. . . . My teacher um got me in trouble for not paying attention but it wasn't my fault, I didn't know the language. What did you want me to do? And I can understand where they were coming from but like, either learn the language or have a class for them or for us too to learn their language, but it's not right.

> Mr. Ordonez: Anybody else have anything they want to add to the conversation?

> Lucas: But did you think about what you were gonna say before you said anything? I mean did you think about the people that would get offended by what you said?

Sofia: It's just an opinion! It's my opinion. I shouldn't have to. You can say whatever you wanted if it was your opinion, but this is mine.

Lucas: True, about the book, but the way you said it.

Miguel: But it's her opinion, she can say what ever she wants so it is fine. She has the free will to speak to others and you don't have to agree with her.

Maria: Freedom of speech!

Miguel: But yeah its freedom of speech, you don't have to.

Maria: That's why people wanna come here, because they have the freedom of speech.

This exchange led to Lucas admitting that he might not have agreed with Sofia but that he could understand where she was coming from and why she felt as she did.

During event 11, other students chimed in occasionally to offer support for one side or the other, or to share an experience that influenced their opinions on the subject. This event provided a great opportunity for students to form opinions, use persuasive arguments, consider alternative points of view, seek and offer clarification, and decide what language structures would be most effective for these tasks. This sequence demonstrated that the teacher's initial affordance for students to practice dialogue was actively taken up by some of the students, although others chose to participate by listening.

This exchange gave students a chance to express themselves while simultaneously serving as an affordance for language development. It also provided an opportunity to practice communication skills (both speaking and listening) and practice responding appropriately to others' comments. Most of the language was in an informal register, but the style of communication was semi-formal perhaps due to how Mr. Ordonez facilitated the discussion.

This juxtaposition of informal and semi-formal registers could serve to promote learning within students' zones of development and increase opportunities to acquire more language (van Lier, 2004; Vygotsky, 1986).

It is important to note that, of the 17 students, only five took the opportunity to express themselves in this event. The other 12 students chose to remain silent. However, this does not mean that they were precluded from all affordances. If these students were attending to the conversations taking place around them they were being exposed to the language patterns, vocabulary, and communication techniques of their peers and the teacher. For language learners, such exposure typically has to happen before they can comfortably and effectively express themselves orally. Thus the opportunity was not wasted; each student took it up differently.

Interactions Between Events

It is noteworthy that none of the micro literacy events in this class happened independently. Each had connections to other events, as companion activities, within a macro event. Therefore, there were interactions within events as well as between events that possibly played a role in the language and literacy development of students. For example, the following trail of micro events demonstrated how reading, writing, speaking, and listening events interacted within the same macro event. Lucas read silently from a self-selected novel. He then spoke to his group about events in the book and answered questions about the characters. Next, he listened as other group members shared about their books. Finally, he wrote about events from the book in his reading log.

Although these may be considered separate literacy events, they came together as part of a macro event wherein students were able to improve their language and literacy skills due to the affordances being made. These affordances were not necessarily independent of each other nor

were they limited to one type of event. They were also connected through the interactions between events. It was most likely the interactions between multiple events that provided the strongest affordances. It is within these interactions that vocabulary and language structures were encountered, considered, practiced both orally and in writing, and essentially added to the overall knowledge base or schema of the student.

Summary of Findings

This qualitative study was designed to answer three questions about how one high-school teacher successfully implemented literacy events to provide affordances for language and literacy development for his students. The questions were: (a) What actions did this teacher take to facilitate literacy development? (b) What affordances for language and literacy were made available by these actions? (c) How did the students engage in taking up affordances for language use and literacy development in this classroom context?

The teacher's actions described in this paper included the following: he required students to have their materials with them each day, he created a safe and comfortable classroom atmosphere, he followed a routine that was familiar to the students but was willing to stray from the routine when needed, he participated in sharing opportunities, and he made sure that all students had multiple opportunities to share by requiring them to share within their small groups and then asking for volunteers to share with the whole class. Overall, this teacher successfully created learning spaces wherein students could explore and practice language and thus acquire more language (van Lier, 2004; Vygotsky, 1986). He recognized that learning is a construction between individuals (Wang, Bruce, & Hughs, 2011) and, like Wells (1991) said, he needed to provide many opportunities for interaction between students and with the teacher in order to support learning that would prepare students for their future.

The affordances described in this paper included opportunities for growth through reading, writing, speaking, and listening events. Silent and oral reading activities provided affordances for learning and recognizing vocabulary and language structures, and practice with pronunciation, prosody, and comprehension. Writing activities provided opportunities for students to practice written English, develop and express ideas and thoughts, use vocabulary, and move beyond text to reflect on meaning and personal connections. Speaking and listening activities were coupled with every reading and writing activity and offered affordances for students to express and hear ideas and opinions, hear and practice academic vocabulary and oral language structures, and experience and practice public speaking and communication skills. These interactions helped promote language acquisition (Kasper & Wagner, 2011) and improve literacy skills (Hamilton, 2000).

