

## **Why Essential Learning Systems (ELS) Works for L2 Students (English-Language Learners)**

*Why ELS Works: Its Scientific, Theoretical, and Evaluation Research Base* (2005) documents that the content, lesson design, instructional strategies, and implementation features of *Essential Learning Systems* are solidly grounded in research. Some schools have requested the specific evidence that the program works for a particular subgroup, such as English-language learners. The research findings in this document provide that documentation. It, therefore, is a supplement to the original research paper. Readers will note that the research makes it clear that *the developmental path for learning to read is the same for all learners*. There are variables that make it necessary to provide more emphasis and/or more practice/repetition in certain areas, based on the individual needs of learners. For instance, for dyslexics, there are major emphases on phonological awareness and spelling, as well as fluency. For English-language learners, the emphases are phonemic awareness in English, vocabulary development, and fluency. Readers are reminded that English-language learners frequently also struggle in mathematics. The research grounding of CEI's *Mathematical Learning Systems (MLS)* as it relates to teaching these students is found in *Why MLS Works: Its Scientific, Theoretical, and Evaluation Research Base* (chapters II and IV).

### **Content—Letter Recognition**

<b>Researcher(s)</b>	<b>Findings/Conclusions</b>
Jones, 1996, p. 2	"Reading and writing are both dependent upon an individual's ability to form and/or recognize letters of the alphabet and to understand how they are grouped together to make words."
Jones, 1996, p. 11	"A mastery of the alphabet is basic to reading because every aspect of reading is dependent upon speech and accuracy of letter perception. The names of the alphabet letters (and particularly vowels) also provide phonological clues."
Southwest Educational Development Lab, p. 17	"To be fluent at recognizing letters, students need to be familiar with the distinctive features of each letter."
Shanahan & Beck, 2006, p. 425	"There is evidence that approaches to phonemic awareness that include letter-sound associations are more effective than those that are only speech based (Adams, Foorman, Lundberg, & Beeler, 1998; National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 2000; Oudeans, 1003). Instruction in phonemic awareness, accompanied by the teaching of written letters . . . may be considered part of phonics instruction because phonics involves knowledge of the relationship between phonemes and their written representations."
Lesaux with Koda, Siegel, & Shanahan, 2006, p. 82	"In the aggregate, it is possible to conclude that, as with monolingual English-speaking children, word awareness, letter knowledge, and phonemic awareness are predictors of the word identification and reading fluency skills of language-minority students."

Researcher(s)	Findings/Conclusions
Lesaux with Koda, Siegel, & Shanahan, 2006, p. 83	"It appears that having an alphabetically transparent language as a first language and acquiring some reading skills in that language may facilitate the acquisition of second-language decoding skills. Instruction that emphasizes the development of phonological awareness and stress systematic phonics instruction in the second language may also help develop word reading skills. . . . In general, available evidence indicates that word recognition and pseudoword reading may be equivalent skills for language-minority children and native speakers."
Lesaux & Geba, 2006, pp. 54-55	"It is critical in reading instruction to ensure that children have the opportunity to integrate learning the code (by developing skills in phonological awareness, letter knowledge, phoneme-grapheme relationships, spelling rules, fluency) with learning all that is necessary to read for meaning (by developing skills in vocabulary, world knowledge, discourse structure, comprehension strategies, purposes for reading)."
Burt, Peyton, & Adams, 2003, p.11	"Learners who are literate in a language with a non-Roman alphabetic script have the advantage of an alphabetic literacy background, but they may struggle to find words in the dictionary and may need time to process written materials presented in class because the L1 orthography is different from that of English."
Hossein & Geva, 1999, p. 261	"These results suggest that, while speed of letter naming is not directly associated with reading comprehension in experienced adult L2 readers, it is related to the linguistic components of L2 reading, including lexical and syntactic knowledge."

### Content—Phonemic Awareness and Phonics

Researcher(s)	Findings/Conclusions
Stuart, 1995, p. 287	"In 90% of cases, the source of reading comprehension problems is poor word recognition skills."
Meschyan & Hernandez (2004), pp. 74-75	"The ability to construct accurate and distinct short-term phonological representation of unfamiliar speech sounds predicts vocabulary learning. Once children construct more long-term phonological and semantic representations, vocabulary knowledge itself begins to mediate the learning of new words."
Meschyan & Hernandez (2004), p. 77.	"The ability to repeat aloud unfamiliar sound forms. . . accurately has been consistently found to predict native language learning. Therefore, it is feasible that this ability can also play a predictive role in L2 [second language] learning. In fact, several researchers have implicated good phonological or phonological-orthographic abilities in L2 learning success."
Meschyan & Hernandez (2004), pp. 77-78.	"When knowledge of L2 Phonology is limited, the ability to represent the speech sounds of the target language accurately is a preexisting ability that can facilitate and expedite L2 acquisition. Good phonological ability is a facilitator of higher level L2 abilities, such as vocabulary knowledge and reading comprehension. Individuals with below-average phonological abilities are not prevented from learning an L2; however, their journey to L2 learning may be longer and more arduous, requiring more exposures to the novel language before long-term learning takes place."
Hossein & Geva, 1999, p. 242	"Many L1 reading researchers conceptualize reading as a complex information processing operation, which draws on many subcomponent processes, any of which can be a potential source of individual difference in reading. In this view, efficient lower level visual and graphophonic skills are considered an integral component of fluent reading. It is this efficient lower-level processing that allows the limited capacity system to be devoted to processing higher order information during reading comprehension."
Hossein & Geva, 1999, p. 242	"A number of L1-based studies . . . have shown that phonological processing skill is a potent force in word-identification processes and reading comprehension even in adult skilled reading."
Hossein & Geva, 1999, p. 242	"Coltheart et al. (1988) showed that both children and adult readers use phonological information to a significant degree when reading for meaning."
Burt, Peyton, & Adams, 2003, p. 12	"In fact, all English language learners, regardless of the type of L1 literacy in their background, need direct teaching in the English symbol system and English-sound symbol correspondences (Strucker, 2002)."
National Reading Panel, 2000, pp. 2-5.	"PA [phonemic awareness] instruction helped all types of children improve their reading, including normally developing readers, children at risk for future reading problems, disabled readers, preschoolers, kindergartners, 1st grades, children in 2 <sup>nd</sup> through 6 <sup>th</sup> grades (most of whom were disabled readers), children across various SES levels, and children learning to read in English as well as in other languages."
Troia, 2004, p. 271	"Phonological processing is critical for the development of proficient literacy skills, principally because alphabetic orthographies encode lexical entries more or less at the level of the phoneme, the smallest segment of a spoken language's phonological structure that cues meaningful differences between words."
Bruer, 1993, p. 189	"Children who can't recognize words automatically can get permanently stuck at the decoding level and may never realize or learn that the goal of reading is to construct meaning."

Researcher(s)	Findings/Conclusions
Barone, 1998, pp. 62-63	<p>“Children learning to read and write in a second language face additional challenges. . . . The first of these is that they need to learn to manipulate the symbols of a new language. This involves learning to encode and decode these symbols and their combinations for understanding and expressing ideas in reading and writing. Second, students need to learn to transfer their ideas from one language to another. Here students are becoming facile with the phonetic, syntactic, and semantic systems of a new language. The third task involves the transfer of thinking and conceptualization in a first language to a second language. This can only happen when a student acquires a large vocabulary and an understanding of the structure of a second language.”</p>
Hossein & Geva, 1999, p. 243	<p>“Hayes and Carr (1990) argued that basic language processing skills are necessary for an adequate development of L2 reading, and that a deficiency at lower-level visual and graphophone processing might negatively influence L2 reading efficiency. In a study of Chinese college-level ESL learners, these researchers found that knowledge of orthographic rules in ESL reading is as important for ESL learners of Chinese as it is for L1 readers. Koda (1992) found that efficiency in lower-level processing contributed significantly to comprehending connected texts (paragraph comprehension) and reading isolated sentences in Japanese L2 readers.”</p>
Hossein & Geva, 1999, p. 243	<p>“In general, the role of phonological processing as an essential factor for word recognition and reading comprehension has been firmly established in the L1 reading literature.”</p>
Hossein & Geva, 1999, p. 260	<p>“The present research on ESL reading by Farsi native speakers resulted in a number of important findings concerning the role of different language processing skills in adult advanced ESL reading. The results of the correlational analyses revealed that both speed and accuracy on L2 phonological, orthographic, syntactic, and semantic measures correlate significantly with each other and with various indices of L2 reading proficiency. Furthermore, the results of the hierarchical regressions indicated that efficient lower level phonological and orthographic processing skills as well as higher level syntactic and semantic skills contribute significantly to various indices of ESL reading.”</p>
Hossein & Geva, 1999, p. 260	<p>“Efficiency in orthographic processing was found to contribute uniquely to ESL reading comprehension, silent reading rate, and single word reading over and above the contribution made by higher level syntactic and semantic processing, although in the case of single word recognition the contribution failed to reach statistical significance.”</p>
Francis, Rivera, et al., 2006b, p. 21	<p>“As with other dimensions of academic achievement, adolescent newcomers are likely to vary considerably in their preparation for and progress in acquiring word-reading skills. Although newcomers with well-developed literacy skills in their native language are likely to make faster progress in reading than those students with limited or interrupted formal schooling, any newcomer who lacks the ability to decode words requires targeted, systematic intervention in phonics in order to benefit from higher-level reading comprehension instruction.”</p>

Researcher(s)	Findings/Conclusions
Francis, Rivera, et al., 2006b, p. 22	"Effective interventions for adolescents who struggle to decode words are similar to those found to be effective with younger children in that they provide systematic and explicit instruction in the code of English reading. . . . These interventions are characterized by explicit instruction in letter-sound correspondence in English, including phonics instruction, and instruction to build fluency. More comprehensive interventions also include attention to the development of comprehension and vocabulary skills."
UTRLA & TEA, 2001, p. 9	"Hearing the sounds and expressions used in reading English text may alert English-language learners to intonation patterns that may differ from those of their home language."
CAELA, 2004, p. 1	"Phonics instruction works because it teaches readers the predictable patterns of sounds and symbols produced in the English language."
Burt, Peyton, & Van Duzer, Mar. 2005, p. 2.	"Truly knowing a word includes knowing its pronunciation, spelling, morphological and syntactic properties, and multiple meanings; the contexts in which the word can be used; the frequency with which it is used; and its collocates, or how it combines with other words."
Jones, 1996, pp. 1-2	"There are compelling reasons for integrating phonics into the adult education ESL curriculum, as has been done in American primary school education. As English spelling is morphophonemic, understanding how phonemes are represented by single letters as well as spelling patterns can assist in the development of basic ESL literacy. The adult ESL student has the analytical capability to understand phoneme-grapheme relationships and can be taught how to utilize any transferable L1 literacy skills in the acquisition of English spelling."
Jones, 1996, p. 11	"Letters do correspond to sounds some of the time so that phonics instruction is very helpful in mastering the numerous English words whose spelling is based upon grapheme-phoneme correspondences."
Jones, 1996, p. 15	". . . phonics plays a more important role in spelling than in reading, for phonics assists an individual in writing down the sounds he hears. Without phonics he would simply have to rely heavily on memorization. From the perspective of both reading and writing, phonics instruction can be crucial to any individual with emergent ESL literacy for English in an alphabetic language in which there are consistent, although not entirely predictable, relationships between letters and sounds. When these relationships are learned, many of the words that the ESL student has in his spoken language become accessible when seen in print and he (like the young child learning to read) can be said to have broken the code."

Researcher(s)	Findings/Conclusions
Jones, 1996, p. 15	“The ESL student with limited L1 literacy in a language such as Spanish knows the Spanish names of the alphabet letters which provide phonological clues enabling him to sound out most Spanish words. Yet he must master the phoneme-grapheme relationships in English, particularly where these differ from Spanish—as with vowels. While many of the discrete sounds in Spanish are similar to those in English, an understanding of the differences is a prerequisite to transferring knowledge about phoneme-grapheme relationships from L1 to L2.”
Jones, 1996, p. 17	“An understanding of English phonics facilitates literacy acquisition by the ESL student, for a sufficiently large number of English words follow primary or secondary patterns. Phonics is also related to a utilization of cognates, particularly if L1 and L2 are related.”
Jones, 1996, p. 29.	“While Freire is best known by some for his theory of <i>conscientizacao</i> , it is important to remember that he based his literacy program upon mastery of the basic phonemes of the Portuguese language.”
Ellis, 2001, p. 41	“A key task for the learner is to discover these patterns [of language] within the sequence of language. At some level of analysis, the patterns refer to meaning.”
Ellis, 2001, p. 41	“Learning lexical structures involves identifying the categorical units of speech perception, their particular sequences in particular words, and their general sequential probabilities in the language. Melton (1963) demonstrated for digit sequences like phone numbers that the more they are repeated in the phonological STM [short-term memory], the greater the LTM [long-term memory] for these items, and in turn, the easier they are to repeat as sequences in STM [short-term memory]. The same process of chunking allows us to bootstrap our way into lexis (Ellis, 1996a). Repetition of sequences in the phonological loop allows their consolidation in phonological LTM.”
Hulstijn, 2001, p. 265	“Only less skilled readers use contextual information in word recognition (Stanovich, 1980). When readers become more skilled their reliance on context decreases. Only when a text is visually degraded (e.g., in the case of a poor quality copy of a faxed or photocopied text) do skilled readers use contextual information in the same way as unskilled readers.”
Shanahan & Beck, 2006, p. 419	“Literacy is complex and involves the orchestration of many different skills or abilities, including phonemic awareness, phonics, oral reading fluency, reading comprehension, vocabulary, writing, and spelling. It has been shown that special instruction aimed at improving performance in any of these components can evidence overall literacy achievement. For instance, the National Reading Panel found that explicit teaching of phonemic awareness, phonics, oral reading fluency, reading comprehension strategies, and vocabulary was beneficial. Additionally, the benefits of teaching spelling, sight vocabulary, and writing have been demonstrated in other research reviews. Because a range of instructional approaches to teaching these components have been found to be effective, we might reasonably conclude that it is not special approaches to teaching the components that mattered in these studies, but the emphasis on the components of literacy. For example, the National Reading Panel concluded that teaching children how to use sound-letter relationships to decode words led to improved early reading achievement. Several different phonics approaches were studied, all having similar positive outcomes. The pattern is evident with the other components as well. Content of instruction was found to be more important than methodological differences.”

