

Effects of Instructional Conversations and Literature Logs on Limited- and Fluent-English-Proficient Students' Story Comprehension and Thematic Understanding

William M. Saunders

Claude Goldenberg

California State University, Long Beach

Abstract

This article reports an experiment that tests the effects of 2 instructional components used to study literature with upper-elementary-grade limited-English-proficient and English-proficient students. The study is part of an ongoing "component-building" program of research designed to estimate the effects of several individual components of a Spanish-to-English language arts transition program. Literature logs and instructional conversations were the program components identified for intensive study. 5 teachers and 116 fourth and fifth graders participated in the study. Slightly more than half the students were English learners completing their first or second year of English language arts. Teachers had completed 1 year of literature log and instructional conversation training. Students were randomly assigned to 1 of 4 treatment conditions: literature logs only, instructional conversation only, literature log + instructional conversation, and control. Posttests showed significant differences among treatment groups. Students in the instructional conversation and literature log + instructional conversation groups scored significantly higher on story comprehension than the control group. Moreover, students in all 3 experimental groups were significantly more likely to demonstrate an understanding of the story themes than the control group. The combined effects of literature logs and instructional conversations on students' essays about a story's theme varied by language proficiency: limited-English-proficient students' essays benefited from the combined effects of literature logs and instructional conversations; fully English-proficient students' essays, in contrast, showed no such effect.

More than 2 million students—5% of the U.S. student population—speak a language other than English in their homes and are not fluent in English (Fleischman & Hopstock, 1993; National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, 1995). The number of

limited-English speakers has risen over the past 2 decades and continues to grow. At a time when the size of the general school population remained essentially stable, the number of limited-English-proficient students (three-fourths of whom are Spanish speakers) grew by 85% nationwide between 1985 and 1992 (National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, 1995).

Although estimates vary, perhaps as many as 50% of these students are in some form of "transitional bilingual education," or TBE (August & Hakuta, 1997). In TBE programs, students receive academic instruction in their native language during the early years of schooling, then "transition" into mainstream English once they are proficient enough to participate fully in all-English instruction and activities. The purpose of TBE is not to maintain or, much less, to promote academic and linguistic development in a student's home language *per se*. Rather, TBE's purpose is to use the student's home language for academic instruction only as long as necessary. Once students acquire enough proficiency in English, they are "transitioned" into all-English instruction. Transition can occur anywhere from the early elementary grades to middle school, depending on a school's program or model, when a student begins the program, individual student characteristics and achievement, and teachers' judgment.

Recent evidence has suggested that programs that maintain and actively promote continued use of the primary language, rather than having students transition to all-English instruction in elementary school, produce superior academic outcomes *in English* (Thomas & Collier, 1997). Yet these programs are exceedingly rare (August & Hakuta, 1997), and the fact remains that if English language learners' home language is used academically at all, it is for a relatively brief time and generally for no more than a few years during elementary school. Once children have reached a certain level of literacy in their

home language and oral fluency and comprehension in English, they are transitioned into all-English instruction.

Given the assumptions underlying TBE, many educators consider the transition period a positive indication that English learners are entering the mainstream (Gándara & Mérimo, 1993). However, transition can be problematic for both students and teachers. Student participation often declines, and concerns about student achievement and special education referrals go up (Gersten, 1996). Teacher expectations tend to drop and along with them, students' academic learning opportunities (Berman et al., 1992). If transition is handled too abruptly and primary language support suddenly removed, achievement can decline precipitously (Ramírez, 1992). Transition—for the million or so English-language learners in TBE programs—is a crucial period during which many of these students are especially vulnerable to academic underachievement. If schools are to continue using TBE programs (instead of programs that support and maintain the home language throughout students' school careers), it is critical that teachers know about and use effective procedures and strategies during this very important phase of limited-English speakers' schooling.

Unfortunately, educators have little research on which to base policy and practice (Goldenberg, 1996). Teachers tend to describe themselves as uncertain about the appropriate methods to use during transition (Gersten & Woodward, 1994). Even in schools and districts recognized for their exemplary bilingual programs, transition is often a conundrum (Berman et al., 1992). Much existing research has focused on the timing and duration of transition (e.g., Ramírez, 1992). Far less attention has been devoted to empirical studies of effective transition instruction and curriculum (Gersten, 1996). In this article we report a study that is the first in a series of experiments attempting to identify effective components of a successful transition program.