Listing all the ways in which students can take up affordances is difficult. However, there are some general ideas that can guide practice. For example, educators should keep in mind that affordances can and will serve different purposes for different students. Just as Mason (2009) argued, it is almost impossible to prescribe what all students will learn. Instead, educators should be well prepared to guide instruction within a bounded set of expectations by creating learning spaces wherein students can explore and wander, so to speak, within those bounds. When students are attending to the provided affordances they will be engaged in the activity as well as the content, which will be seen in the speaking or sharing activities and events. Students will be more inclined to share with each other and will be interested in what others have to say. They will not want the activity to end and will often be found talking about the learning event or the content of the event after it has ended.

Literacy events can be a great tool for educators to use in supporting the language and literacy development of adolescent ELLs in any content area. They can provide affordances for learning in reading, writing, speaking, and listening and can be particularly helpful if used to create spaces for learning wherein the students themselves have freedom to explore language and literacy use within a bounded framework.

Chapter 5: Discussion

The ever-growing population of adolescent English language learners is often overlooked, ignored, and neglected (e.g., Genesee et al., 2005; Perkins-Gough, 2007; Moore et al., 1999). Many of these students are not gaining proficiency in English, and are therefore at risk of failure in our schools, as well as future pursuits (August & Shanahan, 2006; Fisher & Frey, 2008; Garcia & Cuellar, 2006). In order to support ELLs, policy makers, researchers, administrators, and educators need to take a closer look at the issues surrounding English learners in our public schools, and the ways in which teachers might provide greater affordances for language and literacy growth. The purpose of this study was to examine and describe how one high-school English teacher facilitated literacy events within his classroom to effectively provide affordances for language and literacy development for English language learners.

Implications for Educators

Mr. Ordonez is a good example of a teacher who successfully engaged his students in activities, or literacy events, that supported continued language and literacy development. His process of having students read silently, write, share together in small groups, and then share with the whole class created learning spaces wherein students could be exposed to academic language as well as practice language and literacy skills with each other, and with the teacher. There are three main aspects of this study that may be valuable for educators to consider. First, observation of successful teachers can provide insight into the value of literacy events and how they may be incorporated across disciplines. Second, students may benefit from frequent exposure to language and new vocabulary. Third, many opportunities to practice language and vocabulary may support ELLs' language and literacy development.

Observing successful teachers. Educators can learn a great deal by observing successful teachers, such as Mr. Ordonez. Even when the content area or context is different, teachers will have the opportunity to examine strategies and practices that have been effective. They can then make decisions as to how those strategies and practices may be implemented within their own classrooms.

While observing, it is important to note how other teachers create safe environments, establish simple routines, and set clear expectations, as Mr. Ordonez did. These key aspects of classroom management help foster engagement and create learning spaces wherein affordances for language and literacy can be made. Observation also allows educators to examine how affordances are made available and how students respond to those affordances, which can help them identify affordances being made in their own classrooms and evaluate the quality of student responses in regard to those affordances. Having observed successful literacy events can give teachers something to which they can compare their own literacy events.

After observing how successful teachers implement literacy events, educators can examine their own curriculum and determine which texts could be read independently. They can then develop literacy events around those texts and other artifacts and determine ways of inviting student interaction and conversation about those artifacts. For example, they may want to consider writing activities that will be required and how speaking-listening opportunities may benefit ELL students by scaffolding their language and general knowledge (Vygotsky, 1986). Speaking-listening events can also help students to organize their thoughts and ideas before they attempt to express them in writing. Observing how successful teachers, like Mr. Ordonez, incorporate speaking and listening into activities could encourage educators to include them in

their own lessons, and may help clarify ways of helping students be successful in their

discussions.

Exposing students to language and vocabulary. All students, especially ELLs, benefit

from having many opportunities to hear and read the English language. Students need exposure

to new vocabulary and language structures from sources that are at or just above their current

ability level; these may include texts as well as other artifacts such as videos, pictures, audio

recordings, and speech. Independent reading, reading aloud, and reading in choral groups can

serve to expose students to language, which leads to further language development (Vygotsky,

1986). Using a variety of sources, including novels, poetry, picture books, quotes, informational

text, and other students' writings can provide a rich language environment and exposure to

various language styles and structures.

Vygotsky (1978) also argued that students should work within their zone of development.

Thus, it can be beneficial for teachers to read a text aloud before having students read it

independently, especially when the text is above the ability level of students. Time constraints

may make it difficult for teachers to read everything to their students, and students should be

expected to read on their own, but shorter texts, such as poems, short stories, or expository

passages, can be perfect for a teacher to model reading, as Mr. Ordonez did. Videos, audio

recordings, guest readers, and quest speakers can also help model language use.

Another way of exposing students to vocabulary and language is through discussion.

Educators could identify places in their curriculum that lend themselves to discussion, or adjust

the curriculum to create such opportunities. They could also be prepared to model how to

participate in a discussion by sharing their own thoughts and ideas, as Mr. Ordonez did. This can

help create a safe and comfortable environment where sharing becomes the norm.

At first, teachers may want to require students to participate in sharing activities. Dividing them into small groups can serve to support students that are afraid to share with the whole class. Higher-level students in each group can lead discussions and demonstrate speaking skills, which can scaffold the learning of other students. As students feel more comfortable sharing their own ideas, they will most likely gain confidence and strengthen their literacy abilities while learning language and vocabulary.