Researcher(s)	Findings/Conclusions
Hulstijn, 2001, p. 285	“The more a learner pays attention to a word’s morphological, orthographic, prosodic, semantic, and pragmatic features and to intraword and interword relations, the more likely it is that the lexical information will be retained.”
Snow, 2006, p. 634	“The same societal, familial, and individual factors that predict good literacy outcomes for monolingual readers do so for second-language readers as well: . . . *Individual factors include school readiness skills, phonological processing skills, oral language proficiency (including vocabulary), and use of comprehension strategies.”
Snow, 2006, pp. 638-639	“Many of the instructional components known to be effective with monolingual English-speakers—enhancing children’s phonological awareness before or while teaching letter-sound relationships, teaching letter-sound relationships, systematically integrating letter-sound instruction with use of meaningful and engaging texts, providing extra help immediately to students who are falling behind—appear to be effective as well with English–language learners.”
Shanahan & Beck, 2006, p. 425	“There is evidence that approaches to phonemic awareness that include letter-sound associations are more effective than those that are only speech based (Adams, Foorman, Lundberg, & Beeler, 1998; National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 2000; Oudeans, 1003). Instruction in phonemic awareness, accompanied by the teaching of written letters . . . may be considered part of phonics instruction because phonics involves knowledge of the relationship between phonemes and their written representations.”
August & Erickson, 2006, p. 498	“With regard to word-level skills, students involved in explicit phonics instruction improved their phonological awareness and decoding skills.”
Geva, 2006, p. 131	“Finally, the existing evidence indicates that phonological processing skills play a significant role in the spelling skills of English-language learners; furthermore, the evidence suggests that native English speakers and English-language learners who are poor spellers have similar cognitive profiles despite differences in their vocabulary and grammatical proficiency in English.”
Lesaux with Koda, Siegel, & Shanahan, 2006, p. 79	“In each of the four studies, those language-minority students who were classified as having difficulties in spelling or word reading also demonstrated difficulties in phonological awareness, and these difficulties were very comparable to those of their monolingual peers who were similarly classified.”
Lesaux with Koda, Siegel, & Shanahan, 2006, p. 94	“Learning to read and learning to spell are related and make use of similar skills, a combination of phonological processing and orthographic processing skills, as well as visual memory, is needed to learn to spell in English. Spelling requires the application of phoneme-grapheme correspondences in a written format. Phonological skills enable spellers to segment the sounds in words and try to represent those sounds with corresponding letters, whereas orthographic skills in spelling provide the ability to spell from memory. Children store and access the orthographic representations of words, which involve knowledge of the letters and their sequence in the words to be spelled. In the case of deep orthographies, such as English, it is particularly important that children rely on both phonological and orthographic skills for accurate word spelling. Developing successful spelling skills may be an additional challenge for language-minority students who are likely to have had less exposure to the language and literacy in the second language than their native-speaking peers.”

Researcher(s)	Findings/Conclusions
Lesaux with Koda, Siegel, & Shanahan, 2006, p. 82	“In the aggregate, it is possible to conclude that, as with monolingual English-speaking children, word awareness, letter knowledge, and phonemic awareness are predictors of the word identification and reading fluency skills of language-minority students.”
Lesaux with Koda, Siegel, & Shanahan, 2006, p. 83	“It appears that having an alphabetically transparent language as a first language and acquiring some reading skills in that language may facilitate the acquisition of second-language decoding skills. Instruction that emphasizes the development of phonological awareness and stress systematic phonics instruction in the second language may also help develop word reading skills. . . . In general, available evidence indicates that word recognition and pseudoword reading may be equivalent skills for language-minority children and native speakers.”
Lesaux & Geba, 2006, pp. 54-55	“It is critical in reading instruction to ensure that children have the opportunity to integrate learning the code (by developing skills in phonological awareness, letter knowledge, phoneme-grapheme relationships, spelling rules, fluency) with learning all that is necessary to read for meaning (by developing skills in vocabulary, world knowledge, discourse structure, comprehension strategies, purposes for reading).”
Lesaux & Geba, 2006, p. 55	“An important precursor to word reading ability is phonological processing, or the ability to use the sounds of the language to process oral and written language; globally, one’s phonological processing abilities have an impact on reading acquisition and comprehension. Findings from longitudinal, cross-sectional, and intervention studies have converged to demonstrate the crucial role of phonological processing in acquiring reading skills and are skills typically assessed in studies of reading.”
Lesaux & Geba, 2006, p. 56	“Early in the process of learning to read, skilled readers begin learning to use letter-sound relationships to decode print. Simultaneously, they build up a sight vocabulary of words encountered frequently in text. Thus, word reading involves a combination of phonological and visual skills.”
Lesaux & Geba, 2006, p. 57	“Phonological skills, in particular, have been shown to be essential for learning to read and spell not only alphabetic orthographies, but also nonalphabetic orthographies, such as Chinese.”
Lesaux & Geba, 2006, p. 64	“As was the case for word reading, research suggests that various aspects of phonological processing skills in English, including phonological awareness and WM, play a significant role in the spelling skills of English-language learners. The evidence also shows that native English speakers and English-language learners who are poor and good spellers have similar phonological processing and WM skills despite differences in their oral language proficiency.”
Lesaux & Geba, 2006, p. 57	“Research on reading difficulties has clearly demonstrated the cumulative nature of reading skills; that is, without mastery of decoding, fluency is compromised; if decoding and fluency are not automatic, the reader’s ability to extract and construct meaning from text effectively and efficiently is compromised.”
August & Shanahan, 2006, p. 17	“The patterns of learning across these studies suggest that the basic ordering of teaching is likely to be the same between first- and second-language learners—with greater attention to decoding required early in the process and relatively more direct and ambitious attention to comprehension later on. Vocabulary and background knowledge should be targeted intensively throughout the entire sequence . . . . “

Researcher(s)	Findings/Conclusions
Burt, Peyton, & Van Duzer, Mar. 2005, p. 3.	<p>Kruidenier makes the following suggestions for teaching ABE learners:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Assess beginning readers' letter-sound knowledge through their pronunciation of letters, word parts, or whole words that are decodable using common rules or generalizations.</li> <li>*Assess knowledge of sight words with lists of regularly and irregularly spelled words.</li> <li>*Provide adult beginning readers with explicit instruction in word analysis.</li> <li>*When assessing letter-sound knowledge, consider using nonsense words to ensure the reader does not know the words as sight words."</li> </ul>
Burt, Peyton, & Van Duzer, Mar. 2005, p. 3.	<p>Suggestions for teaching English-language learners:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Teach English letter-sound correspondences to all learners.</li> <li>*When assessing knowledge of letter-sound relationships, use actual English words that follow patterns, such as <i>bat/pat/sat</i>. Do not use nonsense words.</li> <li>*Teach morphophonemic relationships in the English writing system. . . .</li> <li>*Teach word-analysis skills, include word prefixes and suffixes. . . ."</li> </ul>
Shiotsu & Weir, 2007, p. 100	<p>"The literature on componential analyses of L1 reading suggests individual differences in reading ability maybe accounted for by such factors as vocabulary knowledge, word recognition skills, phonological awareness, and working memory span."</p>
Lesaux & Geba, 2006, p. 63	<p>"Skills such as phonological processing and concepts of print that predict later literacy development in language-minority students are consistent with those identified in studies conducted with English monolingual children. Research has also shown that phonological processing skills, including phonemic awareness, rapid naming and phonological memory, assessed in the first or second language, predict word identification skills in English for language-minority children."</p>
Segalowitz, 2003, p. 398	<p>"One of the basic skills that underlies fluency is single word recognition."</p>
Riches & Genesee, 2006, p. 73	<p>"The causal relationship between reading and phonological awareness has been shown to be bidirectional, with certain aspects of phonological awareness playing a fundamental role in facilitating early reading acquisition, while reading acquisition itself facilitates the emergence of yet other, more sophisticated aspects of phonological awareness."</p>
Riches & Genesee, 2006, p. 73	<p>"The causal role of phonological awareness in reading acquisition is also supported by intervention studies that show that children with difficulty learning to read exhibit statistically significant gains in reading ability following training in phonological awareness and also by research that shows that poor and good L1 readers differ significantly from one another on tasks that tap phonological awareness, suggesting that phonological awareness is a decisive factor."</p>
Riches & Genesee, 2006, p. 74	<p>"The results from instructional studies also suggest that phonological awareness in the L2 can be developed through direct intervention, even if L2 oral development is itself somewhat limited, adding further evidence that phonological awareness is a metalinguistic or common underlying proficiency."</p>

Researcher(s)	Findings/Conclusions
Gersten & Baker, 2003, p. 98	“We have consistently argued that effective reading instruction principles are directly relevant for teaching reading to English-language learners, although significant modulation and adjustment are required. Modulation, for example, would require much greater linkage of vocabulary instruction with word-attack and analysis instruction for English-language learners than for native English speakers. Additional attention should also be paid to teaching phonemes and sounds that are prevalent in English but not existent in a student’s native language (be it Korean or Tagalog, Spanish or Arabic). English-language learners would likely require many more opportunities to practice speaking and reading aloud, and more time on vocabulary development, including the teaching of meanings of words that will be quite familiar to virtually all native speakers in first grade.”
Burt, Peyton, & Adams, 2003, p. 26	“However, there is evidence indicating that even advanced English learners whose native language is written with Roman alphabet can have difficulty with phonological processing in English and need to be taught to decode—to match letters and sound.”
Francis, Rivera, et al., 2006, p. 17	“ELLs need early, explicit, and intensive instruction in phonological awareness and phonics in order to build decoding skills.”
Francis, Rivera, et al., 2006, p. 18	“We know from many years of research with native English speakers—and have more recently learned from research with ELLs—that learners who are experiencing difficulties need explicit, intensive instruction and/or intervention in phonemic/phonological awareness and phonics. This intervention must be explicit, systematic, and intensive in order to augment students’ abilities and prevent further difficulties.”
Francis, Rivera, et al., 2006, p. 18	“. . . recent reviews have made clear the role of phonological awareness in reading acquisition in all alphabetical languages, while empirical studies have shown a very high degree of correspondence between phonological abilities across languages in ELLs.”
Kamps, Abbott, Greenwood, Carreaga-Mayer, Wills, Longstaff, Culpepper, & Walton (2007), p. 154	“The National Reading Panel suggests that teachers working with ELL students must be sensitive to the fact that the sounds of English and other phonetic languages are not exactly the same and that these differences may constitute an area of difficulty for students in learning English word structures.”

## Content—Fluency

Researcher(s)	Findings/Conclusions
Segalowitz, 2003, p. 383	"In language learning, increased performance efficiency can be seen as contributing to fluency, that is, the ability to use language rapidly, smoothly, and accurately."
Sticht, 1997, p. 3	"To efficiently read and comprehend, the decoding aspect of reading must become automatic, that is, performed without conscious attention. This can be accomplished by hours and hours of practice in reading. This is one of the reasons why adults who leave literacy programs having completed just 50 to 100 or so hours of instruction do not make much improvement in general reading comprehension; they have not automated the decoding process."
Samuels, 2002, p. 174	"Other research evidence also shows that repeated exposures to the same words leads to improvements in fluency."
Samuels, 2002, p. 173	"Students who encountered 10 repetitions of a word while reading acquired more word knowledge than did students who encountered the same word only twice."
Mercer & Mercer, 2005, 289	". . . interventions that engage students interactively with memory devices. . . and graphic depictions . . . and are paired with direct instruction appear most promising in promoting vocabulary learning. They also note that students should have multiple exposures to words across time to promote understanding."
Schmidt, 2001, p. 8	"Attention is a key concept in accounts of the development of L2 fluency that are related to the psychological concept of automaticity. Models that contrast controlled with automatic processing posit a transition from an early stage in which attention is necessary and a later stage (after practice) in which attentional resources are no longer needed and can be devoted to higher level goals."
Schmidt, 2001, p. 12	"The classic view in psychology is that limited capacity is the primary characteristic of attention, and this view has been taken on by many in SLA [second-language acquisition]. Within this general view, some have stressed that there are two general human information processing systems. Such accounts contrast effortful, attention-demanding ('controlled') processes with capacity-free ('automatic') processes. Another variant of the basic notion of capacity limitations in attention is that of Wickens (1984, 1989), who proposed multiple, specific resource pools for processing stages, brain hemispheres, and modalities (visual, auditory, vocal, manual). This model accounts for the fact that attention-demanding activities can be carried out at the same time more easily if they call upon different modalities than if they draw upon the same modality. In other words, there is some flexibility to capacity limitations, though each resource pool is assumed to have limited capacity."
Francis, Rivera, et al., 2006, p. 26	"Individuals whose word-recognition skills are automatic can devote greater cognitive resources to comprehending the text."
Schmidt, 2001, p. 16	"The orthodox position in psychology is that there is little if any learning without attention. This claim is often related to models of memory. It is argued that unattended stimuli persist in immediate short-term memory for only a few seconds at best, and attention is the necessary and sufficient condition for long-term memory storage to occur. In SLA as well, the claim has been made frequently that attention is necessary for input to become available for further mental processing."

Researcher(s)	Findings/Conclusions
Ellis, 2001, p. 48	"This ability to repeat verbal sequences immediately after hearing them is a good predictor of a learner's facility to acquire vocabulary and syntax in first, second, and foreign language learning. Ellis reviews a wide range of evidence for this: (i) phonological STM span predicts vocabulary acquisition in L1 and L2, (ii) interfering with phonological STM by means of articulatory suppression disrupts vocabulary learning, (iii) repetition and productive rehearsal of novel words promotes their long term consolidation and retention, (iv) phonological STM predicts syntax acquisition in L1 and L2, (v) phonological rehearsal of L2 utterances results in superior performance in receptive skills in terms of learning to comprehend and translate L2 words and phrases, explicit metalinguistic knowledge of the detailed content of grammatical regularities, acquisition of the L2 forms of words and phrases, accuracy in L2 pronunciation, and grammatical fluency and accuracy. Thus phonological sensitivity, chunking, and segmentation are key components of language learning aptitude."
MacWhinney, 2001, p. 81	"By building direct links between sound and meaning in L2, and by restructuring underlying concepts, the learner is able to increase the automaticity of lexical access in L2. This automaticity constitutes a 'fire wall' against ongoing interference effects from L1 to L2."
DeKeyser, 2001, p. 125	"The ultimate example of automaticity is probably our ability to use language. Through a complex chain of mental operations, carried out in a fraction of a second, we can convert complex thoughts and feelings into soundwaves; and our interlocutor can convert them back into thoughts and feelings with the same amazing speed. Given the complexity of this skill and the speed with which it is used, it is not surprising that it takes years to acquire, and that learning a new language in adulthood is a slow and frustrating process."
DeKeyser, 2001, p. 126	". . . without automatization no amount of knowledge will ever translate into the levels of skill required for real like use. . . ."
DeKeyser, 2001, p. 130	"The most ubiquitous finding about the acquisition of cognitive skills, recognized by proponents of any kind of theory of automatization, is the <i>power law of practice</i> ."
Hulstijn, 2001, p. 264	". . . the processes involved in accessing lexical entries in the mental lexicon must take place automatically for communication to proceed efficiently."
Hulstijn, 2001, p. 265	". . . there is ample evidence for a casual relationship between word recognition efficiency and reading comprehension both in L1 and in L2."
Snow, 2006, p. 631	"The contributions to successful reading made by accuracy and fluency in word reading, control over the requisite language skills (vocabulary, syntax, discourse structures), and world knowledge have all been richly documented for monolingual readers. Although the reading process is complex for all students, the individual differences among English-language learners greatly increase the complexity of the task of understanding the reading process for these students."
Snow, 2006, p. 634	"The same societal, familial, and individual factors that predict good literacy outcomes for monolingual readers do so for second-language readers as well: . . . *Individual factors include school readiness skills, phonological processing skills, oral language proficiency (including vocabulary), and use of comprehension strategies."