As part of a previous project (Saunders, 1998; Saunders & Lennon, 1996; Saunders et al., 1998), members of our research team collaborated with educators from a school district in Southern California to develop and evaluate an effective transition program for Spanish-speaking children. In general, our efforts have proved successful: compared to the transition program students typically receive in the district, the program we developed produced significantly higher levels of Spanish literacy achievement at grades 3 and 4 and English literacy achievement at grade 5 (as gauged by both standardized and performance-based assessments), significantly higher numbers of students who formally demonstrated fluent English proficiency by grade 5 (and were reclassified from "limited" to "fluent" English proficient), and more positive attitudes toward bilingualism (specifically, students' attitudes toward Spanish literacy) for significantly larger numbers of students (Saunders, 1998).

The program is complex and comprises 12 components falling into three categories (described more fully in the next section). In our current project, we are studying the implementation and the effects of the program at a number of new schools. We are also studying the independent and combined effects of several of the 12 program components. In a previous study (Saunders & Goldenberg, 1997) we found that teachers consider all the program components to be important, although some more important than others. Our assumption is that teachers of transition students need precise and systematic information about the relative contribution of specific program components to children's achievement. This will enable them to make informed choices when faced with the inevitable constraints of time and resources that all teachers face, particularly those of English language learners.

Using a strategy Slavin (1984) has called "component building," we are seeking to identify and estimate the effects of individual program components. Component

building is "a long program of field experimental research on classroom practices that are or could become components of complete programs, but are separable elements in themselves" (Slavin, 1984, p. 262). As a total package, our transition program produces achievement results superior to those of the standard transition program used in the district where it was developed, one of the largest in the nation. Other than teachers' reports, however, we know nothing about the relative importance of each of the 12 components. Our approach is thus to evaluate systematically the effects of individual components and clusters of components in order to determine which produce the strongest and most reliable effects on student learning, which produce negligible effects, and which produce no or even negative effects. In this article we report on the first of this series of studies.

As a further consideration, because English-language learners (or "ELLs," sometimes referred to as limited-English-proficient students, or "LEPs") are often in classrooms with fluent-English-proficient students ("FEPs"), it is also important to gauge the effects of various program components on students of varying English proficiency. We cannot assume that the effects are consistent across categories (LEPs and FEPs), and here again, teachers need reliable information about effects in order to plan and organize their instructional programs for different types of students.

The Transition Program

Three-Year Conceptualization of Transition

The 3-year conceptualization of transition optimally spans grades 3–5. Grade 3 is considered a pretransition year, grade 4 is transition 1, grade 5 is transition 2 (see Table 1). The concept of a pretransition component is designed to emphasize the fundamental role of Spanish reading and writing and oral English development that precedes transition. The focus of this phase is intensive Spanish reading and writing in-

TABLE 1. Three-Year Conceptualization of Transition: Goals and Outcomes

Phases	Optimal Grade	Goal	Measureable Outcome
Pretransition	K-2	Initial reading and writing proficiency (Spanish); early production 2 (oral English)	Existing norm- or criterion-referenced measures
	3	Grade-appropriate reading and writing achievement (Spanish); speech emergence (oral English)	Pass CARE (district transition instrument; LAUSD, 1996)
Transition 1	4	Initial reading and writing proficiency (English); academic oral language proficiency (English); grade-appropriate reading and writing achievement (Spanish)	Existing norm- or criterion-referenced measures
Transition 2	5	Grade-appropriate reading and writing achievement (English)	Reclassification: LEP to FEP

NOTE.—LEP = limited-English proficient; FEP = fluent-English proficient.

struction and extensive oral English development. The goal is to have all students performing at grade level in Spanish reading and writing and at the speech emergence level in oral English development by the end of third grade, which in this district would qualify students to begin transitional language arts.

The concept of transitions 1 and 2—grades 4 and 5—is designed to make explicit the need for a transition program of serious substance and duration. By the end of transition 1 students should be able to show at least initial reading and writing fluency in English. They should be able to decode and demonstrate basic understanding of end-of-third-grade English reading material (within a year of the students' academic grade). They should also increase their academic oral English-language proficiency (intermediate fluency), so that they can participate in academic discussions. Finally, students should continue to demonstrate grade-level Spanish reading and writing proficiency. Spanish language arts is maintained throughout the entire year of transition 1.

By the end of transition 2, students should be decoding and comprehending grade-level material in English, both in terms of literature and in the content areas. The goal is reclassification from "limited"

to "fluent" English proficient: students have transitioned and can now perform successfully in a mainstream program when they have grade-level or close to grade-level English skills.

The Language Arts Model

As part of our work on the transition program, we identified 12 instructional components that seemed most effective in serving the needs of students throughout the three phases of the program (see Table 2; see also Appendix for short descriptions of each component).