Practicing language and vocabulary. Coupled with exposure to language and vocabulary is using that language and vocabulary to communicate. Students should have multiple opportunities, daily, to use the language they are learning. As mentioned in the previous section, sharing activities, such as those provided by Mr. Ordonez, give students the opportunity to hear how others use language. These activities also give students a chance to use the language themselves.

Students could also be required to participate during small group discussions, and then invited to share with the whole class. To help encourage whole-class sharing, teachers could find ways of motivating students to participate. One way Mr. Ordonez did this was to ask students to volunteer classmates who shared something interesting during their small group discussion. This peer encouragement may motivate students who are less likely to share on their own. Another way he encouraged students to share was for him to share as well; often sharing first to start the discussion. This modeled how to share, while also demonstrating that the classroom was an open and safe place to share.

Another way to have students practice language and vocabulary is to have them write about their thoughts and opinions. Writing can be a great form of expression and can help students focus on what they are thinking, what they are feeling, and what they are learning. Like

Mr. Ordonez, teachers could organize literacy events in such a way that there is ample time for students to write. This writing can be done before, during, and after an activity to help students organize their thoughts and practice the language that will be used during sharing activities. Teachers could also keep in mind that students typically want to share what they have written, and could include time for sharing.

Limitations and Future Research

As with other qualitative research, the findings of the present study cannot be generalized in the way a large sample quantitative study might allow. However, studies such as this can be helpful for informing administrators, educators, and parents of some of the ways in which literacy events might be used to promote language as well as literacy development. Practitioners, in all content areas, can examine their own instruction and identify similar literacy events to the ones described in this study, consider what affordances are made, and assess how their students take up these affordances. In this way, educators can better consider their own educational processes, as well as examine end products.

More research is needed across content areas and contexts. For example, one of the limitations of this study is that only two days of recordings were collected. Follow-up studies could include longer recording periods and/or multiple classrooms. Studies focused on other content areas besides language arts could be very beneficial for showing how literacy events can be used across content areas to provide affordances for language and literacy development.

Another limitation is that the class was recorded long after the teacher had established routines and expectations. The questions arise, "How did the teacher get these students interested and engaged?" and "How did he create a safe environment for sharing?" To better understand the teacher's actions that led to interest and engagement, recordings could be made

earlier in the year when the teacher first introduced procedures for various types of events. A great deal of information could be gathered from local case studies that focus on how teachers begin the creation of an environment that promotes success.

Another variation would be to analyze follow-up recordings at a later point in the year to see if there were any changes in the patterns of interaction or changes in how the teacher facilitated the events. A final suggestion would be to analyze interview data from the teacher and students to add to the bigger picture. Interviews could answer questions about whether the teacher was aware of what he was or was not doing during each event, and whether or not the students were actively trying to improve language and literacy.

Conclusion

One key to implementing literacy events that improve language and literacy is for educators to observe how successful teachers are already incorporating such events into their curriculum. Observing successful literacy events can give educators ideas on how to create a safe, comfortable environment that encourages engagement and supports interaction between students and with the teacher.

Another key is for teachers to use text and other artifacts to provide ample exposure to language and vocabulary. Students can benefit from reading independently, orally, and chorally as well as listening to others read and speak. Sources that help provide exposure to language may include, but are not limited to, print and online texts, videos, audio recordings, and speech of other people.

A third key is for teachers to provide multiple opportunities for students to practice language and vocabulary, daily. Students could be expected to share their thoughts and ideas with peers and with the teacher both orally and in writing. A good way to start is to have

students share in small groups where they may feel more comfortable, then have volunteers share with the whole class. Teachers can encourage participation by asking students to volunteer their peers. The more students are exposed to and use language, the more language they will acquire (Vygotsky, 1986).

Overall, students can benefit from exposure to and practice with reading, writing, speaking, and listening to language and vocabulary. Teachers may want to incorporate literacy activities that include all four of these main aspects of literacy. They could create learning spaces that provide many opportunities for speaking and listening before, during, and after reading and writing. This social interaction is instrumental for supporting the ongoing language and literacy development of adolescent English language learners.

References

Alexander, P. (2005). The path to competence: A lifespan developmental perspective on

    reading. *Journal of Literacy Research, 37*, 413-436.

    doi:10.1207/s15548430jlr3704_1

Alvermann, D. E. (2002). Effective literacy instruction for adolescents. *Journal of Literacy

    Research, 34*, 189-208. doi:10.1207/s15548430jlr3402_4

August, D., & Shanahan, T. (Eds.). (2006). *Developing literacy in second-language learners:

    Report of the National Literacy Panel on Language Minority Children and Youth.*

    Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. doi:10.1017/S0272263108080182

Australian Council for Adult Literacy. (2001). *A literate Australia: A national

    position paper on the future adult literacy and numeracy needs of Australia*. Canberra:

    Australia.

Barton, D., & Hamilton, M. (1998). *Local literacies: Reading and writing in one community*.

    London, England: Routledge.