Researcher(s)	Findings/Conclusions
Shanahan & Beck, 2006, p. 419	“Literacy is complex and involves the orchestration of many different skills or abilities, including phonemic awareness, phonics, oral reading fluency, reading comprehension, vocabulary, writing, and spelling. It has been shown that special instruction aimed at improving performance in any of these components can evidence overall literacy achievement. For instance, the National Reading Panel found that explicit teaching of phonemic awareness, phonics, oral reading fluency, reading comprehension strategies, and vocabulary was beneficial. Additionally, the benefits of teaching spelling, sight vocabulary, and writing have been demonstrated in other research reviews. Because a range of instructional approaches to teaching these components have been found to be effective, we might reasonably conclude that it is not special approaches to teaching the components that mattered in these studies, but the emphasis on the components of literacy. For example, the National Reading Panel concluded that teaching children how to use sound-letter relationships to decode words led to improved early reading achievement. Several different phonics approaches were studied, all having similar positive outcomes. The pattern is evident with the other components as well. Content of instruction was found to be more important than methodological differences.”
Hulstijn, 2001, pp. 265-266	“. . . knowledge of reading goals, text characteristics and reading strategies (such as inferring the meaning of unknown words from context), cannot compensate for a lack of language knowledge if the latter remains below a certain threshold level. . . . Thus, learning to apply reading strategies should not take precedence over establishing a core of automatically accessible lexical items.”
Shanahan & Beck, 2006, p. 427-428	“The importance of fluency in reading is increasingly being recognized . . . . Fluency requires accuracy (reading the words an author has written), speed, and proper expression; it depends on automatic word recognition that is carried out simultaneously with some initial interpretation of text meaning (e.g., grouping words syntactically, using punctuation). Fluency in reading is important because human capacity for processing information is limited; without fluency, readers have to attend to too many things at once, hindering other necessary cognitive activity. For example, research has shown that comprehension tends to be weak when texts are read too slowly—that is, without fluency. If students can read text fluently (without much attention to basic information-processing demands), they will have sufficient cognitive resources to think about what they read.”
Shanahan & Beck, 2006, p. 429	“Thus, fluency instruction benefits native speakers and appears to similarly benefit English-language learners.”
Lesaux with Koda, Siegel, & Shanahan, 2006, p. 82	“In the aggregate, it is possible to conclude that, as with monolingual English-speaking children, word awareness, letter knowledge, and phonemic awareness are predictors of the word identification and reading fluency skills of language-minority students.”

Researcher(s)	Findings/Conclusions
Lesaux with Koda, Siegel, & Shanahan, 2006, p. 98	“Studies examining the development of word reading and spelling among language-minority students have demonstrated that, in the majority of cases, the development of these skills is very similar to that of native speakers in the same context. These similarities are evident not only in the findings of those studies examining the word reading and spelling achievement of second-language learners as compared with their monolingual peers, but also in the findings of those studies examining the variables that influence word spelling and reading. For both native speakers and second-language learners, factors such as phonological awareness and orthographic skills were found to influence word reading and word spelling.”
Lesaux & Geba, 2006, pp. 54-55	“It is critical in reading instruction to ensure that children have the opportunity to integrate learning the code (by developing skills in phonological awareness, letter knowledge, phoneme-grapheme relationships, spelling rules, fluency) with learning all that is necessary to read for meaning (by developing skills in vocabulary, world knowledge, discourse structure, comprehension strategies, purposes for reading).”
Lesaux & Geba, 2006, p. 57	“Research on reading difficulties has clearly demonstrated the cumulative nature of reading skills; that is, without mastery of decoding, fluency is compromised; if decoding and fluency are not automatic, the reader’s ability to extract and construct meaning from text effectively and efficiently is compromised.”
Burt, Peyton, & Van Duzer, Mar. 2005, p. 3.	Kruidenier (2002) makes the following suggestions for teaching ABE learners: *Assess learners’ fluency by rating the accuracy and speed of their oral reading. *Involve learners in repeated reading of texts and words, taped and live.”
Shiotsu & Weir, 2007, p. 100	“The literature on componential analyses of L1 reading suggests individual differences in reading ability maybe accounted for by such factors as vocabulary knowledge, word recognition skills, phonological awareness, and working memory span.”
Ellis, 2001, pp. 38-39	“The term <i>chunking</i> was coined by George Miller in his classical review of STM [short-term memory]. It is the development of permanent sets of associative connections in long-term storage and is the process that underlies the attainment of automaticity and fluency in language. Newell (1990) argues that it is the overarching principal of human cognition. . . . Chunking appears to be a ubiquitous feature of human memory.”
Hulstijn, 2001, p. 266	“The more they repeat words, the more these are consolidated in long-term memory (LTM). Acquisition of fluency is influenced by frequency, recency, and regularity. The frequency effect is simply that of ‘practice makes perfect.’”
Hulstijn, 2001, p. 281	“As was explained . . . , it is not enough to ‘know’ a word; one must also be able to use word knowledge quickly in order to be able to listen or speak at a speed of two to three words per second and to read at a speed of three to six words per second. The training of automaticity appears to be a neglected component in many current L2 curricula.”
Francis, Rivera, et al., 2006, p. 15	“. . . the great majority of ELLs experiencing reading difficulties struggle with the skills related to fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension.”

Researcher(s)	Findings/Conclusions
Hill & Flynn, 2006, p.10	"There are two generalizations from the research regarding practice. First, a student will not master a skill without a significant amount of practice. In fact, students generally do not reach 80 percent competency until they have practiced a skill at least 24 times. This is important to remember because the goal of practice is to develop a skill or process so that it can be applied fluently with minimal conscious thought. Second, when practicing, students should adapt and shape what they have learned. The conceptual understanding of a skill should develop during practice. Again, students need multiple opportunities to make continued adaptations as they develop their understanding of the skill they are learning."
Segalowitz, 2003, pp. 400-401	"There are several possible reasons to expect learning to benefit from automaticity. The most commonly cited one is that because automatic processing consumes fewer attentional resources than does controlled processing, the more automatic performance becomes the more attention resources there are left over for other purposes. . . . A second reason to favor automaticity is that once a mechanism becomes automatic it will process information very quickly and accurately, being immune to interference from other sources of information."
Segalowitz, 2003, p. 401	"A number of authors have emphasized the importance of automaticity as one pedagogical goal in SLA."
Segalowitz, 2003, p. 401	"All automaticity proposals for enhancing SLA are based, in one way or another, on the idea that extended practice, under particular conditions and circumstances, will increase fluency by developing automaticity."
Ullman, 2005, p. 152	"Memorizing complex forms and rules in declarative memory may be expected to lead to a fairly high degree of proficiency, the level of which should vary according to a number of factors."
Hossein & Geva, 1999, p. 260	"Geva and Ryan (1993), for example, found that working memory plays even a more important role in L2 reading of upper-elementary school children than in L1 reading. According to these researchers, this was mainly due to the heavier demands posed on working memory by the lack of automaticity in executing lower level component processes in L2 than in L1 reading."
Rubinstein-Avila, 2003, p. 1	"Students arrive in middle school with a broad range of reading experiences and abilities, a number of most implicit reading strategies, and varying prior experiences with text genres. While socioeconomic (SES) accounts for much of this range, there are many other factors at play as well. Secondary students who are said to struggle with reading are not formed from a single mold and may experience different challenges. Some may expend so much energy decoding a string of printed words from their textbooks that they fail to derive even the most basic textual meaning from a paragraph."

## Content—Vocabulary

Researcher(s)	Findings/Conclusions
Lehr, Osborn, & Hiebert, p. 20	“Attention to vocabulary development is important for all students, but is especially important for students who are at risk for learning to read and those who are ELLs.”
Gersten & Baker, 2003, p. 105	“Vocabulary learning should play a major role in successful programs for English-language learners.”
Graves & Watts-Taffe, 2002, p. 145	“There is increasing evidence that lack of vocabulary is a key component underlying school failure for disadvantaged students. . . . We include word consciousness in our vocabulary program because it is crucial to do everything possible to shore up students’ vocabularies, particularly the vocabularies of disadvantaged students.”
Jiang & Kuehn, 2001, p. 2	“Many ESL professionals have realized that general English proficiency is not all that ESL students need in order to succeed in mainstream courses. They also need English academic language development. Language proficiency is ‘only a means to an end: the critical outcome. . . is how well (students) succeed in school’ (Saville-Troike, 1984, 217). According to Flowerdew (1994) and Wang (1996), educators and researchers generally agree that low proficiency in academic language and the distinctive type of English used in classrooms and in textbooks are contributing factors to academic failure among language minority and at-risk minority students (Wright * Kuehn, 1998).”
American Educational Research Association, 2004, p. 2	“English-language learners will never catch up with native speakers unless they develop a rich vocabulary. Native speakers typically know at least 5,000 to 7,000 English words before kindergarten—a huge vocabulary, as anyone who has struggled to learn a second language knows. English-language learners not only must close that initial gap, but also keep pace with the native speakers as they steadily expand their vocabularies.”
Barone, 1998, pp. 62-63	“Children learning to read and write in a second language face additional challenges. . . . The first of these is that they need to learn to manipulate the symbols of a new language. This involves learning to encode and decode these symbols and their combinations for understanding and expressing ideas in reading and writing. Second, students need to learn to transfer their ideas from one language to another. Here students are becoming facile with the phonetic, syntactic, and semantic systems of a new language. The third task involves the transfer of thinking and conceptualization in a first language to a second language. This can only happen when a student acquires a large vocabulary and an understanding of the structure of a second language.”
Short & Echevarria (Dec, 2004/Jan. 2005), p. 10.	“Many educators agree on the important sheltered instruction techniques that help students comprehend content—for example, slower speech, clear enunciation, use of visuals and demonstrations, targeted vocabulary development, connections to student experiences, and use of supplementary materials.
Marzano, 1992, p. 76	“. . . a growing body of research indicates that classification emphasizing semantic feature analysis is a powerful tool for learning vocabulary.”
Southwest Educational Development Lab, p. 15	“A variety of methods for increasing vocabulary is more effective than a single method.”

Researcher(s)	Findings/Conclusions
Graves & Watts-Taffe (2002), p. 143	"Vocabulary instruction is most effective when learners are given both definitional and contextual information, when learners actively process the new word meanings, and when they experience multiple encounters with words."
Burt, Peyton, & Van Duzer, Mar. 2005, p. 2.	"Kruidenier (2002) makes the following suggestions for teaching ABE learners: *Conduct oral assessments, where learners either choose the one correct meaning of a word from multiple choices or define terms in their own words. *Teach vocabulary in semantic sets. *Encourage students to get meaning of new vocabulary items through context."
Burt, Peyton, & Van Duzer, Mar. 2005, p. 3.	". . . instructional strategies that rely on oral comprehension of vocabulary and use of nonsense words to teach sound-symbol correspondence are unlikely to be successful with English language learners (Nation, 2005; Qjan, 1999).
Burt, Peyton, & Adams, 2003, p. 17	"One of the components of language proficiency that has been shown to have a strong effect on reading comprehension is vocabulary knowledge in the language being read."
Schmidt, 2001, pp. 23-24.	"Even if it is true that in order to learn anything one must attend to it, that does not entail that it is necessary to have either the intention to attend or the intention to learn. On the other hand, we know that preparatory attention and voluntary orienting vastly improve encoding, and since many features of L2 input are likely to be infrequent, non-salient, and communicatively redundant, intentionally focused attention may be a practical (though not theoretical) necessity for successful language learning. Language learners who take a totally passive approach to learning, waiting patiently and depending on involuntary attentional processes to trigger automatic noticing, are likely to be slow and unsuccessful learners. As Hulstijn points out, most vocabulary is learned from context, but relying on reading and listening alone for vocabulary learning is very inefficient."
Schmidt, 2001, 30	"In order to acquire vocabulary one must attend to both word form (pronunciation, spelling) and to whatever clues are available in input that can lead to identification of meaning."
Hulstijn, 2001, p. 258	"Most learners of a second language (L2) feel concerned with the burden of vocabulary learning and worry about the question of how to cope with the formidable task of learning thousands of words."
Hulstijn, 2001, p. 260-261	"Beginning L2 learners, learning the first few hundred L2 vocabulary items, often appear to link the L2 word form directly to a corresponding L1 word form. In a later stage, the L2 word form is directly linked to its meaning. Thus, initially, L2 lexical entries are often coded as phonological or orthographic extensions of L1 lexical entries. This may explain why beginners have been found to confuse phonologically similar words more often and semantically simpler words less often than do advanced learners."

Researcher(s)	Findings/Conclusions
Hulstijn, 2001, p. 261	“Learning the first 15 content words of a new L2 language may take the beginning learner several hours. However, three months of daily study later, he or she may easily add another hundred new words to his or her medium-sized vocabulary in one hour simply because, by that time, letters and sounds are no longer encoded as single units but in now familiar chunks of phonemes, morphemes, syllables, and prosodic patterns.”
Hulstijn, 2001, p. 262-263	“. . . there is sufficient empirical evidence that the receptive vocabulary of English-speaking university undergraduates is in the range of 14,000—17,000 words. In the literature on L2 learning a receptive knowledge of 5,000 base words is generally considered to be a minimal learning target with respect to the comprehension of the main points of non subject-specific texts. This may not be enough, however. Hirsh and Nation (1992) have convincingly argued that for such comprehension to be attained readers generally need to be familiar with 95 per cent of the words in a text. Hazenberg and Hulstijn (1996), in their study of text coverage and vocabulary knowledge, however, have given empirical evidence for the claim that if adults with secondary education want to be familiar with 95 per cent of the words contained in the large variety of non-specific texts encountered in their daily lives, they must know at least 10,000 base words.”
Hulstijn, 2001, p. 273	“In most published teaching materials for learners at beginning and intermediate levels (textbooks, multimedia software), a selected core vocabulary is explicitly taught and rehearsed through a wide variety of techniques and activities. Coady (1993) advocates explicit teaching of a base vocabulary at an early stage of acquisition, which should be learned to the point of automaticity, with contextual learning during the later stages.”
Snow, 2006, p. 631	“The contributions to successful reading made by accuracy and fluency in word reading, control over the requisite language skills (vocabulary, syntax, discourse structures), and world knowledge have all been richly documented for monolingual readers. Although the reading process is complex for all students, the individual differences among English-language learners greatly increase the complexity of the task of understanding the reading process for these students.”
Snow, 2006, p. 634	“The same societal, familial, and individual factors that predict good literacy outcomes for monolingual readers do so for second-language readers as well: . . . *Individual factors include school readiness skills, phonological processing skills, oral language proficiency (including vocabulary), and use of comprehension strategies.”
Snow, 2006, p. 638	“. . . classroom teachers are unanimous in noting that children who arrive in the United States with strong first-language vocabularies have little difficulty in acquiring English words. The mechanism widely suggested for this phenomenon is that knowledge of those concepts need not be reacquired; all that is needed is new labels for those concepts already present. In other words, conceptual knowledge is available in the first language and facilitates vocabulary acquisition in the second language.”
Gersten, Baker, Shanahan, Linan-Thompson, & Collins, 2007, p. 2	“Provide high-quality vocabulary instruction throughout the day. Teach essential content words in depth. In addition, use instructional time to address the meanings of common words, phrases, and expressions not yet learned (Level of Evidence: Strong).”