Literature studies. Across all phases of the program, from pretransition to transition 2—from Spanish to English language arts and from grades 2 or 3 through 5—students study literature. We assumed that students would benefit from more extensive and intensive opportunities to work with text, to study interesting stories under the tutelage of a teacher. Based on research conducted as part of the Kamehameha Elementary Education Program in Hawaii (Au, 1979, 1992; Tharp & Gallimore, 1988) and Spanish-speaking Latino communities in southern California (Goldenberg, 1992/1993; Saunders & Goldenberg, in press; Saunders, Patthey-Chavez, & Goldenberg, 1997), we adapted the Experience-Text-Relationship (ETR) approach as our frame-

TABLE 2. Components of the Language Arts Model

Literature Studies	Skill Building	Other Supporting Components
Literature units (Experience-text-relationship approach)	Comprehension strategies	Pleasure reading
Literature logs	Assigned independent reading	Teacher read-alouds
Instructional conversation	Dictation	Interactive journals
Culminating writing projects (Writing-as-a-process approach)	Written conventions lessons	
	ELD through Literature ^a	

NOTE.—See Appendix for brief description of each component.

^aELD through Literature applies to the Pretransition year.

work for literature units. Through ongoing discussions (instructional conversations), writing activities (literature logs and culminating writing projects), and reading, the teacher helps students study the story in relation to their own experiences and a central theme. The metaphor for this approach to studying literature is weaving (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988). With the assistance of the teacher, students weave together new and existing knowledge, experiences, and concepts. The medium for weaving is both writing and discussion. Discussions set up writing assignments, and writings inform subsequent discussions throughout the course of the literature unit. Writing is an individual opportunity for each student to think about and articulate ideas, interpretations, and related experiences. Discussions provide a social opportunity for students and teacher to collaboratively build more elaborate and sophisticated understandings.

With respect to literacy development, we assume that through this recurrent process of individual and social discourse—of reading, writing, and discussing—studying literature helps students learn to comprehend text, make connections between the text and their own lives, and develop more fully formed concepts (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988). In terms of second-language acquisition (Cummins, 1989; Krashen, 1987), we assume literature units help provide substantial comprehensible input—language

that includes somewhat more sophisticated structures or vocabulary than learners can produce on their own but is understandable within the context in which it is used. The literature unit becomes a meaningful social context in which words, phrases, language structures, and concepts are used, acquired, and learned (see Saunders et al., 1998, for a more detailed explanation of the ETR approach).

Skill-building components. As we found throughout our research and development work, studying literature needs to be complemented by additional skill-building components. Students need direct instruction in specific reading comprehension strategies (predicting, summarizing, questioning), and they need daily opportunities to read texts geared to their reading level—assigned independent reading. Comprehension strategies are presented in 2-week modules in the first and fourth quarters of the year. The assigned independent reading center runs throughout the year. Ideally, the center includes materials related to the literature unit. Students need similar study and practice experiences for written language. As part of a weekly dictation program, students study a short but carefully targeted passage from the literature selection.

English Language Development (ELD) through Literature (developed by project consultant Dolores Beltrán) is a daily, 30–40-minute oral English program used in the

pretransition phases of the program. Instruction is delivered to students in small, homogeneous groups based on students' proficiency levels. Lessons and independent activities are all drawn from a particular literature selection (typically one with predictable patterns, language structures, and target vocabulary for various domains). The focus of lessons and the teacher's talk are geared specifically to students' production levels. The ELD through Literature is an integral part of our pretransition program (grades 3 and also 2). (Note: this component is not included in the subsequent analysis because it only applies to the early grades; the explanation here is provided for completeness.)

Other supporting components. Teacher read-alouds and pleasure reading are both designed to expose students to good literature and support their independent reading behaviors. At all grades, teachers read to students for approximately 20 minutes at least 3 times per week. Teacher read-alouds serve various purposes: exposing students to the language of expert writers and the fluency of an expert reader, engaging students in material they may not yet be able to read on their own, and introducing students to new authors and genre. In addition, a portion of time each day is devoted to pleasure reading. Students choose their own books and stories, keep records of their reading, and for those books they find most interesting, they complete short assignments (summaries, synopses, oral presentations, drawings, etc.). In addition, many transition 1 teachers use interactive journals during the first half of the year when students are making their first attempts at English writing. The immediate written response from the teacher provides both emotional support for the students and a highly contextualized and therefore comprehensible English text for students to read.