Barton, D., & Hamilton, M. (2000). Literacy practices. In D. Barton, M. Hamilton, & R. Ivanic

    (Eds.), *Situated literacies: Reading and writing in context* (pp. 7-15). New York, NY:

    Routledge.

Bullough, R. V., Jr. (2012). Against best practice: Uncertainty, outliers and local studies in

    educational research. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 38*, 343-357.

    doi:10.1080/02607476.2012.668335

Campbell, B. (1990). What is literacy? Acquiring and using literacy skills. *Aplis*, *3*, 149-

    152.

Cervetti, G., Damico, J., & Pearson, P. D. (2006). Multiple literacies, new literacies, and

      teacher education. *Theory into Practice*, *45*, 378-386. doi: 10.1207/s15430421tip4504_12

Chall, J. S. & Jacobs, V. A. (2003). The classic study on poor children's fourth-grade slump.

      American Educator, 27, 14-15.

Cummings, J. (2005). A proposal for action: Strategies for recognizing heritage language

      competence as a learning resource within the mainstream classroom. *The Modern*

      Language Journal, 89, 585-592.

Espinosa, L. M. (2008). *Challenging common myths about young English language learners.*

      (FCD Policy Brief Advancing PK-3 No. 8). New York, NY: Foundation for Child

      Development.

Fisher, D., & Frey, N. (2008). Comprehension instruction in action: The secondary classroom. In

      C. Brown & S. Parris (Eds.), *Comprehension instruction: Research-based best practices*

      (2nd ed.) (pp. 258-270). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Garcia, E. E., & Cuellar, D. (2006). Who are these linguistically and culturally diverse students?

      Teachers College Record, 108, 2220-2246.

Gee, James P. (1991). What is literacy? In C. Mitchell & K. Weiler (Eds.), *Rewriting literacy:*

      culture and the discourse of the other (pp. 3-11). New York, NY: Bergin & Garvey.

Genesee, F., Lindholm-Leary, K., Saunders, W., & Christian, D. (2005). English language

      learners in U.S. schools: An overview of research findings. *Journal of Education for*

      Students Placed at Risk, 10, 363-385.

Goldenberg, C. (2008). Teaching English language learners: What the research does—and

      does not—say. *American Educator, 32*(2), 8-23, 42-44.

Goldenberg, C. (2012). Research on English learner instruction. In M. Calderón (Ed.), Breaking

  Through: Effective instruction & assessment for reaching English learners (pp. 39-61).

  Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.

Goldenberg, C., Rueda, R., & August, D. (2006). Sociocultural influences on the literacy

  attainment of language-minority children and youth. In D. August & T. Shanahan (Eds.).

  Developing literacy in second-language learners: Report of the national literacy panel

  on language-minority children and youth (pp. 269-347). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence

  Erlbaum.

Guthrie, J. T., Alao, S., & Rinehart, J. M. (1997). Engagement in reading for young adolescents.

  Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, *40*, p. 438-446.

Hamilton, M. (2000). Expanding the new literacy studies: Using photographs to explore literacy

  as social practice. In D. Barton, M. Hamilton, & R. Ivanic (Eds.), *Situated literacies:*

  Reading and writing in context (pp. 16-34). New York, NY: Routledge.

Harste, J. C. (2003). What do we mean by literacy now. *Voices from the middle*, *10*(3), 8-12.

Heath, S. B. (1982a). What no bedtime story means: Narrative skills at home and at school.

  Language in Society, *11*, 49-76. doi.org/10.1017/s0047404500009039

Hull, G. A., Mikulecky, L., St. Clair, R., & Kerka, S. (2003). *Multiple literacies: A compilation*

  for adult educators. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University.

International Reading Association. (2002). *Supporting young adolescents' literacy learning: A*

  joint position statement of the International Reading Association and the national Middle

  School Association. Newark, DE: Author.

International Reading Association. (2009). *New literacies and 21st century technologies: A*

  position statement of the International Reading Association. Newark, DE: Author.

International Reading Association. Adolescent Literacy Committees, Adolescent Literacy Task Force. (2012). *Adolescent literacy: A position statement of the International Reading Association*. Newark, DE: Author.

Kasper, G., & Wagner, J. (2011). A conversation-analytic approach to second language acquisition. In D. Atkinson (Ed.), *Alternative approaches to second language acquisition* (pp. 117-142). London, England: Routledge.

Kohn, A. (1999). *The schools our children deserve.* Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Lantolf, J. P. (2000). Introducing sociocultural theory. In J. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 1-26). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Lantolf, J. P., & Appel, G. (Eds.). (1994). *Vygotskian approaches to second language research.* Westport, CT: Ablex.

Lantolf, J. P., & Thorne, S. (2006). *Sociocultural Theory and the genesis of second language development.* Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

LeCompte, M. D., Preissle, J., & Tesch, R. (1993). *Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research* (2nd ed.). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Livingstone, S. (2004). Media literacy and the challenge of new information and communication technologies. *The Communication Review,* 7, 3-14. doi: 10.1080/10714420490280152

Luke, C. (1989). *Pedagogy, printing, and Protestantism: The discourse on childhood*. New York, NY: State University of New York Press.