Researcher(s)	Findings/Conclusions
Shanahan & Beck, 2006, p. 419	“Literacy is complex and involves the orchestration of many different skills or abilities, including phonemic awareness, phonics, oral reading fluency, reading comprehension, vocabulary, writing, and spelling. It has been shown that special instruction aimed at improving performance in any of these components can evidence overall literacy achievement. For instance, the National Reading Panel found that explicit teaching of phonemic awareness, phonics, oral reading fluency, reading comprehension strategies, and vocabulary was beneficial. Additionally, the benefits of teaching spelling, sight vocabulary, and writing have been demonstrated in other research reviews. Because a range of instructional approaches to teaching these components have been found to be effective, we might reasonably conclude that it is not special approaches to teaching the components that mattered in these studies, but the emphasis on the components of literacy. For example, the National Reading Panel concluded that teaching children how to use sound-letter relationships to decode words led to improved early reading achievement. Several different phonics approaches were studied, all having similar positive outcomes. The pattern is evident with the other components as well. Content of instruction was found to be more important than methodological differences.”
Lesaux & Geba, 2006, pp. 54-55	“It is critical in reading instruction to ensure that children have the opportunity to integrate learning the code (by developing skills in phonological awareness, letter knowledge, phoneme-grapheme relationships, spelling rules, fluency) with learning all that is necessary to read for meaning (by developing skills in vocabulary, world knowledge, discourse structure, comprehension strategies, purposes for reading).”
Hulstijn, 2001, p. 274	“. . . in L2 pedagogy it is important to design tasks that focus learners’ attention on vocabulary learning and to make them aware of the importance of efficient vocabulary learning strategies. From an educational point of view, simply encouraging learners to spend much time on reading and listening, although leading to some incidental vocabulary learning, will not be enough in itself.”
Hulstijn, 2001, p. 285	“Thus, encountering new words in context and extensive reading, as advocated in current L1 and L2 pedagogy, are neither necessary nor sufficient for efficient vocabulary expansion.”
Lesaux & Geba, 2006, p. 56	“Early in the process of learning to read, skilled readers begin learning to use letter-sound relationships to decode print. Simultaneously, they build up a sight vocabulary of words encountered frequently in text. Thus, word reading involves a combination of phonological and visual skills.”
Lesaux & Geba, 2006, p. 57	“If a child is experiencing reading difficulties, the result may be a knowledge base and vocabulary that are insufficient for comprehension of the increasingly complex reading material students confront in the later elementary years and high school.”
Lesaux & Geba, 2006, p. 64-65	“Research findings suggest that limited vocabulary knowledge is associated with low levels of reading comprehension in English, and English-language learners with a large repertoire of high-frequency and academically relevant words are better able to process written texts than English-language learners without such a repertoire.”

Researcher(s)	Findings/Conclusions
August & Shanahan, 2006, p. 17	“The patterns of learning across these studies suggest that the basic ordering of teaching is likely to be the same between first- and second-language learners—with greater attention to decoding required early in the process and relatively more direct and ambitious attention to comprehension later on. Vocabulary and background knowledge should be targeted intensively throughout the entire sequence . . . . ”
Klingner & Vaughn, 2004, p. 191	“Vocabulary knowledge is strongly related to effective text comprehension and appears to be a highly significant variable in second-language readers’ success.”
Hill & Flynn, 2006, p. 27	“Even though ELLs are taught vocabulary as soon as they enter U.S. classrooms, they still lag significantly behind their English-speaking peers. McLaughlin and colleagues (2000) report that over time, an enriched vocabulary program can close the gap in vocabulary knowledge and reading comprehension between ELLs and English-dominant students.”
Burt, Peyton, & Van Duzer, Mar. 2005, p. 2.	<p>“Suggestions for teaching English language learners: . . .</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Provide learners with multiple exposures to specific words in multiple contexts.</li> <li>*Provide learners with lists of words for intentional learning.</li> <li>*Avoid presenting synonyms, antonyms, or words in the same semantic set together. . . .</li> <li>*Encourage vocabulary learning through regular tests where students can prove receptive knowledge of words through matching words to definitions or multiple-choice exercises.</li> <li>*After reading, students can write sentences to which they use specific words and grammatical forms.”</li> </ul>
Burt, Peyton, & Van Duzer, Mar. 2005, p. 3.	<p>Kruidenier (2002) makes the following suggestions for teaching ABE learners:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Have students complete cloze passages (in which learners fill in specific words that are left out of a text. . .</li> <li>*Assess learners’ reading comprehension by having them read passages and answer comprehension questions about the text in multiple-choice or short answers.”</li> </ul>
Shiotsu & Weir, 2007, p. 100	“The literature on componential analyses of L1 reading suggests individual differences in reading ability maybe accounted for by such factors as vocabulary knowledge, word recognition skills, phonological awareness, and working memory span.”
Hulstijn, 2001, p. 277	“The educational implication of this finding would be that incidental vocabulary learning benefits from regular and frequent exposure whereas intentional vocabulary learning benefits from self tests with increasing intervals.”
Hulstijn, 2001, p. 279	“. . . learners with larger vocabulary knowledge profited more from reading the novel than learners with smaller vocabularies, suggesting that the ‘rich get richer’.”
Riches & Genesee, 2006, p. 71	“Lack of vocabulary knowledge resulted in reading miscomprehension at all levels, but it was particularly detrimental for low-level students, where lack of syntactic knowledge also impeded reading comprehension. Perez found that direct instruction in aspects of L2 oral competence specifically related to literacy (e.g., multiple word meanings, sentence patterns) resulted in significant improvements to the L2 reading scores of third-grade ELLs.”

Researcher(s)	Findings/Conclusions
Ullman, 2005, p. 142	"Language depends upon two mental abilities. First, all idiosyncratic information must be memorized in some sort of mental dictionary, which is often referred to as the mental lexicon. The lexicon necessarily includes all words with arbitrary sound-meaning pairings. . . . But language also consists of regularities, which can be captured by rules of grammar. The rules constrain how lexical forms combine to make complex representations and allow us to interpret the meanings of complex forms even if we have not heard or seen them before."
Burt, Peyton, & Adams, 2003, p. 26	"When readers struggle with the meanings of individual vocabulary words, they will have difficulties connecting the meanings of words in a sentence or passage. Learners in this situation may decode reasonably well, but they may do so with limited comprehension."
Burt, Peyton, & Adams, 2003, p. 26-27	"Some studies indicate that training second language readers on accurate and rapid vocabulary recognition can increase their reading comprehension. Results of these studies show (not surprisingly) that vocabulary learning must be addressed in second language literacy instruction."
Gersten, Baker, Shanahan, Linan-Thompson, & Collins, 2007, pp. 3-4	"Adopt an evidence-based approach to vocabulary instruction. . . . Vocabulary instruction for English learners should also emphasize the acquisition of meanings of everyday words that native speakers know and that are not necessarily part of the academic curriculum."
Francis, Rivera, et al., 2006a, p. 7	"Mastery of academic language is arguably the single most important determinant of academic success for individual students. While other factors (e.g., motivation, persistence, quantitative skills) play important roles in the learning process, it is not possible to overstate the role that language plays in determining students' success with academic content. Proficient use of—and control over—academic language is the key to content-area learning."
Francis, Rivera, et al., 2006a, p. 7	"To be successful academically, students need to develop the specialized language of academic discourse that is distinct from conversational language."
Francis, Rivera, et al., 2006a, p. 20	"Vocabulary instruction rarely occurs despite the fact that it is the academic language of middle and high school classrooms and texts that prove most difficult for ELLs and in spite of the fact that ELLs—and their classmates—need between 12 and 14 exposures to a word and its meaning, across multiple contexts (different texts, classroom discussions, writing activities), in order to gain deep understanding of a word."
Francis, Rivera, et al., 2006b, p. 6	"Academic vocabulary is central to text and plays an especially prominent role in the upper elementary, middle, and high school years as students read to learn about concepts, ideas, and facts in content-area classrooms such as math, science, and social studies. In doing so, ELLs encounter many words that are not part of everyday classroom conversation."
Francis, Rivera, et al., 2006b, p. 9	". . . adolescent newcomers are likely to struggle with academic English."
Francis, Rivera, et al., 2006b, p. 12	"Knowing more words supports successful comprehension, while successful comprehension and more reading lead to more opportunities to learn words. Although few would disagree with the importance of vocabulary instruction for adolescent newcomers, current practices are not necessarily sufficient to support the development of vocabulary knowledge, which is a sophisticated, complex undertaking."
Francis, Rivera, et al., 2006b, p.13	"Effective vocabulary instruction for adolescent newcomers is explicit, systematic, extensive, and intensive."

<b>Researcher(s)</b>	<b>Findings/Conclusions</b>
Francis, Rivera, et al., 2006b, p. 14	“Although good readers learn many words just by encountering them while reading, struggling readers can find it difficult to discern the meaning of novel words from context. Thus, direct instruction in the meanings of specific words is crucial.”
Nagy & Scott, 2000, p. 280	“Vocabulary researchers concerned with second language learning have argued that ‘natural’ vocabulary acquisition is simply not efficient enough to produce the desired rates of learning.”
Kamps, Abbott, Greenwood, Carreaga-Mayer, Wills, Longstaff, Culpepper, & Walton (2007), p. 154	“Additionally, challenges in vocabulary proficiencies affect comprehension.”

## Content—Writing and Spelling

Researcher(s)	Findings/Conclusions
Jones, 1996, p. 3	"... 84% of English words are spelled according to regular patterns."
Bruer, 1993, p. 189	"Children who can't recognize words automatically can get permanently stuck at the decoding level and may never realize or learn that the goal of reading is to construct meaning."
Adams, 1990, p. 131	"The value of having the children write and spell is also strongly reinforced. It has been shown that the act of writing newly learned words is a significant strengthening of their perceptual integrity in recognition. This is surely a factor underlying the documented advantages of programs that emphasize writing and spelling activities."
Dixon-Krauss, 1995, pp. 105-106	"Journals and notebooks are a good way for children to begin developing ideas for their writing, as well as showing their understanding about the things that happen in their daily lives, including their school lives."
Jones, 1996, pp. 1-2	"There are compelling reasons for integrating phonics into the adult education ESL curriculum, as has been done in American primary school education. As English spelling is morphophonemic, understanding how phonemes are represented by single letters as well as spelling patterns can assist in the development of basic ESL literacy. The adult ESL student has the analytical capability to understand phoneme-grapheme relationships and can be taught how to utilize any transferable L1 literacy skills in the acquisition of English spelling."
Barone, 1998, p. 69	"Children who are learning English as a second language need to be provided many opportunities to express themselves in writing."
Jones, 1996, p. 11	"Skilled spellers can visually recognize spelling patterns and link them to their phonological translations effortlessly and accurately. Spelling-sound regularities are also seen in what are known as word families. NS children (as well as many NNS immigrant workers) have a larger spoken than written vocabulary. By utilizing spelling-sound regularities in word families, children can often transfer information correctly from the known spelling of a word to a phonetically similar one, thus quickly increasing the number of words they can spell."
Jones, 1996, p. 18	"This combination of L1/L2 capabilities and L2 spelling principles provides the rationale for explicit instruction in graphological literacy. It can be concluded that an appropriate syllabus would include instruction in basic alphabet skills, phonics, lexical relatedness spelling, and contrastive analysis while utilizing the analytic capabilities of the ESL student."
Geva, 2006, p. 131	"Finally, the existing evidence indicates that phonological processing skills play a significant role in the spelling skills of English-language learners; furthermore, the evidence suggests that native English speakers and English-language learners who are poor spellers have similar cognitive profiles despite differences in their vocabulary and grammatical proficiency in English."
Gava, 2006, p. 131	"The review also appears to indicate that spelling accuracy among English-language learners is predicted by various phonological processing skills (such as phoneme deletion, rapid naming, phonological memory) and pseudoword decoding."

Researcher(s)	Findings/Conclusions
Shanahan & Beck, 2006, p. 419	<p>“Literacy is complex and involves the orchestration of many different skills or abilities, including phonemic awareness, phonics, oral reading fluency, reading comprehension, vocabulary, writing, and spelling. It has been shown that special instruction aimed at improving performance in any of these components can evidence overall literacy achievement. For instance, the National Reading Panel found that explicit teaching of phonemic awareness, phonics, oral reading fluency, reading comprehension strategies, and vocabulary was beneficial. Additionally, the benefits of teaching spelling, sight vocabulary, and writing have been demonstrated in other research reviews. Because a range of instructional approaches to teaching these components have been found to be effective, we might reasonably conclude that it is not special approaches to teaching the components that mattered in these studies, but the emphasis on the components of literacy. For example, the National Reading Panel concluded that teaching children how to use sound-letter relationships to decode words led to improved early reading achievement. Several different phonics approaches were studied, all having similar positive outcomes. The pattern is evident with the other components as well. Content of instruction was found to be more important than methodological differences.”</p>
Lesaux with Koda, Siegel, & Shanahan, 2006, p. 79	<p>“In each of the four studies, those language-minority students who were classified as having difficulties in spelling or word reading also demonstrated difficulties in phonological awareness, and these difficulties were very comparable to those of their monolingual peers who were similarly classified.”</p>
Lesaux with Koda, Siegel, & Shanahan, 2006, p. 94	<p>“Learning to read and learning to spell are related and make use of similar skills, a combination of phonological processing and orthographic processing skills, as well as visual memory, is needed to learn to spell in English. Spelling requires the application of phoneme-grapheme correspondences in a written format. Phonological skills enable spellers to segment the sounds in words and try to represent those sounds with corresponding letters, whereas orthographic skills in spelling provide the ability to spell from memory. Children store and access the orthographic representations of words, which involve knowledge of the letters and their sequence in the words to be spelled. In the case of deep orthographies, such as English, it is particularly important that children rely on both phonological and orthographic skills for accurate word spelling. Developing successful spelling skills may be an additional challenge for language-minority students who are likely to have had less exposure to the language and literacy in the second language than their native-speaking peers.”</p>
Lesaux with Koda, Siegel, & Shanahan, 2006, p. 94	<p>“Studies examining the spelling development of second-language learners have found it to be similar to that of monolingual children, at least for English-language learners, who represent the majority of the samples in the studies reviewed . . . .”</p>
Lesaux with Koda, Siegel, & Shanahan, 2006, p. 98	<p>“Studies examining the development of word reading and spelling among language-minority students have demonstrated that, in the majority of cases, the development of these skills is very similar to that of native speakers in the same context. These similarities are evident not only in the findings of those studies examining the word reading and spelling achievement of second-language learners as compared with their monolingual peers, but also in the findings of those studies examining the variables that influence word spelling and reading. For both native speakers and second-language learners, factors such as phonological awareness and orthographic skills were found to influence word reading and word spelling.”</p>

Researcher(s)	Findings/Conclusions
Lesaux & Geba, 2006, pp. 54-55	"It is critical in reading instruction to ensure that children have the opportunity to integrate learning the code (by developing skills in phonological awareness, letter knowledge, phoneme-grapheme relationships, spelling rules, fluency) with learning all that is necessary to read for meaning (by developing skills in vocabulary, world knowledge, discourse structure, comprehension strategies, purposes for reading)."
Lesaux & Geba, 2006, p. 64	"As was the case for word reading, research suggests that various aspects of phonological processing skills in English, including phonological awareness and WM, play a significant role in the spelling skills of English-language learners. The evidence also shows that native English speakers and English-language learners who are poor and good spellers have similar phonological processing and WM skills despite differences in their oral language proficiency."
Burt, Peyton, & Van Duzer, Mar. 2005, p. 2.	<p>"Suggestions for teaching English language learners: . . .</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Provide learners with multiple exposures to specific words in multiple contexts.</li> <li>*Provide learners with lists of words for intentional learning.</li> <li>*Avoid presenting synonyms, antonyms, or words in the same semantic set together. . . .</li> <li>*Encourage vocabulary learning through regular tests where students can prove receptive knowledge of words through matching words to definitions or multiple-choice exercises.</li> <li>*After reading, students can write sentences to which they use specific words and grammatical forms."</li> </ul>
Lesaux & Geba, 2006, p. 57	"Phonological skills, in particular, have been shown to be essential for learning to read and spell not only alphabetic orthographies, but also nonalphabetic orthographies, such as Chinese."
Hossein & Geva, 1999, p. 242	Bruck and Waters (1990), investigating the role of lower-level sound-spelling knowledge in three groups of poor and good readers, found that poor readers' reading comprehension was significantly related to their poor knowledge of grapheme-phoneme correspondence rules, as measured by different word and nonword spelling tasks."
Hossein & Geva, 1999, p. 261	". . . orthographic processing contributed significantly to reading comprehension and silent reading rate."
Hossein & Geva, 1999, p. 261	". . . while beginning readers depend more on phonological codes, expert readers might rely more on orthographic representations of words and efficiently use orthographic visual codes during word recognition processes."
Hossein & Geva, 1999, pp. 261-262	"In conclusion, the research reported here indicates that information about individual differences in the efficiency with which L2 readers process phonological and orthographic information helps us to understand individual differences in ESL reading. It suggests that the role of lower level graphophonetic processing should not be overlooked in L2 reading, even when readers are proficient adult L2 readers. Moreover, it is clear that these linguistic processes interact with one another and with underlying cognitive processes, such as working memory and speed of processing sequentially orthographic information."