Theoretical Premises

The program is a combination of the 3-year conceptualization of transition and the

language arts model. Four theoretical premises undergird the program, all of which are assumed to promote first- and second-language acquisition and achievement:

1. *Challenge*: consistently challenge students academically—challenge them to think, learn, and engage intellectually;
2. *Continuity*: achieve continuity in curriculum and instruction as students move from primary to middle to upper grades, and from Spanish to English language arts;
3. *Connections*: build on and make explicit connections between students' existing knowledge, skills, and experiences and the academic curriculum to be learned (including language, literacy, and content);
4. *Comprehensiveness*: address both meaning and skills, both higher-level thinking and appropriate drill and practice, and provide complementary portions of student- and teacher-centeredness.

These premises are grounded in the research literature, specifically studies in which researchers have tried to identify the characteristics of more and less successful programs for English learners (Berman et al., 1992; García, 1992; Gersten & Jiménez, 1993; Goldenberg & Gallimore, 1991; Ramírez, 1992).

In this study we examined the effects of two literature studies components: literature logs and instructional conversations. Teachers rated both components as extremely important to transition students' literacy development (Saunders & Goldenberg, 1997). The purpose of this experiment was to establish the independent and combined effects of literature logs and instructional conversations for transition and non-transition students (i.e., limited and fluent English proficient, respectively) on story comprehension (factual and interpretive) and theme understanding (explaining and describing examples of the story theme). We have evidence from previous studies that instructional conversations improve aspects of reading comprehension (Saunders

& Goldenberg, in press); our hypothesis was that literature logs would also produce positive effects. This is what the component-building strategy is designed to do: build a better understanding of individual program components and their effects on student learning.

Method

Context

School and population. The student body at the urban K-5 elementary school where this study was conducted is 82% Hispanic and 69% limited-English proficient; 62% of students qualify for the federal meals program, and 22% qualify for aid to families with dependent children. Enrollment is 1,400 students, and the school operates on a three-track, year-round calendar. At the time of the study, whether tested in Spanish or English, more than 75% of fourth graders at the school were below grade level in reading, language, and math; the school ranked among the lowest 20% of schools in the district. Over the last 2 years, the school has embarked on a large-scale improvement project to substantially raise both Spanish and English literacy achievement. Schoolwide efforts are underway to improve bilingual programs, English language development programs, language arts instruction, and the overall academic infrastructure at the school. Our research team has been collaborating with administrators and teachers from this school and several other neighboring schools in the same subdivision of the district.

Teachers and classrooms. The five teachers who participated in the study are members of a research and development team. The team is implementing the language arts model in Spanish, transition, and English mainstream language arts classrooms. Led by two instructional advisors, one of whom spearheaded the original development of the transition program (Cisela O'Brien), the team meets twice a month throughout the year to study instructional components, view videotape and live dem-

onstrations, plan units, and analyze student work. Advisors coteach and assist teachers in the classroom daily. At the time of the study, the teachers were completing their first year of participation on the research and development team. All five teachers have at least 5 years' experience teaching in the upper grades. Teachers volunteered to participate in the study and received a stipend for the time spent outside the school day designing the instructional unit, developing materials, and assessing student work. All five teachers felt sufficiently comfortable with both literature logs and instructional conversations to participate in the design and conduct of the experiment.

The experiment was conducted during the last quarter of the school year. With few exceptions (described below), the experiment involved the same classroom conditions students had participated in throughout the school year. Teachers had been conducting literature units, leading instructional conversations, and assigning and sharing literature logs all year long. Each teacher used a similar, heterogeneously comprised four-group rotation system that allows 30-45-minute teacher lessons for two groups each day. While the teacher works with one group, other groups work with the teaching assistant or independently on unit-related and other language arts assignments. Procedures developed for the experiment were based on the existing small-group rotation system.

The literature unit. The literature unit used in the experiment was designed by the five participating teachers and the first author. The unit featured a story about a young girl who is asked by her teacher to sing a solo as part of a class performance ("Louella's Song"; Greenfield, 1993). Louella loves to sing, and her teacher thinks she is very good. But Louella is afraid to sing alone in front of others, and despite her teacher's encouragement, she feigns laryngitis to avoid singing the solo. When the class arrives at the designated location for their performance, they discover it is a chil-

dren's hospital. Louella immediately sees the joy and heartfelt gratitude of the children at the hospital as her classmates begin their performance. On seeing this, she changes her mind and sings her solo, much to everyone's delight.