Mason, M. (Ed.). (2009). *Complexity theory and the philosophy of education.* Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). Qualitative research and case study applications in education: Revised and expanded from case study research in education. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Moje, E. B., & Tysvaer, N. (2010). *Adolescent literacy development in out-of-school time: A practitioner's guidebook.* New York, NY: Carnegie Corporation of New York.

Moore, D. W., Bean, T. W., Birdyshaw, D., & Rycik, J. A. (1999). *Adolescent literacy: A position statement for the commission of adolescent literacy of the International Reading Association.* Newark, NJ: International Reading Association.

National Assessment of Educational Progress. (2013). Nation's Report Card. Retrieved from http://nationsreportcard.gov/reading%5Fmath%5F2013/#/student-groups

National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition & Language Instruction Educational Programs. (2011). *NCELA state title III information system*. Retrieved from http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/t3sis

Nes Ferrara, S. L. (2005). Reading fluency and self-efficacy: A case study. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, *52*, 215–231. doi:10.1080/10349120500252858

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, P.L. 107-110, 20 U.S.C. (2002).

Nunan, D. (1988). *The learner-centered curriculum: A study in second language teaching.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Perkins-Gough, D. (2007). Focus on adolescent English language learners [Special report]. *Educational Leadership, 64*(6), 90-91.

Phelps, S. (2005). *Ten years of research on adolescent literacy: A review*. Naperville, IL: Learning Point Associates.

Rosborough, A. A. (2010). *Gesture as an act of meaning-making: An eco-social perspective of a sheltered-English second grade classroom* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.library.unlv.edu/thesesdissertations/748

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.* New York, NY: Alliance for Excellent Education.

Street, B. (Ed.) (1993). *Cross-cultural approaches to literacy*. London, England: Cambridge University Press.

Street, B. (2003). What's "new" in new literacy studies? Critical approaches to literacy in theory and practice. *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, *5*, 77-91.

Tierney, R. J., Bond, E., & Bresler, J. (2006). Examining literate lives as students engage with multiple literacies. *Theory into Practice*, *45*, 359-367.
doi: 10.1207/s15430421tip4504_10

van Lier, L. (2004). *The ecology and semiotics of language learning: A sociocultural perspective.* Boston, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in Society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1986). *Thought and language.* Cambridge, England: MIT Press.

Wang, L., Bruce, C., & Hughes, H. (2011). Sociocultural theories and their application in information literacy research and education. *Australian Academic & Research Libraries, 42*, 296-308. doi:10.1080/00048623.2011.10722242

Wells, G. (1991). Dialogic inquiry in education: Building on the legacy of Vygotsky. In C.D.

    Lee and P. Smagorinsky (Eds.) *Vygotskian perspectives on literacy research.* New York,

    NY: Cambridge University Press.

Wertsch, J. (1985). *Vygotsky and the social formation of mind.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard

    University Press.

Williams, R. (1985). *Keywords: A vocabulary of culture and society* (Rev. ed.). New York, NY:

    Oxford University Press.

Appendix

Sample Analysis Chart for Literacy Events

Event	Time	Grouping	Description of Event	Teacher Actions	Affordances: R=Reading, W=Writing, S=Speaking, L=Listening	Student Actions
1	0:00-0:50	Individual	Students read novels silently	Established routine previously; greets students at the door and shakes their hand; tells some students they will be reading when they come in; posts directions on overhead, walk in quietly, find a book to read, make sure to document how many pages you are reading and be prepared to talk about it; sits with a group and reads silently as well; plays light classical music	R- Exposure to written language; opportunity to choose literature to explore; vocabulary/new word exposure	Read silently, there appears to be total engagement
2	0:50-3:40	Small Group	Students share about novel with their groups	Tells students to share with their group, what was their novel about, who are the characters, what happened in the novel during today's reading; circulates to hear what they are saying; asks one student about Harry Potter book/movie; another student interrupts and the teacher listens and responds to the student; has students fill in reading log and get out vocabulary home work	L- Listening to other's comments and questions (new words) S- Share comments and questions, use new words from the novel	Each student takes a minute or two to share about their book while the others in the group listen quietly. Mateo shares briefly with teacher until Lucas interrupts to talk about his book, says that "his is interesting because…"; they record what they read in their reading logs