## Content—Comprehension

Researcher(s)	Findings/Conclusions
Tan, Moore, Dixon, & Nicholson, June 1994, p. 1	“In a temporally contiguous within-subjects repeated trials reversal design, decoding training on isolated words was shown to be associated with significant increases in decoding speed and accuracy both in isolation and context, and improvements in the participants’ comprehension.”
Nassaji, June 2003, p. 1	“This study investigated the role of higher-level syntactic and semantic processes and lower-level word recognition and graphophonic processes in adult English as a second language (ESL) reading comprehension. . . . One-way discriminant function analysis revealed that lower-level component processes, such as word recognition and graphophonic processes, in addition to higher-level syntactic and semantic processes, contributed significantly to the distinction between skilled and less-skilled ESL readers. These findings suggest that efficient lower-level word recognition processes are integral components of second language reading comprehension and that the role of these processes must not be neglected even in highly advanced ESL readers.”
Burt, Peyton, & Adams, 2003, p. 17	“One of the components of language proficiency that has been shown to have a strong effect on reading comprehension is vocabulary knowledge in the language being read.”
Shanahan & Beck, 2006, p. 419	“Literacy is complex and involves the orchestration of many different skills or abilities, including phonemic awareness, phonics, oral reading fluency, reading comprehension, vocabulary, writing, and spelling. It has been shown that special instruction aimed at improving performance in any of these components can evidence overall literacy achievement. For instance, the National Reading Panel found that explicit teaching of phonemic awareness, phonics, oral reading fluency, reading comprehension strategies, and vocabulary was beneficial. Additionally, the benefits of teaching spelling, sight vocabulary, and writing have been demonstrated in other research reviews. Because a range of instructional approaches to teaching these components have been found to be effective, we might reasonably conclude that it is not special approaches to teaching the components that mattered in these studies, but the emphasis on the components of literacy. For example, the National Reading Panel concluded that teaching children how to use sound-letter relationships to decode words led to improved early reading achievement. Several different phonics approaches were studied, all having similar positive outcomes. The pattern is evident with the other components as well. Content of instruction was found to be more important than methodological differences.”
Snow, 2006, p. 634	“The same societal, familial, and individual factors that predict good literacy outcomes for monolingual readers do so for second-language readers as well: . . . *Individual factors include school readiness skills, phonological processing skills, oral language proficiency (including vocabulary), and use of comprehension strategies.”
Chamot, n.d., p. 7	“What we learned from these classroom observations was that these low-literacy students could think analytically and could relate what they were reading to their own prior knowledge, but that their low English proficiency was a barrier to displaying higher level thinking skills in English.”

Researcher(s)	Findings/Conclusions
Lesaux & Geba, 2006, pp. 54-55	"It is critical in reading instruction to ensure that children have the opportunity to integrate learning the code (by developing skills in phonological awareness, letter knowledge, phoneme-grapheme relationships, spelling rules, fluency) with learning all that is necessary to read for meaning (by developing skills in vocabulary, world knowledge, discourse structure, comprehension strategies, purposes for reading)."
Lesaux & Geba, 2006, p. 57	"If a child is experiencing reading difficulties, the result may be a knowledge base and vocabulary that are insufficient for comprehension of the increasingly complex reading material students confront in the later elementary years and high school."
Lesaux & Geba, 2006, p. 57	"Research on reading difficulties has clearly demonstrated the cumulative nature of reading skills; that is, without mastery of decoding, fluency is compromised; if decoding and fluency are not automatic, the reader's ability to extract and construct meaning from text effectively and efficiently is compromised."
Burt, Peyton, & Van Duzer, Mar. 2005, p. 3.	Kruidenier (2002) makes the following suggestions for teaching ABE learners: *Have students complete cloze passages (in which learners fill in specific words that are left out of a text. . . *Assess learners' reading comprehension by having them read passages and answer comprehension questions about the text in multiple-choice or short answers."
Riches & Genesee, 2006, p. 81	"Research has shown that certain text types, such as factual reports as opposed to narratives, pose more difficulty for ELLs, as do more decontextualized literacy tasks."
Burt, Peyton, & Adams, 2003, p. 19	"The need for increased vocabulary in the L2 can be addressed on several levels. First, direct vocabulary instruction can be part of the ESL literacy curriculum. It can improve reading comprehension, especially when it is given before the text is read. Computer-assisted vocabulary activities may be particularly helpful, as they allow individualized vocabulary learning. Texts that repeat vocabulary are more likely to be comprehensible, especially to learners with lower English language proficiency."

### Instructional Strategies—Multi-Sensory Processing (MSP)

Researcher(s)	Findings/Conclusions
National Institute for Literacy, nd, p. 1	"It has been estimated that 50-80% of the students in Adult Basic Education and literacy programs are affected by learning disabilities (LD)."
National Center for Family Literacy & National Center for ESL Literacy Education at the Center for Applied Linguistics, 2004, p. 61.	<p><i>"What instructional methods and materials are effective?"</i></p> <p>Educators of children and adults with learning disabilities give the following suggestions for providing instruction for this population:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Be highly structured and predictable.</li> <li>*Teach small amounts of material in sequential steps.</li> <li>*Include opportunities for learners to use several senses and learning strategies.</li> <li>*Recognize and build on learners' strengths and prior knowledge.</li> <li>*Simplify language but not content.</li> <li>*Emphasize content words and make concepts accessible through the use of pictures, charts, and maps.</li> <li>*Reinforce main ideas and concepts by rephrasing rather than repeating.</li> <li>*Be aware that learners often can take in information but may have difficulty retrieving and using it.</li> <li>*Provide a clean, uncluttered, quiet, and well-lit learning environment.</li> <li>*Use technology if possible. Learners often feel more comfortable and productive working along and in front of a computer, where they receive positive feedback, than in a crowded classroom. (Almanza, Singleton, &amp; Terrill, 1995/6; Ganschow &amp; Sparks, 1993; Rivere, 1996)."</li> </ul>
Lesaux with Koda, Siegel, & Shanahan, 2006, p. 96	"Taken together, these findings suggest that underlying processing deficits, as opposed to language-minority status, are related to reading and spelling difficulties."
MacWhinney, 2001, p. 88	"We know that neural networks can be effectively trained through repeated presentation of stimuli."
Hulstijn, 2001, p. 269	". . . the chance that some piece of new information will be stored into LTM is not determined by the length of time that it is held in STM but rather by the shallowness or depth with which it is initially processed. They further postulated several levels of processing depth. For instance, processing the meaning of a new lexical item takes place at a rather deep level whereas processing the phonological form takes place at a rather shallow level. Craik and Lockhart were initially successful in providing evidence that semantic processing of lexical items resulted in higher retention than phonological or orthographical processing."
Hulstijn, 2001, p. 270	". . . processing new lexical information more elaborately (e.g., by paying careful attention to the word's pronunciation, orthography, grammatical category, meaning and semantic relations to other words) will lead to higher retention than by processing new lexical information less elaborately (e.g., by paying attention to only one or two of these dimensions).
Hulstijn, 2001, p. 276	"High quality information processing when a word is first encountered as such is not predictive of retention outcomes. Rather, as some word forms are less codable and more arbitrary than others, they need deliberate rehearsal."
Shanahan & Beck, 2006, p. 430	"This result is consistent with findings from studies of native speakers, which have shown that instruction leading to deeper processing of word means and requiring greater repetition and use of words in different formats leads to higher proficiency."

Researcher(s)	Findings/Conclusions
Lesaux & Geba, 2006, p. 56	<p>“Some of the studies in this report focused on working memory (WM), in addition to short-term memory (STM). Both WM and STM have been shown to be independently related to word recognition and reading comprehension performance. However, it is important to note that they are not terms to be used interchangeably, and the two types of tasks are inherently different. Although both require attention to stimuli presented for recall to occur, the crucial distinction is that WM tasks demand active manipulation of the information presented while concurrently holding the information in memory, whereas STM tasks require only the direct recall of information. . . . WM is often measured using tasks such as repeating a string of letters or numbers in reverse order to that presented.</p> <p>Specific to a complex domain like reading comprehension, WM is vital as the reader must simultaneously decode words, remember, and actively process what has been read. In the early reading acquisition stage, SM is critical as the grapheme-phoneme conversion rules for each segment of the word are recalled and held in memory as the reader decodes each part of the word. Implicated in WM tasks is the individual’s STM ability, in that STM ability has an impact on the amount of phonological information being held in memory for recall. Thus, the common link among any verbal memory task is the ability to store and/or access the sound structure of the language, thus drawing on phonological processing skills.”</p>
Lesaux & Geba, 2006, p. 63	<p>“Thus, findings from studies with language-minority students with word-level difficulties suggest that underlying processing deficits, as opposed to language-minority status, are primarily related to word-level difficulties.”</p>
Hill & Flynn, 2006, p. 7	<p>“The use of nonlinguistic representations enhances students’ ability to represent and elaborate on knowledge using mental images.”</p>
Hill & Flynn, 2006, p. 36	<p>“Knowledge is stored in two ways: linguistically and nonlinguistically. Teachers mainly present new knowledge linguistically in the classroom, as they often ask students to listen to or read new information. Think of knowledge presented linguistically as actual sentences stored in long-term memory. Knowledge that is presented nonlinguistically is stored in the form of mental pictures or physical sensations such as sight, sound, smell, touch, taste, and movement. Using both linguistic and nonlinguistic methods of learning helps students recall and think about information. Because ELLs cannot solely rely on linguistic ability to learn and retain knowledge in a new language, nonlinguistic methods of learning are particularly important for them.”</p>
Leow & Bowles, 2005, p. 179	<p>“Almost all theories of SLA posit some role for attention, but the construct is especially emphasized in cognitive accounts, where it has been proposed that ‘attention appears necessary for understanding nearly every aspect of second and foreign language learning’ (Schmidt, 2001, p. 6). This view is based in large part on a long-standing and empirically supported position in cognitive psychology that maintains that attention to stimuli is needed for long-term memory storage and that little, if any, learning can take place without attention.”</p>

Researcher(s)	Findings/Conclusions
Vanpatten, 2005, p. 267	“In short, PI [processing instruction] is a technique that has proven to be worthy of scrutiny in any discussion of focus on form, pedagogical intervention, or computer-assisted language learning. . . . PI considers the nature of real-time input processing and the ways in which learners make form-meaning connections during comprehension. Thus it attempts to identify particular processing problems and treat them.”
Park, 2001, p. 214	“Research has identified cultural differences in the learning styles of various ethnic groups.”
Park, 2001, p. 215	“Previous research also indicated that students’ learning styles were significantly related to their achievement level. Park (1997a) found that among high, middle, and low achievers, high achievers were the most visual and low achievers were the least visual, and that middle and low achievers had minor preferences and high achievers had a negative preference for group learning.”
Park, 2001, p. 216	“. . . male Mexican-American students had the strongest tactile learning preferences whereas both groups of females in general preferred the least amount of tactile learning. . . .”

### Instructional Strategies—Computer-Assisted Instruction (CAI)

Researcher(s)	Findings/Conclusions
Levin & Long, 1981, p. 32	“. . . simplicity of pictorial presentation facilitates learning. Pictures need to draw the attention of students precisely to those aspects of learning required by the instructional goal.”
Eichel, 1989, p. 1	“Two studies were reported in this paper. The first investigated whether computer-assisted instruction with cloze exercises would be more effective in teaching English to nonnative speakers than traditional paper-and-pencil methods. Subjects were 38 community college students of varying language backgrounds enrolled in several levels of English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) courses and randomly assigned to experimental and control groups. . . . Results suggest the computer does aid in increasing both student motivation and information retention.”
Hulstijn, 2001, p. 280	“The computer, obviously, must be considered as a welcome aid in the implementation of a well-designed rehearsal regime, since . . . it can be easily programmed to keep track of the learner’s performance on every individual word, retesting less well known words more often than well known words.”
Sawyer & Ranta, 2001, p. 352	“In terms of designing instruction to cope effectively with IDs [individual differences], one clearly promising direction is computerized instruction. Computer programs can be written to provide virtually limitless possibilities for variety in the choice, modification, and sequencing of language learning tasks.”
Park, 2001, p. 225	“Based upon the findings of this study, teachers are encouraged to try to use more visual materials to provide effective instruction for these English learners. Using real objects, pictures, charts, character webs, graphs, and videos along with other materials that can instructional content visual would be helpful for these students.”
Partnership for Reading, 2002, p. 102	“In general, computer-assisted instruction (CAI) is at least as effective as non-CAI in increasing reading achievement.”
Partnership for Reading, 2002, p. 103	“The use of CAI may lead to increased reading comprehension achievement.”
Gersten & Baker, 2003, p. 106	“Intervention studies and several observational studies have noted that the effective use of visuals during instruction can lead to increased learning.”
CAELA, “Uses of Technology,” p. 9	“Technology can be used in a range of different contexts—in the classroom, at distance learning sites, and for extended or self-study. This adaptability is extremely appealing in a field with a wide variety of program types, content objectives, instructional settings, and learner needs and goals. At the classroom or individual learning level, new technologies present opportunities to accomplish multiple instructional goals (e.g., integrated language skills, critical thinking, cooperative and interpersonal skills). They may also be responsive to different learning styles (e.g., auditory, visual, tactile).”