The word "giving" is used repeatedly at the end of the story. In this context, "giving" is spiritual, not material. The teachers in the study assumed that students probably understood the giving of material things but not necessarily giving of oneself, as in the case of Louella, who overcame her fear in order to give joy to others through her song. The theme was particularly timely for the fifth graders in this study, because the children were preparing graduation performances, and many of them were apprehensive about performing. Through discussions as part of the lessons and activities, teachers were able to talk with students about how participating in the performance was a way of "giving" back to their parents.

"Louella's Song" suited the purposes of the experiment well. First, students could identify with the circumstances of the story (i.e., a 10-year-old's apprehension about performing a solo). Second, the story had a strong theme that was an appropriate challenge for the students (i.e., giving of oneself as opposed to giving material goods). Third, as designed by the teachers, the unit could be completed within a week because "Louella's Song" is a relatively short narrative (1060 words). Thus, the unit provided an opportunity to study the effects of literature logs and instructional conversation within a meaningful context: teachers wanted to conduct the unit for its own sake. But the relatively short length of the unit, 1 week, allowed using experimental conditions without causing prolonged stress on the teachers or loss of instructional time for students.

Subjects

The study involved three fifth- and two fourth-grade classrooms. Class size ranged from 26 to 31 students. Each class included

a mixture of fluent- and limited-English-proficient students. Fluent-English-proficient students include native, English-only (EO) speakers and former limited-English-proficient students whose English competence permitted their reclassification to "fluent"-English proficient based on district measures and criteria (RFEP, or "reclassified" fluent-English proficient). All limited-English-proficient students (LEP) had been receiving transitional instruction since at least the beginning of the year. Most LEP students had participated in the bilingual program; however, a small number of LEP students had, based on parent request, participated in an English language development program rather than the bilingual program.

All students enrolled in the five classes participated in the experiment. However, of the 138 enrollees, 22 students were excluded from the final analysis; three special education students, four students who enrolled just prior to the study (and were therefore less familiar than other students with literature unit activities), 12 students who were absent for some portion of the experiment activities, and three students who were randomly excluded in order to maintain precise matching across the four treatment groups. Table 3 shows the composition of the four treatment groups (29 per group; $N = 116$).

Design and Procedures

We used a pretest/posttest 2×4 design to evaluate component effects on students' comprehension of the story's details and themes. The design includes two categories of students—(1) limited- and (2) fluent-English proficient—and four treatment conditions: (1) read and study (control group), (2) literature logs only, (3) instructional conversation only, and (4) literature logs + instructional conversation. Students in the five classrooms were matched by language proficiency (limited or fluent) and teachers' rating of reading skills, then randomly assigned within classrooms to one of the four

TABLE 3. Sample and Treatment Group Composition

Language Classification	Reading Achievement (Teacher's Rating)	Treatment Groups				Total	Sample (%)
		Read and Study (Control)	Literature Logs	Instructional Conversation	Literature Logs + Instructional Conversation		
Fluent-English Proficient	On grade level	9	9	9	8	35	30
	Below grade level	3	3	3	4	13	11
	Severe problems	1	1	1	1	4	3
Limited-English Proficient	On grade level	3	2	3	3	11	9
	Below grade level	9	11	9	9	38	33
	Severe problems	4	3	4	4	15	13
Total		29	29	29	29	116	

treatment conditions. To control for teacher effects, all four treatment conditions were carried out in each classroom. A detailed set of lesson plans, developed by the first author and the participating teachers, described instructional procedures for each treatment condition. The first author briefed each participating teacher just prior to the beginning of the study, maintained daily contact throughout the study, and debriefed each teacher immediately following the study's conclusion. All communication between the researcher and participating teachers indicated that treatment conditions were maintained and procedures were properly carried out across all five classrooms.

The study was conducted in three phases over approximately 10–15 calendar days.

Phase 1 comprised pretesting and whole-class preparatory activities. Students wrote essays telling what they knew or thought about the topic of "giving." Three to 5 days later, teachers reviewed the plan of activities, introduced the story with a prepared, three-sentence synopsis, and read aloud the first page of the six-page story. Students then read the remainder of the story independently. They were given as much time as needed; all finished within 30

minutes. Finally, students took a comprehension pretest on the story. (See "Measures" for details on theme essays and comprehension tests.)

Phase 2 comprised the conduct of the literature unit under experimental conditions (see Table 4). It commenced the day after students read the story and lasted 4 days. Within the 90-minute language arts block each day, teachers conducted two consecutive 45-minute small-group lessons. Table 4 depicts the order of the teacher-directed lessons and which groups participated. On day 1, the teacher conducted literature log lessons with the literature log-only group and the literature log + instructional conversation group. On day 2, the teacher conducted instructional conversation lessons with the instructional conversation-only group and the literature log + instructional conversation group. On days 3 and 4 the same procedures were followed, this time counterbalancing the order of the literature log and instructional conversation lessons.