3	4:35-8:23	Whole Class	Teacher reviews vocabulary homework	Tells students to use their own words to explain what it means to put "full" at the end of a word; gives them time to write; directs them to #1 of the fill in the blank questions and asks what they wrote, student volunteers incorrect answer so he asks if anyone put anything else, another student's answer is partly correct so teacher suggests the correct answer and they discuss why it is the best answer; goes over last questions with them; tells them to finish writing and turn in home work	R- Read vocabulary W- Write definitions for vocabulary S- Share definitions L- Listen to others definitions and teacher's explanation	Students completed worksheet at home. During review they write, in their own words, what "full" means when added to a word, Jamie offers the wrong answer, other students give a better answer but quite correct. Jamie answers the next three answers as well, then various students answer the last ones in unison; at the end we see the students finish writing what "full" means
4	8:24-12:48	Small Group	Groups discuss prompt "Who Belongs Here?"	Explains that they will work on the last vignette for "The Circuit" and discuss the thought of the week, "Who Belongs Here?"; posts deep thought on door and overhead; tells them to "talk at your groups"; says he will be coming by looking for volunteers to read passages; appears to intercede quietly when students from different groups are arguing across the room; helps get a group of girls talking	S- Practice social language (vocab) and communication skills; sharing of ideas and opinions L- Listening to ideas and opinions of others	Isaac, Carols, and Alejandro take turns sharing their opinion about the prompt; Sofia and Miguel are arguing across groups; Vanessa, Paula, and Julia share then explain to the camera what the blue sheet is for and that English class is for sharing deep thoughts
5	12:48-14:05	Whole Class	Volunteers share thoughts about prompt	Opens discussion to the whole class asking for volunteers to share; acknowledges a student who says he was first to share by allowing him to share first; allows a girl to share (these are the two that were arguing earlier); asks for other volunteers and waits 5 seconds then moves on	S- Practice public speaking, practice vocabulary/new words L- Listen to language of others	Miguel calls out first, some girls volunteer Sofia, Miguel says he was first then shares; Sofia (hesitantly) shares her thoughts after some prompting from the teacher

6	14:06-26:23	Whole Class	Teacher reads "Who Belongs Here?" out loud	Explains passages that were passed out, students will read their passage when he puts it on the overhead during the vignette; introduces book, "Who Belongs Here?" and starts reading; changes overheads 10 times during story and pauses while a different student reads each passage aloud	L- Read aloud offers exposure to language as well as someone's ideas on the topic; vocabulary exposure	Erik, Miguel, Jamie, Sofia, Maria, Lucas, Julia, Daniela, Paula, and Vanessa volunteered to read a passage aloud when it comes up in the story
7	26:24-30:55	Individual	Students write a response to the prompt/ book	Asks them to get out their binders and write a response to the book he just read and or the prompt in general; sets timer	W- Practice writing (doesn't have to be academic), sharing of ideas and opinions through writing; practice using vocabulary/new words	Students write response to book prompt; Miguel says, "I'm writing a response to the literature that we just read…"; Lucas says he is "writing about the book and how it was and what I thought about it…he wants to hear my opinion about what I thought"; Julia says that she is writing her opinion because it help with vocabulary and to learn more about what is happening also states that the teacher has them write because some students aren't comfortable sharing out loud, when asked how it helps her thinking she says she doesn't know; Alejandro says he likes to write and that it is hard sometimes but easy when you have a lot of thoughts to write down; some students seem to be writing faster and more deliberately than others

| 8 | 30:56-33:30 | Small Group | Students share responses with their group | Asks student to share responses with their group starting with the person with the darkest pants | R- Oral reading L- Listening to other's ideas and opinions S- Voicing your opinion; practice vocabulary/new words | Alejandro, Carlos, and Isaac read their written responses with each other; other students are sharing in their groups as well |
| 9 | 33:31-35:44 | Whole Class | Volunteers share responses with the class | Asks students to volunteer someone who had an amazing response or volunteer themselves; acknowledges that Jose was volunteered; volunteers Ernesto doesn't finish responding because he laughs instead; encourages volunteers and volunteering of others, asks "anyone else?" and "who else wants to share?"; collects papers | R- Oral reading L- Listening to other's ideas and opinions S- Voicing your opinion; practice vocabulary/new words | Sofia's group tries to volunteer her again; Juan is volunteered by his friends and reads his response; Elias is volunteered by the teacher and reads some but starts laughing and doesn't finish; Carlos reads his response; no one else volunteers |

| 10 | 37:13-43:54 | Small Group | Groups plan for Friday's poetry presentation (Coral Reading) | Gives direction on how long they have to work (7min) sets timer and reminds them of presentation date; warns them to choose groups wisely because of what happened last week; put list of what to do is on the board; circulates to answer questions and give feedback; tells a group they need to choose something contemporary; tells another group which poem from the book they are using is his favorite, asks about their choice of poem; listens to a group talking about the prompt and feeling attacked because of their opinion, a girls says you should change because someone disagrees with you and he reminds them of a previous thought of the week "it is better to stand alone with what you believe is right than go along with what's wrong" says that we all form our own opinions but the important thing is communication; tells them to mark their chosen poems and put everyone's name on the paper before returning to their seats | S- Working/ communicating/ planning together, discussing text R- Exposure to poetry and new vocabulary reading | Miguel and Erik explain that they chose this group because they work well together; Vanessa explains that they chose their group because they had never worked together before and they try to choose different people says that it was hard to present at first but now it is easier; Ian says that poetry is good because it is a way to express yourself; Lucas asks about doing a Shel Silverstein poem; Daniela, Jamie, Maria and Sofia are still discussing the prompt instead of working on their poem, Sofia is upset that others don't agree with her opinion, Jamie tries multiple time to get the group back on track but Maria and Sofia keep talking about the prompt; we see a group of boys starting work on the computer |