Researcher(s)	Findings/Conclusions
<p>National Center for Family Literacy &amp; National Center for ESL Literacy Education at the Center for Applied Linguistics, 2004, p. 61.</p>	<p><i>“What instructional methods and materials are effective?</i>            Educators of children and adults with learning disabilities give the following suggestions for providing instruction for this population:            *Be highly structured and predictable.            *Teach small amounts of material in sequential steps.            *Include opportunities for learners to use several senses and learning strategies.            *Recognize and build on learners’ strengths and prior knowledge.            *Simplify language but not content.            *Emphasize content words and make concepts accessible through the use of pictures, charts, and maps.            *Reinforce main ideas and concepts by rephrasing rather than repeating.            *Be aware that learners often can take in information but may have difficulty retrieving and using it.            *Provide a clean, uncluttered, quiet, and well-lit learning environment.            *Use technology if possible. Learners often feel more comfortable and productive working alone and in front of a computer, where they receive positive feedback, than in a crowded classroom. (Almanza, Singleton, &amp; Terrill, 1995/6; Ganschow &amp; Sparks, 1993; Rivere, 1996).”</p>

### Instructional Strategies—Individualization/Differentiation (I/D)

Researcher(s)	Findings/Conclusions
Short & Echevarria, Dec. 2004/Jan. 2005, p. 9	“We do English-language learners a disservice if we think of them as one-dimensional on the basis of their limited English proficiency.”
Sawyer & Ranta, 2001, p. 319	“Individuals who attempt to learn a foreign language differ dramatically in their rates of acquisition and in their ultimate attainment.”
LDA Minnesota, 2004), p. 1	“It is possible that adult learners whose CASAS or TABE scale scores reflect an Intermediate, Advanced, ABE, or Adult Secondary level are still experiencing difficulties with intermediate decoding skills.”
Armstrong, et al., 2003, p. 6	“Our knowledge of the characteristics of immigrants (especially asylum seekers and refugees) suggests that these groups are more likely than the general population to have some sort of physical or mental disability due to the difficult conditions that they have endured.”
Burt, Peyton, & Adams, 2003, p. 7	<p>“Many factors influence the literacy development of adults learning English and should be considered in planning instruction for them. These facts include learners’:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ages;</li> <li>• motivations to read;</li> <li>• instructional, living, and working environments;</li> <li>• sociocultural backgrounds;</li> <li>• socioeconomic status; and</li> <li>• learning abilities or disabilities.”</li> </ul>
Sanz, 2006), p. 1	“Researchers agree that L2 learners follow a predictable path in their acquisition process irrespective of their L1, aptitude, and context of acquisition and that language learners vary in the efficiency with which they go through the stages. There is no doubt that the learning context is in part responsible for this situation: Graduates from immersion programs learn faster and attain higher proficiency levels than L2 learners in foreign language programs. In addition, IDs [individual differences] such as motivation, aptitude, and attitude account for differences among learners in the same contexts. It is the interaction between internal processing mechanisms and IDs on the one hand, and external factors, such as quality and quantity of input on the other, that explain why some adult language learners learn faster than others and get further ahead in the acquisition process.”
Dornyei & Skehan, 2003, p. 589	“An appropriate starting point for a discussion of individual differences in second language learning is what might be termed ‘the correlational challenge.’ This is that individual differences in second language learning, principally, foreign language aptitude and motivation, have generated the most consistent predictors of second language learning success.”
Ellis, 2001, p. 48	“. . . individual differences in phonological STM [short-term memory] ability explain individual differences in language learning aptitude. Individuals differ in their ability to repeat phonological sequences. In part this can result from constitutional factors—some individuals are born with better phonological abilities than others. Language impaired and dyslexic individuals have poorer phonological STM spans.”

Researcher(s)	Findings/Conclusions
Sanz, 2005, p. 14	"There is general agreement that IDs [individual differences] seem to have a greater effect on the acquisition of an L2 than an L1."
Garcia & Godina, 2004, p. 310	"Adamson (1991) reported that English language learners from a variety of language backgrounds and proficiency levels needed additional help before they were able to participate effectively in the type of instruction that characterized all-English academic classrooms at middle, high school, and college levels."
Snow, 2006, p. 639	"A logical case could be made that factors shown to promote monolingual children's literacy development, such as the capacity of the teacher to adapt instruction to the child's needs, are even more important to children learning to read in a second language."
Snow, 2006, p. 633	"Obviously, excellent instruction (systematic, intensive, differentiated) is more likely than poor instruction to generate expected levels of performance on word-level skills."
Sawyer & Ranta, 2001, p. 349	"The most straightforward way of accommodating learner aptitude profiles is to teach to learners' strengths, that is, to match learner characteristics with instructional characteristics. . . . Another approach to accommodating learners' aptitudinal differences is to adopt a compensatory approach and teach to remediate learners' weaknesses."
August & Erickson, 2006, p. 502	"The implication is that, over time and with good instruction, lower level readers, including English-language learners, can attain the same goals as higher level readers."
National Center for Family Literacy & National Center for ESL Literacy Education at the Center for Applied Linguistics, 2004, p. 60.	<p>"Before an adult learner is tested and labeled as having a learning disability, other reasons for lack of expected progress should be considered. The following reasons for slow progress in learning English have been noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Limited academic skills in a learner's native language due to limited previous education.</li> <li>*Lack of effective study habits.</li> <li>*Interference from the native language, particularly if the learner's written language is a non-alphabetic language or uses a non-Roman alphabet.</li> <li>*Mismatch between the instructor's teaching style and the learner's expectations of how the class will be conducted.</li> <li>*Stress or trauma the learner has experienced that may cause difficulty concentrating and memory dysfunction.</li> <li>*Sociocultural factors such as age, physical health, social identity, and even diet.</li> <li>*Vision and hearing problems.</li> <li>*External problems with work, health, and family.</li> <li>*Sporadic attendance.</li> <li>*Lack of opportunities to use English outside the classroom."</li> </ul>

Researcher(s)	Findings/Conclusions
National Center for Family Literacy & National Center for ESL Literacy Education at the Center for Applied Linguistics, 2004, p. 61.	<p><i>“What instructional methods and materials are effective?”</i>            Educators of children and adults with learning disabilities give the following suggestions for providing instruction for this population:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Be highly structured and predictable.</li> <li>*Teach small amounts of material in sequential steps.</li> <li>*Include opportunities for learners to use several senses and learning strategies.</li> <li>*Recognize and build on learners’ strengths and prior knowledge.</li> <li>*Simplify language but not content.</li> <li>*Emphasize content words and make concepts accessible through the use of pictures, charts, and maps.</li> <li>*Reinforce main ideas and concepts by rephrasing rather than repeating.</li> <li>*Be aware that learners often can take in information but may have difficulty retrieving and using it.</li> <li>*Provide a clean, uncluttered, quiet, and well-lit learning environment.</li> <li>*Use technology if possible. Learners often feel more comfortable and productive working along and in front of a computer, where they receive positive feedback, than in a crowded classroom. (Almanza, Singleton, &amp; Terrill, 1995/6; Ganschow &amp; Sparks, 1993; Rivere, 1996).”</li> </ul>
Lesaux & Geba, 2006, p. 59	<p>“Diagnosable disabilities that interfere with normal reading development are estimated to occur in 5% to 15% of the monolingual population. Presumably, similar percentages of the bilingual population experience such difficulties, although over- and under-identification of English-language learners with learning disabilities related to the difficulty of accurate identification and assessment have complicated efforts to arrive at reliable estimates.”</p>
Hill & Flynn, 2006, p.11	<p>“There are two related generalizations from the research on reinforcing effort. First, not all students realize the importance of believing in effort as a means for academic success. Second, students can learn to believe that effort pays off, even if they do not initially hold this belief.”</p>
Hill & Flynn, 2006, p. 16	<p>“Knowing the level of language acquisition also allows you to work within the student’s ‘zone of proximal development’—that area between what the student is capable of at the moment and the point you want the student to reach next. According to Vygotsky, you can work in a student’s zone of proximal development by ‘scaffolding’ language development, or providing the support a student needs as she progresses.”</p>
DeKeyser, 2003, p. 335	<p>“. . . the instructional approach should be different depending on age: full-scale immersion is necessary for children to capitalize on their implicit learning skills, and formal rule teaching is necessary for adolescents and adults to draw on their explicit learning skills.”</p>
Watson-Gegeo & Nielsen, 2003, pp. 158-159	<p>“The work of LS [language socialization] researchers on cognitive processes is supported and informed by recent advances in several lines of theoretical work in psychology and cognitive anthropology. Neo-Vygotskians have built on Vygotsky’s argument that children develop higher-order cognitive functions, including linguistic skills, through social interaction with adults of more knowledgeable peers, eventually internalizing these skills and functioning independently. The most important interactions take place within a child’s Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), that is, slightly ahead of the learner’s independent ability.”</p>
Francis, Rivera, et al., 2006a, p. 19	<p>“When selecting any intervention, there is a need for a very precise match between the child’s source of difficulty and the intervention itself.”</p>

<b>Researcher(s)</b>	<b>Findings/Conclusions</b>
Francis, Rivera, et al., 2006b, p. 28	"To be most successful, supplemental programs should be designed to meet individual students' specific academic needs and be well-coordinated with the overall instructional program."

### Instructional Strategies—Time-on-Task (TOT)

Researcher(s)	Findings/Conclusions
Ellis, 2001, p. 63	"Language understanding and language production utilise the many millions of associations that the learner has acquired in their history of language use. Thus language is learned in the course of using language, and the best predictor of language facility will simply be time-on-task."
Torgerson, et al., 2004, p. 7	"The amount of instructional time learners need to make educationally significant progress is estimated in the USA to be at least 100 hours of instruction to make progress equivalent to one grade level."
Gersten, Baker, Shanahan, Linan-Thompson, & Collins, 2007, p. 3	Use an intervention program with students who enter the first grade with weak reading and prereading skills, or with older elementary students with reading problems. Ensure that the program is implemented daily for at least 30 minutes in small, homogeneous groups of three to six students."
Francis, Rivera, et al., 2006b, p. 28	". . . adolescent newcomers must be immersed in language-rich environments, engaged with challenging content in English, and provided with effective instruction for more time than are their native English-speaking counterparts."
Francis, Rivera, et al., 2006b, p. 28	"A strong research base supports the notion that, provided instruction is deemed effective, greater time on task is essential to the success of students performing below grade level, ELLs in particular."
Francis, Rivera, et al., 2006b, p. 28	"In addition to increasing the overall instruction time, effective newcomer programs increase the amount of instructional time focused on language and literacy development, whether through two- to four-hour ESL blocks daily, extended time for content-based literacy instruction designed with particular language and literacy objectives in mind, or, preferably, a combination of both."
Kamps, Abbott, Greenwood, Carreaga-Mayer, Wills, Longstaff, Culpepper, & Walton (2007), p. 154	"In addition to the specific reading skills one needs to learn to read, research suggests that factors such as the instructional environment . . . and instructional dosage such as intensity and duration are also critical components to improve instruction for students who have difficulty learning to read. . . ."
Kamps, Abbott, Greenwood, Carreaga-Mayer, Wills, Longstaff, Culpepper, & Walton (2007), p. 154	"Torgesen (2000) suggested that the gains made with the lowest performing students can be attributed in part to the number of hours the intervention lasts and intensity of learning. Intensity consists of instructional changes such as a more parsed sequence of skills, double doses of daily intervention, and/or smaller grouping sizes."
Kamps, Abbott, Greenwood, Carreaga-Mayer, Wills, Longstaff, Culpepper, & Walton (2007), p. 154	"Haager and Windmueller (2001) and others . . . reported that such a process may require long-term intervention."
Kamps, Abbott, Greenwood, Carreaga-Mayer, Wills, Longstaff, Culpepper, & Walton (2007), pp. 154-155	". . . for all students, but especially for student populations who traditionally struggle to meet minimum academic standards, appropriate instructional intensity and consistent progress monitoring are critical to improving student outcomes."

### Instructional Strategies—Chunking/Clustering (C)

Researcher(s)	Findings/Conclusions
Ellis, 2001, pp. 38-39	“The term <i>chunking</i> was coined by George Miller in his classical review of STM [short-term memory]. It is the development of permanent sets of associative connections in long-term storage and is the process that underlies the attainment of automaticity and fluency in language. Newell (1990) argues that it is the overarching principal of human cognition. . . . Chunking appears to be a ubiquitous feature of human memory.”
Ellis, 2003, p. 69	“Even for simple concrete lexis or formulae, acquisition is no unitary phenomenon. It involves the (typically) implicit learning of the sequence of sounds or letters in the word along with separable processes of explicit learning of perceptual reference. Yet however multifaceted and fascinating is the learning of words, lexical learning has generally been viewed as a phenomenon that can readily be understood in terms of basic processes of human cognition. Learning the form of formulae is simply the associative learning of sequences. It can readily be understood in terms of the process of chunking. . . .”
Ellis, 2003, p. 69	“The store of familiar collocations of the native language is very large indeed. The sheer number of words and their patterns variously explains why language learning takes so long, why it requires exposure to authentic sources, and why there is so much current interest in corpus linguistics in SLA.”
Ellis, 2003, p. 75	“We have learned to chunk letters, sounds, morphemes, words, phrases, clauses, bits of co-occurring language at all levels. Psycholinguistic experiments show that we are tuned to these regularities in that we process faster and most easily language which accords with the expectations that have come from our unconscious analysis of the serial probabilities in our lifelong history of input. Furthermore, we learn these chunks from the very beginning of learning a second language.”
Ellis, 2003, p. 76	“Acquisition of these sequential patterns is amenable to explanation in terms of psychological theories of chunking. The notion of chunking has been at the core of short-term memory research since Miller (1956) first proposed the term. While the chunk capacity of short-term memory (STM) is fairly constant at $7 \pm 2$ units, its information capacity can be increased by chunking, a useful representational process in that low-level features that co-occur can be organized together and thence referred to as an individual entity.”
National Center for Family Literacy & National Center for ESL Literacy Education at the Center for Applied Linguistics, 2004, p. 61.	<p>“<i>What instructional methods and materials are effective?</i></p> <p>Educators of children and adults with learning disabilities give the following suggestions for providing instruction for this population:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Be highly structured and predictable.</li> <li>*Teach small amounts of material in sequential steps.</li> <li>*Include opportunities for learners to use several senses and learning strategies.</li> <li>*Recognize and build on learners’ strengths and prior knowledge.</li> <li>*Simplify language but not content.</li> <li>*Emphasize content words and make concepts accessible through the use of pictures, charts, and maps.</li> <li>*Reinforce main ideas and concepts by rephrasing rather than repeating.</li> <li>*Be aware that learners often can take in information but may have difficulty retrieving and using it.</li> <li>*Provide a clean, uncluttered, quiet, and well-lit learning environment.</li> </ul>