For the literature logs, teachers met the group briefly and gave them a prompt asking students to write about personal experiences related to Louella's experiences in the story. (LL1: Write about a time when you were supposed to do something in front of a group of people. LL2: Write about

TABLE 4. Study Procedures

Phase 2: Experimental Treatments				
Day	Read and Study (Control)	Literature Logs	Instructional Conversation	Literature Logs + Instructional Conversation
1		Literature Log 1 and sharing		Literature Log 1 and sharing
2			Instructional Conversation 1	Instructional Conversation 1
3	Storyboard and summary	Storyboard and summary	Storyboard and summary	Storyboard and summary
4		Literature Log 2 and sharing	Instructional Conversation 2	Instructional Conversation 2
				Literature Log 2 and sharing

NOTE.— $N = 29$ per treatment group. See text for description of phase 1 (pretreatment) and phase 3 (posttreatment) procedures.

*All students participated in storyboard and summary.

a time when others were really giving to you.) Students wrote in their logs independently. In the 45-minute lesson, students read their logs aloud, and then the teacher led a discussion about the similarities and differences between students' experiences and those of the characters in the story. In the instructional conversation lessons, teachers attempted through discussion to clarify the factual content of the story and develop students' understandings of the more sophisticated concept of giving, that is, giving of oneself.

Students in the read and study-only group (control) did not participate in small-group lessons with the teacher; they instead worked independently or with the teaching assistant on reading and writing activities related to social studies curriculum. The same activities were completed by the literature log-only and instructional conversation-only groups when they were not receiving experiment-related teacher lessons. The activities were designed to ensure that students were working on worthwhile instructional content, although it was unrelated to the "Louella's Song" experimental unit.

It is important to note that when the experimental conditions—literature log only, instructional conversation only, and literature log + instructional conversation—are compared to the control condition, or when the single-component conditions are compared to literature log + instructional conversation, these comparisons are confounded with time on-task and instructional time with teacher: Students in the literature log-only, instructional conversation-only, and literature log + instructional conversation conditions not only engaged in these lessons/activities, they also spent more direct instructional time with the teacher on the topics and materials. This study therefore allows us to address the question of whether literature logs and instructional conversations, independently or combined with each other, represent "value added" for time spent in instruction with

the teacher. The literature log versus instructional conversation comparison is free from instructional time confound, however, because students spent equivalent instructional time with the teacher in both conditions.

All students in the study (including students in the control group) also engaged in independent "read and study" about the story "Louella's Song." Students were given worksheets with six frames, each frame to be filled in with a drawing and caption for an important event from the story. Using this story board, students wrote a summary of the story from this prompt: "Write a summary of what happened in this story. Write as much as you can so that someone who has not read the story will know what happened." Students devoted at least 45 minutes to this activity; some took as long as two entire 45-minute slots.

Phase 3 comprised posttesting. Students took the same comprehension test and completed the same essays used for the pretest. The comprehension test was administered to the whole class on the afternoon of day 4—the last day of experiment-related instruction. Essays were completed 3–5 days after day 4.

Measures

The same measures were used for pre- and posttesting.

Factual comprehension: 10 questions about the factual details of the story. Answers were scored on a 3-point scale: 0 (incorrect), 1 (partially correct), and 2 (correct). 20 points possible.

Interpretive comprehension: Five questions calling for text-based interpretations of story events. Answers were scored on a 3-point scale: 0 (inaccurate); 1 (accurate but not complete); 2 (accurate and complete). 10 points possible.

Theme-explanation essay: Students were asked to explain the concept of "giving." (What does it mean to be a giving person?) Essays were scored as falling into one of four categories: (1) no clear concept of giving; (2) materialistic (i.e.,

giving things); (3) materialistic/altruistic (materialistic and altruistic interwoven); (4) altruistic (giving of oneself).

Theme-exemplification essay: Students were asked to give an example of "giving." (Describe a time when you or someone you know was being very giving.) Essays were scored into one of four categories: (1) no clear concept of giving; (2) materialistic; (3) materialistic/altruistic; (4) altruistic.