| 11 | 44:20-54:58 | Whole Class | Class discussion about the prompt | Explains that this is one of those moments when a teacher has to decide whether to stick to the lesson plan or take care of what needs to be taken care of, says they know him well enough to know that he takes care of what needs taking care of so he invites them all to grab a chair and form a circle; explains that the book and prompt elicited feelings and opinions and they can't move on until students can say what they want to say about it; explains that a ground rule is that everybody's opinion is important and that they need to be understanding and good listeners and accept that there will be differences of opinion; shares an example of a close friend who disagrees with him politically but they still talk about it and agree to disagree; tells them to be honest about how they feel and that this isn't about attacking, part of being educated is listening to other opinions; Says that a student feels like they are against her and they can't move forward as a community of learners; says, "Come on lets be honest" Lets do it honestly instead of under our breath"; after a minute he asks a question about how their schools handled ESL classes; asks "anybody else?" and "anybody else have anything they want to add?" both questions | S- Practice social language (vocab) and communication skills; sharing of ideas and opinions L-Listening to ideas and opinions of others | Students are reluctant at first to share, some mumble under their breath; Lucas expresses his opinion about the situation with the boy in the book; Sofia defends her statement that people should know English before the come to the U.S. which seems to make everyone uncomfortable; after prompting from the teacher, Jamie, Lucas, and Maria share about their experience in middle school with less proficient language learners; Maria asks Lucas if he has something to say about Sofia's comment, he says "about what? (everyone chuckles) Regarding her poem?"; Sofia shares that her opinion is based on what her sister thinks due to experiences she had as well as her own experience in an ESL class where the teacher spoke only Spanish yet Sofia doesn't know Spanish; Lucas asks Sofia if she thought about her comment before sharing it so that she didn't offend others; Sofia says it is her opinion and is entitled to it regardless; he says its true but the way she said it; Miguel cuts him off to reiterate that it is her opinion and can say it if she wants and you don't |

				elicited another response; when asked, he shares his thoughts without taking sides then thanks everyone for sharing and tells them to return to seats and get packed up		have to agree; Sofia gives example of football teams; Sofia asks if anyone agrees with her, some raise their hands; Miguel asks about those who didn't raise their hands, "are you in the middle?" many indicate they are in the middle; Lucas asks what the teacher thinks
12	0:00-2:30	Individual	Silent reading of self-selected novels	Established routine previously; greets students at the door and shakes their hand; tells some students they will be reading when they come in; posts directions on overhead-walk in quietly, find a book to read, make sure to document how many pages you are reading and be prepared to talk about it; starts timer; conferences with a student about choosing a new book; plays light classical music	R- Exposure to written language; opportunity to choose literature to explore; vocabulary/new word exposure	Read silently, there appears to be total engagement; one student asks the teacher for book suggestions
13	2:30-4:50	Small Group	Students share about novel with their groups	Tells students to share with their group, what was their novel about, who are the characters, what happened in the novel; starts timer; asks them to turn in their Homework (literature logs)	L- Listening to other's comments and questions (new words) S- Share comments and questions, use new words from the novel	Students take turns sharing; Juan tells about a part of his book where a girl gets shot in the leg; Miguel asks questions and empathizes with the character in the book; both boys show emotion connected to the story; Miguel tells about his book; Juan asks a follow up question; all students fill in literature logs, Miguel explains literature logs

| 14 | 7:00-14:00 | Small Group | Groups practice/ prepare for poetry presenta-tion | Provides copies of poems for students; explains they have 7min to work; reminds of presentation date; circulates to answer questions and give feedback (with one group he suggests putting initials of the readers before each line, with another group he finds he copied the wrong poem and helps them figure out how to deal with it, with another he explains that the poem will need some background before reading it and gives references where to find it and defines "ode", in another he explains the use of old slang in a poem | S- Working/ communicating/ planning together, discussing text R- Exposure to poetry and new vocabulary reading | Juan and Erik explain how they do poetry presentations and they are fun because they can do whatever they want including putting it to music; Juan, Erik, Miguel, and Elias at the computer discussing whether to add the text of the poem to the PowerPoint; Sofia, Jamie, Maria, and Daniela complain that the teacher made copies of the wrong poem but agree that they should just write the correct poem on the back; Lucas explains that Mateo is going to do his own poem so they aren't working together; gets help knowing what "ode " means and listens to suggestion by teacher and thanks him; Isaac, Carlos, and Alejandro ask teacher for some help with their poem, then we hear them reading it aloud; Isaac tells the others to not lose their poems |
| 15 | 15:00-17:44 | Whole Class | A student reads out loud from "The Circuit" | Asks "Who read ahead in "The Circuit?"; Allows students to answer; Directs them to page and allows a student to read out loud to the class after asking if he had practiced that chapter the night before to prepare to read out loud | L- Read aloud offers exposure to language as well as someone's ideas on the topic; vocabulary exposure R- oral reading for volunteer | We hear various students talking about reading ahead, one student? says he read ahead because it was a good book; Lucas asks if he can read out loud to the class then reads out loud, another student is heard volunteering to read as well |