Researcher(s)	Findings/Conclusions
	*Use technology if possible. Learners often feel more comfortable and productive working alone and in front of a computer, where they receive positive feedback, than in a crowded classroom. (Almanza, Singleton, & Terrill, 1995/6; Ganschow & Sparks, 1993; Rivere, 1996)."
Hill & Flynn, 2006, p. 12	"When students identify similarities and differences in the content they are learning, they make new connections, experience new insights, and correct misconceptions."
Burt, Peyton, & Van Duzer, Mar. 2005, p. 2.	<p>"Suggestions for teaching English language learners: . . .</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Provide learners with multiple exposures to specific words in multiple contexts.</li> <li>*Provide learners with lists of words for intentional learning.</li> <li>*Avoid presenting synonyms, antonyms, or words in the same semantic set together. . . .</li> <li>*Encourage vocabulary learning through regular tests where students can prove receptive knowledge of words through matching words to definitions or multiple-choice exercises.</li> <li>*After reading, students can write sentences to which they use specific words and grammatical forms."</li> </ul>

### Instructional Strategies—Repetition/Practice (R/P)

Researcher(s)	Findings/Conclusions
Condelli, nd, p. 28	"Varied practice and interaction strategy—use of this strategy, where the teacher taught concepts in a variety of modalities and allowed student interaction, resulted in faster growth in oral communication skills."
Burt, Peyton, & Van Duzer, Mar. 2005, p. 2.	"Suggestions for teaching English language learners: . . . *Provide learners with multiple exposures to specific words in multiple contexts. *Provide learners with lists of words for intentional learning. *Avoid presenting synonyms, antonyms, or words in the same semantic set together. . . . *Encourage vocabulary learning through regular tests where students can prove receptive knowledge of words through matching words to definitions or multiple-choice exercises. *After reading, students can write sentences to which they use specific words and grammatical forms."
Burt, Peyton, & Van Duzer, Mar. 2005, p. 3.	Kruidenier (2002) makes the following suggestions for teaching ABE learners: *Assess learners' fluency by rating the accuracy and speed of their oral reading. *Involve learners in repeated reading of texts and words, taped and live."
MacWhinney, 2001, p. 88	"We know that neural networks can be effectively trained through repeated presentation of stimuli."
Hulstijn, 2001, p. 261-262	"Several studies have shown that repetition of L2 word forms in the form of overt or silent articulation, briefly held in working memory promotes their long-term retention."
Hulstijn, 2001, p. 266	"The more they repeat words, the more these are consolidated in long-term memory (LTM). Acquisition of fluency is influenced by frequency, recency, and regularity. The frequency effect is simply that of 'practice makes perfect.'"
Hulstijn, 2001, p. 276	"High quality information processing when a word is first encountered as such is not predictive of retention outcomes. Rather, as some word forms are less codable and more arbitrary than others, they need deliberate rehearsal."
Hulstijn, 2001, p. 277	"The educational implication of this finding would be that incidental vocabulary learning benefits from regular and frequent exposure whereas intentional vocabulary learning benefits from self tests with increasing intervals."
Hulstijn, 2001, p. 278	"The results of this study clearly demonstrate that retention probability is greatly enhanced for words that are well encoded in one or two presentations and are subsequently accessed several times at intervals of 30 days."
Hulstijn, 2001, p. 279	". . . optimal retention will be attained if new vocabulary is initially rehearsed with frequent intervals (e.g., one day apart) and with intervals gradually becoming longer until they are approximately one month apart."
Hulstijn, 2001, p. 286	"Rich, elaborate processing, however, is not enough either. New information will seldom leave a lasting trace in memory if not frequently reactivated. . . . several decades of psycholinguistic research have made it clear that lexical information simply must be reactivated regularly for it to remain quickly accessible."
Shanahan & Beck, 2006, p. 430	"This result is consistent with findings from studies of native speakers, which have shown that instruction leading to deeper processing of word meanings and requiring greater repetition and use of words in different formats leads to higher proficiency."

Researcher(s)	Findings/Conclusions
Hill & Flynn, 2006, p.10	"There are two generalizations from the research regarding practice. First, a student will not master a skill without a significant amount of practice. In fact, students generally do not reach 80 percent competency until they have practiced a skill at least 24 times. This is important to remember because the goal of practice is to develop a skill or process so that it can be applied fluently with minimal conscious thought. Second, when practicing, students should adapt and shape what they have learned. The conceptual understanding of a skill should develop during practice. Again, students need multiple opportunities to make continued adaptations as they develop their understanding of the skill they are learning."
Hulstijn, 2003, p. 364	"The results show a differentiated pattern, consistent with the view that it is elaboration of the lexical information being process rather than any of these factors per se that determines retention. For L2 educators it is important to note that deep information processing normally requires more time than superficial information processing."
Hulstijn, 2003, p. 365	"In general, retention rates under genuine incidental learning conditions are extremely low. Retention rates under intentional learning conditions are, again on average, much higher than under incidental conditions."
Segalowitz, 2003, p. 401	"All automaticity proposals for enhancing SLA are based, in one way or another, on the idea that extended practice, under particular conditions and circumstances, will increase fluency by developing automaticity."
Segalowitz, 2003, p. 402	". . . promoting automaticity is generally believed to require massive repetition experiences and consistent practice. . . ."
Sanz & Morgan-Short , 2005, p. 237	"Cognitive psychologists associate fluency with fast, automatic, effortless, and error-free performance. . . . What are the characteristics of practice evident in SLA research? When learners are asked to read and memorize sentences or read passages for comprehension, they are exposed to the target forms. Practice requires learners to interact in some way with the target form in the input, to respond to the information."
Gersten, Baker, Shanahan, Linan-Thompson, & Collins, 2007, p. 13	"Researchers converge in noting that effective vocabulary instruction includes multiple exposures to target words over several days and across reading, writing, and speaking opportunities."
Gersten, Baker, Shanahan, Linan-Thompson, & Collins, 2007, p. 13	"A small but consistent body of intervention research suggests that English learners will benefit most from rich, intensive vocabulary instruction that emphasizes 'student-friendly' definitions, that engages students in the meaningful use of words meanings in reading, writing, speaking and listening, and that provides regular review."
Gersten, Baker, Shanahan, Linan-Thompson, & Collins, 2007, p. 14	"Some authorities recommend teaching only about eight to ten words per week this way, while others suggest teaching two to three words per day (but always with lots of future review and extension)."

### Instructional Strategies—Assessment/Feedback (A/F)

Researcher(s)	Findings/Conclusions
Davidson, 1994, p. 19	“. . . the best instructional improvements are informed by ongoing assessment of student strengths and needs. Such assessments are often, but not exclusively, informal and frequently occur on a daily basis, and therefore are not necessarily suited to the summative task of accountability reporting systems. Data should be catalogued on a computer system that would allow teachers, administrators, and evaluators to inspect students' progress individually and by class. These formative assessments are specifically designed to inform instruction on a very frequent basis so that adjustments to instruction can be made to ensure that students are on pace to reach mastery targets.”
Burt, Peyton, & Van Duzer, Mar. 2005, p. 3.	Kruidenier makes the following suggestions for teaching ABE learners: *Assess beginning readers' letter-sound knowledge through their pronunciation of letters, word parts, or whole words that are decodable using common rules or generalizations. *Assess knowledge of sight words with lists of regularly and irregularly spelled words. *Provide adult beginning readers with explicit instruction in word analysis. *When assessing letter-sound knowledge, consider using nonsense words to ensure the reader does not know the words as sight words.”
Burt, Peyton, & Van Duzer, Mar. 2005, p. 3.	Suggestions for teaching English-language learners: *Teach English letter-sound correspondences to all learners. *When assessing knowledge of letter-sound relationships, use actual English words that follow patterns, such as <i>bat/pat/sat</i> . Do not use nonsense words. *Teach morphophonemic relationships in the English writing system. . . . *Teach word-analysis skills, include word prefixes and suffixes. . . .”
Burt, Peyton, & Van Duzer, Mar. 2005, p. 3.	Kruidenier (2002) makes the following suggestions for teaching ABE learners: *Assess learners' fluency by rating the accuracy and speed of their oral reading. *Involve learners in repeated reading of texts and words, taped and live.”
Burt, Peyton, & Van Duzer, Mar. 2005, p. 3.	Kruidenier (2002) makes the following suggestions for teaching ABE learners: *Have students complete cloze passages (in which learners fill in specific words that are left out of a text. . . . *Assess learners' reading comprehension by having them read passages and answer comprehension questions about the text in multiple-choice or short answers.”
Hill & Flynn, 2006, p. 31	“Effective learning requires feedback. When teaching ELLs, it is particularly important to ensure that your feedback is comprehensible, useful, and relevant.”
Gersten, Baker, Shanahan, Linan-Thompson, & Collins, 2007, p. 2	“Conduct formative assessments with English learners using English language measures of phonological processing, letter knowledge, and word and text reading. Use these data to identify English learners who require additional instructional support and to monitor their reading progress over time (Level of Evidence: Strong).”
Gersten, Baker, Shanahan, Linan-Thompson, & Collins, 2007, p. 3	“Districts should establish procedures for—and provide training for—schools to screen English learners for reading problems. The same measures and assessment approaches can be used with English learners and native English speakers.”

Researcher(s)	Findings/Conclusions
Gersten, Baker, Shanahan, Linan-Thompson, & Collins, 2007, p. 3	“Depending on resources, districts should consider collecting progress monitoring data more than three times a year for English learners at risk for reading problems. The severity of the problem should dictate how often progress is monitored—weekly or biweekly for students at high risk of reading problems.”
Gersten, Baker, Shanahan, Linan-Thompson, & Collins, 2007, p. 3	“Data from screening and progress monitoring assessments should be used to make decisions about the instructional support English learners need to learn to read.”
Gersten, Baker, Shanahan, Linan-Thompson, & Collins, 2007, p. 5	“Data from formative assessments should be used to modify (and intensify) the reading and English language development (or ESL) instruction a child receives.”
Francis, Rivera, et al., 2006a, p. 19	“The student’s progress must be monitored over the course of the intervention in order to track growth and response to intervention.”
Francis, Rivera, et al., 2006b, p. 19	“Effective classroom instruction [for adolescent newcomers] begins with systematic assessment of student’s strengths and needs as well as ongoing monitoring of students’ progress.”
Francis, Rivera, et al., 2006b, p. 20	“An effective assessment system focuses on multiple skills and includes different sources of information, each serving a distinct purpose. Together, sources of student data should serve to identify students’ difficulties as well as strengths, monitor students’ progress, and measure outcomes.”
Kamps, Abbott, Greenwood, Carreaga-Mayer, Wills, Longstaff, Culpepper, & Walton (2007), p. 154	“[Haager and Windmueller (2001)] concluded that in addition to using evidence-based reading practices, ongoing teacher support with student monitoring, while challenging, is essential for improving student outcomes.”
Kamps, Abbott, Greenwood, Carreaga-Mayer, Wills, Longstaff, Culpepper, & Walton (2007), pp. 154-155	“. . . for all students, but especially for student populations who traditionally struggle to meet minimum academic standards, appropriate instructional intensity and consistent progress monitoring are critical to improving student outcomes.”

## Bibliography

- Adams, M. (1990). *Beginning to read: Thinking and learning about print*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- American Educational Research Association (Winter 2004). English language learners: Boosting academic achievement. *Research Points: Essential Information for Education Policy*. Washington, DC: AERA.
- Armstrong, D. & Heathcote, V. (2003). *Research review: Literature review of ESOL for learners with learning difficulties and/or disabilities*. London: National Research and Development Centre for Adult Literacy and Numeracy.
- August, D. & Erickson, F. (2006). Qualitative studies of classroom and school practices. In August, D. & Shanahan, T. (Eds.), *Developing literacy in second-language learners. Report of the National Literacy Panel on language-minority children and youth* (pp. 489-522). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- 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, Publishers.
- August, D. & Shanahan, T. (2006). Introduction and methodology. In August, D. & Shanahan, T. (Eds.), *Developing literacy in second-language learners. Report of the National Literacy Panel on language-minority children and youth* (pp. 1-42). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- August, D. & Shanahan, T. (2006). Synthesis: Instruction and professional development. In August, D. & Shanahan, T. (Eds.), *Developing literacy in second-language learners. Report of the National Literacy Panel on language-minority children and youth* (pp. 351-364). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Barone, D. (1998). How do we teach literacy to children who are learning English as a second language? In S. Neuman & K. Roskos (Eds.), *Children achieving: Best practices in early literacy*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Bruer, J. (1993). *Schools for thought: A science for learning in the classroom*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Burt, M., Peyton, J., & Adams, R. (2003). *Reading and adult English language learners: A review of the research*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Burt, M., Peyton, J., & Van Duzer, C. (March 2005). *How should adult ESL reading instruction differ from ABE reading instruction?* Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics (CAELA).
- Center for Adult English Language Acquisition (n.d.). *Assessment with adult English language learners*. Washington, DC: CAELA. Retrieved April 17, 2007, from [www.cal.org/caela/esl\\_resources/collections/factsheets.html](http://www.cal.org/caela/esl_resources/collections/factsheets.html).

- Center for Adult English Language Acquisition (n.d.). *Family literacy and adult English language learners*. Washington, DC: CAELA. Retrieved April 17, 2007, from [www.cal.org/caela/esl\\_resources/collections/factsheets.html](http://www.cal.org/caela/esl_resources/collections/factsheets.html).
- Center for Adult English Language Acquisition (n.d.). Professional development and adult English language learners. Washington, DC: CAELA. Retrieved April 17, 2007, from [www.cal.org/caela/esl\\_resources/collections/factsheets.html](http://www.cal.org/caela/esl_resources/collections/factsheets.html).
- Center for Adult English Language Acquisition (n.d.). *Uses of technology in adult ESL education*. Washington, DC: CAELA. Retrieved April 17, 2007, from [www.cal.org/caela/esl\\_resources/collections/factsheets.html](http://www.cal.org/caela/esl_resources/collections/factsheets.html).
- Chamot, A. (2000). Literacy characteristics of Hispanic adolescent immigrants with limited prior education. A paper presented at a *Research Symposium on High Standards in Reading for Students from Diverse Language Groups*. April 19-20, 2000. Hosted by U.S. Department of Education and Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs).
- Chamot, A. (n.d.). *Research-based academic skills and strategies for newcomers*. Retrieved on Feb. 23, 2007, from Internet.
- Condelli, L. (n.d.). *Effective instruction for adult ESL literacy students: Findings from the What Works study*. Washington, D.C.: American Institutes for Research.
- Creative Education Institute (June 2004). *A results-based assessment of Essential Learning Systems' correlation to limited English proficient instruction*. Waco, TX: Creative Education Institute.
- Creative Education Institute (Feb. 2002). *A results-based assessment of Essential Learning Systems' correlation to the National Reading Panel guidelines*. Waco, TX: Creative Education Institute.
- Creative Education Institute (Apr. 2005). *Why ELS works: Its scientific, theoretical, and evaluation research base*. Waco, TX: Creative Education Institute.
- Davidson, J. (1994). The evaluation of computer-delivered natural speech in the teaching of reading. *Computers and Education*, 22(1-2): pp. 181-185.
- DeKeyser, R. (2001). Automaticity and automatization. In Robinson, P. (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 125-151). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- DeKeyser, R. (2003). Implicit and explicit learning. In C. Doughty & M. Long (Eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 313-348). Malden, ME: Blackwell Publishing.
- Dixon, R. & Nicholson, T. (1994). Effects of training in rapid decoding on the reading comprehension of adult ESL learners. *Journal of Behavioral Education*. 4(2): pp. 177-189. Retrieved on Feb. 20, 2007, from [www.springerlink.com/content/m4q41516401jg630/](http://www.springerlink.com/content/m4q41516401jg630/).
- Dixon-Krauss, L. (1996). *Vygotsky in the classroom: Mediated literacy instruction and assessment*. White Plains, NY: Longman Publishers.