Scoring Tests and Essays

All tests and essays were scored in one scoring session. Scorers were blind to student identity, treatment condition, and whether the test or essay was completed as a pre- or postassessment. Scorers were the teachers involved in the study who were trained using answer keys, scoring guides, and rubrics. Comprehension tests were scored using an answer key with a three-point scoring scale (see "Measures"). The reliability of comprehension test scores was checked by the first author who, using the same answer key, reviewed a random sample of 40 tests (17% of 232 total). For factual comprehension questions, the first author concurred with the teacher's score on 96.5% of the items (386 of 400). For interpretive comprehension, the first author concurred with the teacher's score on 88% of the items (176 of 200). In the few cases of nonagreement, scores were one point apart.

All essays were scored independently by two teachers on a scale of 1 to 4; in cases of disagreement a third teacher determined which of the scores was assigned to the paper. For the "theme explanation" essay, exact agreement between the independent scorers was 81% (181 of 232); another 17% of papers (39 of 232) were one score-point apart. For "theme exemplification," exact agreement between independent scorers was 79%, and 20% were one score-point apart.

Data Analysis

Scores on comprehension tests were analyzed using two-way (treatment condition

× language proficiency) analysis of variance (ANOVA), with Scheffé post-hoc tests. Essay scores were analyzed using χ^2 tests based on contingency table analyses and inspection of post-hoc cell contributions using the "contingency table" option of *Statview II* statistical software (Feldman et al., 1987).

Results

Comparability of Treatment Groups: Pretreatment Results

There were no significant differences among groups on the pretreatment comprehension measures. We performed two-way ANOVAs (treatment group × language proficiency) on factual and interpretive comprehension scores. Results on both measures were the same: no significant main effect for treatment group, no significant interaction, but a significant main effect for language proficiency (factual comprehension: $F = 8.86$, $p = .0036$; interpretive comprehension: $F = 20.03$, $p = .0001$; $df = 1, 108$). The main effect for language proficiency is, of course, not surprising, because fluent-English-proficient students have a clear advantage in their command of English.

There were no significant pretest differences among treatment groups on the theme-exemplification measure. No more than 10% of the students in any group received a score of 4 on their pretreatment essays—a clearly altruistic concept of giving. A noteworthy difference did arise, however, with regard to the pretreatment theme-explanation essays ($\chi^2 = 7.54$, $p = .056$, $df = 3$). Post-hoc tests revealed that students in the read and study (control) group were more likely than students in the instructional conversation group to receive a score of 4 (28% vs. 3%). Because the advantage lay with the control group, we did not treat this difference as problematic.

Posttreatment Results

Factual comprehension. A two-way ANOVA on posttreatment factual comprehension scores produced a significant main ef-

fect for group ($df = 3, 108; F = 7.01; p = .0002$) and for language proficiency ($df = 1, 108; F = 16.81; p = .0001$), with fluent-English students scoring higher than limited-English-proficient students. A nonsignificant interaction ($df = 3, 108; F = 1.54; N.S.$) indicated that treatments did not affect students of different language proficiencies differently. We therefore collapsed across language proficiency and performed all post-hoc comparisons on results for "all" students (see Table 5; disaggregated results are provided for informational purposes).

The literature logs + instructional conversation group scored significantly higher than both the read and study (control) and literature logs-only groups ($p < .05$) but not significantly higher than the instructional conversation-only group. Students in the literature logs + instructional conversation group scored almost a full standard deviation higher than students in the read and study-only group.

Interpretive comprehension. Results of the two-way ANOVA on interpretive comprehension scores were similar to those for factual comprehension: a significant main effect for group ($df = 3, 108; F = 6.73; p = .0003$); a significant main effect for language proficiency ($df = 1, 108; F = 10.67; p = .0015$); and no interaction between treatment and language proficiency ($df = 3, 108; F = 0.56; N.S.$). Again, all post-hoc comparisons were performed on scores for "all" students (see Table 6).

The individual effect of instructional conversation and its combined effect with literature logs was clearer and stronger on interpretive comprehension than on factual comprehension. Both the instructional conversation-only group and literature logs + instructional conversation group scored significantly higher ($p < .05$) than the read and study group, although the combined effect of literature logs and instructional conversation was greater than the effect for instructional conversation alone ($+ .78$ vs. $+ 1.07$ standard deviation units). Literature

logs alone were not more effective than read and study alone.

Theme explanation. Results for theme explanation indicated a differential effect of treatment group by students' language proficiency. Table 7 provides results by treatment group for fluent- and limited-English-proficiency students and all students combined. Data are the percentage of students in each group who received a score of 4 on their essays, indicating clear evidence of the altruistic concept of giving.