16	17:44-19:48	Small Group	Students discuss a question posed by the teacher	Asks the class why the characters of the story are excited to live in the camp? Tells them to discuss their responses with their groups	S- Practice social language (vocab) and communication skills; sharing of ideas and opinions L-Listening to ideas and opinions of others	Paula says "because he has friends there..."then asks Vanessa what she thinks; Vanessa agrees then asks Julia what she thinks; Julia agrees also
17	19:50-21:20	Whole Class	Volunteers share their thoughts with the class	Asks for volunteers or to volunteer someone; prompts for more volunteers; shares his thoughts	S- Practice public speaking, practice vocabulary/new words L- Listen to language of others	Lucas, Miguel, and Maria share their thoughts about the question
18	21:20-22:44	Individual	Students read silently from "The Circuit"	Grades reading logs	R- Exposure to written language/ new words	Maria complains quietly to herself about having to read silently; tells camera that she already read this last year; Sofia says to teacher "I thought you were going to read it?"; students read silently
19	22:44-27:04	Individual	Students write in reading logs	Instructs students to write in reading log; sets timer, collects logs	W- Practice writing (doesn't have to be academic), sharing of ideas and opinions through writing; practice using vocabulary/ new words	They write in reading logs; Elias says they are writing about what they just read, describing characters; Daniela says they are writing so they can get better at writing, says teacher grades based on whether they wrote better; Carlos says teacher grades on details included and whether you put yourself into the book; Jamie says that the purpose of the writing is so show their understanding as well as connecting the text to self, she relates to them because she moved around a lot as a kid; we see students writing in their log

20	27:44-30:15	Whole Class	Teacher reads "Abuelito Who?" poem	Passes out packet; introduces author; talks about a poem he wrote about a family member who has recently passed away; explains that he usually does this unit later in the year but they have been really interested in writing poetry so he is moving the unit up; tells students to think about someone special in their life as he reads; reads poem while a picture of his uncle is on the projector	L- Read aloud offers exposure to language as well as someone's ideas on the topic; vocabulary exposure	While teacher is passing out packet on Sandra Cisneros we hear some boys talking about the pronunciation of her name; Listen quietly to the poem
21	30:17-31:24	Individual	Students read poem silently and mark favorite line	Asks them to reread the poem silently and mark their favorite line	R- Exposure to written language/ new words	They read silently, choose their favorite line and underline it
22	31:31-32:03	Individual	Students write favorite line in their packet	Asks them to write their favorite line on the lines provided in the packet	W- Practice writing; vocabulary/new words	They write their favorite lines on the lines provided in the packet
23	32:17-33:17	Whole Class	Students read favorite line aloud	Tells students to read their favorite line stating that it doesn't matter if someone else has read the same lines, there are always repeats and it is okay; shares his favorite line	R- Oral reading	Each student takes a turn reading their favorite line out loud; we hear a student whispering her line to practice it
24	33:17-33:58	Individual	Students complete I saw/I felt prompts	Explains how to complete the I saw/I felt sentences	W- Practice writing (doesn't have to be academic), sharing of ideas and opinions through writing; practice using vocabulary/ new words	They complete I saw/I felt sentences based on what they saw or felt when they read their favorite line

25	33:58-34:50	Small Group	Student share I saw/I felt	Tells them to share in their groups what they wrote for the I saw/I felt sentences	R- Oral reading L- Listening to other's ideas and opinions S- Voicing your opinion; practice vocabulary/new words	Isaac says he was happy because the Grandpa will always love the girl; Alejandro says he felt sad because she was crying for Grandpa; Carlos says Grandpa will always love her
26	34:50-37:00	Whole Class	Volunteers share I saw/I felt aloud	Asks if there are any responses that the whole class should hear? Asks for more volunteers between reach response; ends by explaining that poetry like this can create images in our heads and can make us feel things	R- Oral reading L- Listening to other's ideas and opinions S- Voicing your opinion; practice vocabulary/new words	Miguel volunteers Juan then Juan reads his I saw; Lucas volunteers Mateo; when the teacher asks who heard a good I felt, Jamie and Sofia point to Maria who then shares; Lucas volunteers his I felt
27	37:04-41:40	Individual	Students write a list of traits for an important person	Has them look at #4 in their packet, think about a person who means a lot and who they would like to write a poem about; explains that a celebrity is not a good choice, it has to be a human; gives examples of traits of his uncle; asks them to fill in traits for the person they choose; circulates, rereads examples to a student and says they can be abstract traits like loving or friendly, helps a girl decide how to do traits for a sibling that died at birth, helps a student come up with traits for his dad	W- Practice writing; vocabulary/new words	Lucas asks for help, what to put?; Julia is having trouble; Paula asks if it has to be someone that died; Alejandro get some suggestions on using abstract terms; Miguel says that he wrote cats because his grandpa hates cats
28	41:40-44:50	Whole Class	Discuss examples of metaphors in poem	Explains how to make attribute list a poem; refers to part 6 where it explains metaphors use instead of similes; asks them to find examples of metaphors, they share what they find and he affirms if correct and explains why if they are wrong	R- Identifying metaphors S- Discussing metaphors L- listening to teacher explanations	Students volunteer examples of metaphors but sometimes share similes instead