- Dornyei, Z. & Skehan, P. (2003). Individual differences in second language learning. In C. Doughty & M. Long (Eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 589-630). Malden, ME: Blackwell Publishing.
- Doughty, C. J. & Long, M. H. (2003). *The handbook of second language acquisition*. Malden, ME: Blackwell Publishing.
- Eichel, B. (1989). Computer-assisted cloze exercises in the adult ESL classroom: Enhancing retention. *Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education*. 1(3): pp. 168-181. Retrieved on Feb. 20, 2007, from [http://eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/Home.portal?nfpb=true@\\_pageLabel-RecordDetails&ERICExtSearch](http://eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/Home.portal?nfpb=true@_pageLabel-RecordDetails&ERICExtSearch).
- Ellis, N. (2003). Constructions, chunking, and connectionism: The emergence of second language structure. In C. Doughty & M. Long (Eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 63-103). Malden, ME: Blackwell Publishing.
- Ellis, N. (2001). Memory for language. In Robinson, P. (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 33-68). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Francis, D. J., Rivera, M., Lesaux, N., Kieffer, M., & Rivera, H. (2006). *Practical guidelines for the education of English language learners: Research-based recommendations for instruction and academic interventions*. New York: Center on Instruction, RMC Research Corporation.
- Francis, D. J., Rivera, M., Lesaux, N., Kieffer, M., & Rivera, H. (2006). *Practical guidelines for the education of English language learners: Research-based recommendations for serving adolescent newcomers*. New York: Center on Instruction, RMC Research Corporation.
- Garcia, G. E. & Godina, H. (2004). Addressing the literacy needs of adolescent English language learners. In T. Jetton & J. Dole (Eds.), *Adolescent literacy research and practice* (pp. 304-320). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Genesee, F., Lindholm-Leary, K., Saunders, W., & Christian, D. (2006). *Educating English language learners: A synthesis of research evidence*. New York NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Genesee, F. & Riches, C. (2006). Literacy: Instructional issues. In F. Genesee, K. Lindholm-Leary, W. Saunders, & D. Christian (Eds.), *Educating English language learners: A synthesis of research evidence* (pp. 109-175). New York NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Gersten, R. & Baker, S. (2003). English-language learners with learning disabilities. In H. Swanson, K. Harris, & S. Graham (Eds.), *Handbook of learning disabilities* (pp. 94-109). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Gersten, R., Baker, S. K., Shanahan, T., Linan-Thompson, S., Collins, P., & Scarcella, R. (July 2007). *IES Practice Guide: Effective literacy and English language instruction for English learners in the elementary grades*. Washington, DC: Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.

- Geva, E. (2006). Second-language oral proficiency and second-language literacy. In August, D. & Shanahan, T. (Eds.), *Developing literacy in second-language learners. Report of the National Literacy Panel on language-minority children and youth* (pp. 123-140). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Gob, C. & Foong, K. (1997). Chinese ESL students' learning strategies: A look at frequency, proficiency, and gender. *Hong Kong Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 3(1): 39-53.
- Graves, M. & Watts-Taffe, S. (2002). The place of word consciousness in a research-based vocabulary program. In A. Farstrup & J. Samuels (Eds.), *What research has to say about reading instruction* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.) (pp. 140-165). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Haager, D. (Summer 2007). Promises and cautions regarding using response to intervention with English language learners. *Learning Disabilities Quarterly: Journal of the Council for Learning Disabilities*, 30(3), 213-218.
- Hill, J. D. & Flynn, K. M. (2006). *Classroom instruction that works with English language learners*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Hulstijn, J. (2003). Incidental and intention learning. In C. Doughty & M. Long (Eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 349-381). Malden, ME: Blackwell Publishing.
- Hulstijn, J. (2001). Intentional and incidental second language vocabulary learning: A Reappraisal of elaboration, rehearsal, and automaticity. In Robinson, P. (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 258-286). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Institute of Education Sciences (2006). *The nation's report card: 12<sup>th</sup> grade reading and mathematics 2005*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.
- Jetton, T. & Dole, J. (2004). *Adolescent literacy research and practice*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Jiang, B. & Kuehn, P. (2001). Transfer in the academic language development of post-secondary ESL students. *Bilingual Research Journal* 25: 1-17. Retrieved on Feb. 23, 2007, from <http://brh.asu.edu/v254/articles/ar12.html>.
- Johnson, S. & Taylor, K. (Eds.). (2006). *The neuroscience of adult learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Jones, M. (1996). *Phonics in ESL literacy instruction: Functional or not?* Proceedings of the 1996 World Conference on Literacy. Philadelphia, PA: International Literacy Institute.
- Kamps, D., Abbott, M., Greenwood, C., Arreaga-Mayer, C., Wills, H., Longstaff, J., Culpepper, M., & Walton, C. (Summer 2007). Use of evidence-based, small-group reading instruction for English language learners in elementary grades: Secondary-tier interventions. *Learning Disability Quarterly: Journal of the Council for Learning Disabilities*, 30(3), 153-168.

- Klingner, J. & Vaughn, S. (2004). Strategies for struggling second-language readers. In T. Jetton & J. Dole, *Adolescent literacy research and practice* (pp. 183-209). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Kroll, J. F. & Sunderman, G. (2003). Cognitive processes in second language learners and bilinguals: The development of lexical and conceptual representations. In C. Doughty & M. Long (Eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 104-129). Malden, ME: Blackwell Publishing.
- Learning Disabilities Association of Minnesota (Jan. 2004). Decoding skills. *NetNews: An online newsletter devoted to adult literacy*. Minneapolis, MN: LDA Minnesota.
- Learning Disabilities Association of Minnesota (Mar. 2004). Intermediate decoding skills. *NetNews: An online newsletter devoted to adult literacy*. Minneapolis, MN: LDA Minnesota.
- Lehr, F., Osborn, J. & Hiebert, E. A focus on vocabulary. *Research-based practices in early reading*. Regional Educational Laboratory at Pacific Resources for Education and Learning. Retrieved Feb. 6, 2005, from [www.prel.org/products/re\\_ES0419.htm](http://www.prel.org/products/re_ES0419.htm).
- Leow, R. & Bowles, M. (2005). Attention and awareness in SLA. In C. Sanz (Ed.), *Mind and context in adult second language acquisition* (pp. 179-206). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Lesaux, N. & Geva, E. (2006). Synthesis: Development of literacy in language-minority students. In August, D. & Shanahan, T. (Eds.), *Developing literacy in second-language learners. Report of the National Literacy Panel on language-minority children and youth* (pp. 53-74). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Lesaux, N. with Koda, K., Siegel, L., & Shanahan, T. (2006). Development of literacy. In August, D. & Shanahan, T. (Eds.), *Developing literacy in second-language learners. Report of the National Literacy Panel on language-minority children and youth* (pp. 75-122). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Lesley, B. (Dec. 2003/Jan. 2004). CEI's programs: Providing solutions for LEP students. *SHARE* (newsmagazine). Waco, TX: Creative Education Institute.
- Lesley, B. (2004). How does your LEP program measure up? *SHARE* (newspagazine). Waco, TX: Creative Education Institute.
- Levin, T. & Long, R. (1981). *Effective instruction*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Linan-Thompson, S., Cirino, P. T., & Vaughn, S. (Summer 2007). Determining English language learners' response to intervention: Questions and some answers. *Learning Disability Quarterly: Journal of the Council for Learning Disabilities*, 30(3), 185-196.
- MacWhinney, B. (2001). The competition model: The input, the context, and the brain. In Robinson, P. (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 69-90). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

- McIntosh, A. S., Graves, a., & Gersten, R. (Summer 2007). The effects of response to intervention on literacy development in multiple-language settings. *Learning Disability Quarterly: Journal of the Council for Learning Disabilities*, 30(3), 197-212.
- Marzano, R. (1992). *A different kind of classroom: Teaching with Dimensions of Learning*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Mercer, C. & Mercer, A. (2005). *Teaching students with learning problems* (7<sup>th</sup> ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Merrill/Prentice Hall.
- Meschyan, G. & Hernandez, A. (2004). Cognitive factors in second-language acquisition and literacy learning: A theoretical proposal and call for research. In C. A. Stone, E. R. Silliman, B. J. Ehren, & K. Apel (Eds.), *Handbook of language and literacy: Development and disorders* (pp. 73-81). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Nagy, W. E. & Scott, J. A. (2000). In M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, & R Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. III), pp. 269-284. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Nassaji, H. (June 2003). Higher-level and lower-level text processing skills in advanced ESL reading comprehension. *The Modern Language Journal*. 87(2): pp. 261-276. Retrieved on Feb. 20, 2007, from [www.ingentaconnect.com/content/bpl/modl/2003/00000087/0000002/art00006](http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/bpl/modl/2003/00000087/0000002/art00006).
- National Center for ESL Literacy Education (2003). *Adult English language instruction in the 21<sup>st</sup> century*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- National Center for Family Literacy & National Center for ESL Literacy Education at the Center for Applied Linguistics (2004.). *Adult English language learners and learning disabilities*. Retrieved on Feb. 20, 2007, from [www.cal.org/caela/tools/instructional/prac\\_toolkit.html](http://www.cal.org/caela/tools/instructional/prac_toolkit.html).
- National Institute for Literacy (Summer 1995). *Adults with learning disabilities: Definitions and issues*. Retrieved on Feb. 20, 2007, from <http://www.nifl.gov/nifl/ld/archive/definiti.htm>.
- National Institute for Literacy (2005). *Applying research in reading instruction for adults*. Washington, DC: National Center for Family Literacy.
- National Reading Panel (2000). *Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction. Reports of the subgroups*. Washington, DC: US Department of Health and Human Services. National Institutes of Health.
- Nassaji, H. & Geva, E. (1999). The contribution of phonological and orthographic processing skills to adult ESL reading: Evidence from native Speakers of Farsi. *Applied Psycholinguistics* 20: 241-267.
- Park, C. (Summer 2002). Crosscultural differences in learning styles of secondary English learners. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 26(2): 214-229.
- Partnership for Reading (2002). *Research-based principles for Adult Basic Education reading instruction*. Portsmouth, NH: RMC Research Corporation.

- Riches, C. & Genesee, F. (2006). Literacy: Crosslinguistic and crossmodal issues. In F. Genesee, K. Lindholm-Leary, W. Saunders, & D. Christian (Eds.). *Educating English language learners: A synthesis of research evidence* (pp. 64-87). New York NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Robinson, P. (2001). *Cognition and second language instruction*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Rubinstein-Avila, E. (2003). Conversing with Miguel: An adolescent English language learner struggling with later literacy development: A student's view of the multiple literacies in his life provide insights for teachers of struggling readers. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 47. Retrieved on Feb. 23, 2007, from <http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&se=gglsc&d=5002441904>.
- Samuels, S. J. (2002). Reading fluency: Its development and assessment. In A. Farstrup & J. Samuels (Eds.), *What research has to say about reading instruction* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). (pp. 166-183). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Sanz, C. (2005). Adult SLA: The interaction between external and internal factors. In C. Sanz (Ed.), *Mind and context in adult second language acquisition* (pp. 1-20). Washington, DC: George Washington University Press.
- Sanz, C. & Morgan-Short, K. (2005). Explicitness in pedagogical interventions: Input, practice, and feedback. In C. Sanz (Ed.), *Mind and context in adult second language acquisition* (pp. 234-263). Washington, DC: George Washington University Press.
- Sanz, C. (Ed.) (2005). *Mind and context in adult second language acquisition*. Washington, DC: George Washington University Press.
- Sawyer, M. & Ranta, L. (2001). Aptitude, individual differences, and instructional design. In Robinson, P. (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 319-353). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Schmidt, R. (2001). Attention. In Robinson, P. (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 1-32). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Segalowitz, N. (2003). Automaticity and second languages. In C. Doughty & M. Long (Eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 382-408). Malden, ME: Blackwell Publishing.
- Shanahan, T. & Beck, I. (2006). Effective literacy teaching for English-language learners. In August, D. & Shanahan, T. (Eds.), *Developing literacy in second-language learners. Report of the National Literacy Panel on language-minority children and youth* (pp. 415-488). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Shiotsu, R. & Weir, C. (2007). *The relative significance of syntactic knowledge and vocabulary breadth in the prediction of reading comprehension test performance*. Retrieved on Feb. 20, 2007, from <http://ltg.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/24/1/99>.

- Short, D. & Eschevarria, J. (Dec. 2004/Jan. 2005). Teacher skills to support English language learners. *Educational Leadership*. 62(4): pp. 8-13.
- Snow, C. (2006). Cross-cutting themes and future research directions. In August, D. & Shanahan, T. (Eds.), *Developing literacy in second-language learners. Report of the National Literacy Panel on language-minority children and youth* (pp. 631-652). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Southwest Educational Development Lab. *The cognitive foundations of learning to read: A framework*. Retrieved Feb. 26, 2005, from [www.sedl.org/readingfirst/faqs.html](http://www.sedl.org/readingfirst/faqs.html).
- Sticht, T. G. (Dec. 1997). The theory behind content-based instruction. *Focus on Basics*, 1(D).
- Stuart, M. (1995). Prediction and qualitative assessment of five and six-year-old children's reading: A longitudinal study. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*. 65, pp. 287-296.
- Swanson, H., Harris, K., & Graham, S. (Eds.) (2003). *Handbook of learning disabilities*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (Oct. 2000). *Adult ESL language and literacy instruction: A vision and action agenda for the 21<sup>st</sup> century*. Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Torgerson, C., Brooks, G., Porthouse, J., Burton, M., Robinson, A., Wright, K., & Watt, I. (March 2004). *Research review: Adult literacy and numeracy interventions and outcomes: A review of controlled trials*. London: National Research and Development Centre for Adult Literacy and Numeracy.
- Troja, G. (2004). Phonological processing and its influence on literacy learning. In C. A. Stone, E. R. Silliman, B. J. Erhen, & K. Apel (Eds.), *Handbook of language and literacy: Development and disorders* (pp. 271-301). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Ullman, M. (2005). A cognitive neuroscience perspective on second language acquisition: The declarative/procedural model. In C. Sanz (Ed.), *Mind and context in adult second language acquisition* (pp. 141-178). Washington, DC: George Washington University Press.
- Vanpatten, B. (2005). Processing information. In C. Sanz (Ed.), *Mind and context in adult second language acquisition* (pp. 267-281). Washington, DC: George Washington University Press.
- University of Texas Center for Reading and Language Arts & Texas Education Agency (2004). *Supplemental instruction for struggling readers, grades 3-5: A guide for tutors*. Austin, TX: Texas Education Agency.
- Watson-Gegeo, K. & Nielsen, S. (2003). Language socialization in SLA. In C. Doughty & M. Long (Eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 157-177). Malden, ME: Blackwell Publishing.