Looking first at the results for "all" students, regardless of language proficiency, students in the literature logs + instructional conversation condition were significantly more likely to receive a score of 4 than students in each of the other treatment groups (overall χ^2 test: $df = 3; \chi^2 = 12.14; p = .0069; p < .05$ for post-hoc comparisons between literature logs + instructional conversation and each of the other groups). However, results for the fluent- and limited-English-proficiency groups revealed a distinctly different pattern across treatment groups. For fluent students, although there were 50% more 4's in the experimental groups than in the read and study (control) group, results were the same for literature logs, instructional conversation, and literature logs + instructional conversation: 69% of the students in each group received a 4.

In contrast, for limited-English-proficient students, there was little difference between the percentage scoring a 4 among the read and study (control) group, the literature logs group, and the instructional conversation group (respectively, 6%, 19%, and 19%). However, a significantly higher percentage of students in the literature logs + instructional conversation group scored 4's: 69% ($p < .05$ for post-hoc comparisons between literature logs + instructional conversation and each of the other groups). In short, there was a substantial combined literature logs and instructional conversation effect for limited- but not fluent-English-proficient students. Fluent students were equally likely to explain the theme clearly

TABLE 5. Posttreatment Factual Comprehension Results^a

Group	Fluent-English Proficient (13 per Group)		Limited-English Proficient (16 per Group)		All Students (29 per Group)		Scheffé Post Hoc (for All)	Effect Size (vs. RS)
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Read and study (control)	13.23	2.62	12.12	3.50	12.62	3.13		
Literature logs	14.46	1.94	10.38	3.72	12.21	3.65		
Instructional conversation	16.00	1.58	13.19	4.10	14.45	3.48		
Literature logs + instructional conversation	16.15	2.12	14.88	3.03	15.45	2.69	> RS, LL	+ .90
Mean	14.96	2.37	12.64	3.89	13.68	3.48		
F between groups					7.01			
p					.0002			

NOTE.—RS = read and study; LL = literature logs.

^aMax = 20 points.TABLE 6. Posttreatment Interpretive Comprehension Results^a

Group	Fluent-English Proficient (13 per Group)		Limited-English Proficient (16 per Group)		All Students (29 per Group)		Scheffé Post Hoc (for All)	Effect Size (vs. RS)
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Read and study (control)	4.15	2.38	3.62	1.96	3.86	2.13		
Literature logs	5.54	1.85	3.56	1.86	4.45	2.08		
Instructional conversation	6.31	1.44	4.88	2.47	5.52	2.16	> RS	+ .78
Literature logs + instructional conversation	6.85	1.99	5.56	2.73	6.14	2.47	> RS, LL	+ 1.07
Mean	5.71	2.15	4.41	2.30	4.99	2.36		
F between groups					6.73			
p					.0003			

NOTE.—RS = read and study; LL = literature logs.

^aMax = 10 points.

TABLE 7. Posttreatment Theme Explanation Essay Results^a

Group	Fluent-English Proficient (13 per Group)	Limited-English Proficient (16 per Group)	Post Hoc	All Students (29 per Group)	Post Hoc
Read and study (control)	46	6		24	
Literature logs	69	19		41	
Instructional conversation	69	19		41	
Literature logs + instructional conversation	69	69	> RS, LL, IC	69	> RS, LL, IC
All groups	63	28		44	
χ^2	2.24	18.24		12.14	
<i>p</i>	N.S.	.0004		.0069	

NOTE.—RS = read and study; LL = literature logs; IC = instructional conversation.

^aNumbers are the percentage of students whose essays received a score of 4, representing an altruistic concept of giving (see "Measures" for scale).TABLE 8. Posttreatment Theme Exemplification Essay Results^a

Group	Fluent-English Proficient (13 per Group)	Limited-English Proficient (16 per Group)	Post Hoc	All Students (29 per Group)	Post Hoc
Read and study (control)	31	13		21	
Literature logs	46	25		34	
Instructional conversation	62	19		38	
Literature logs + instructional conversation	54	56	> RS, IC	55	> RS
All groups	48	28		35	
χ^2	2.70	8.97		7.50	
<i>p</i>	N.S.	.030		.058	

NOTE.—RS = read and study; IC = instructional conversation.

^aNumbers are the percentage of students whose essays received a score of 4, representing an altruistic concept of giving (see "Measures" for scale).

regardless of whether they participated in literature logs, instructional conversation, or both. In contrast, large numbers of limited-English-proficient students could explain the theme clearly only if they had the benefit of both literature logs and instructional conversation.

Theme exemplification. A similar pattern of results (see Table 8) emerged with regard to providing an example that shows the altruistic concept of giving. Results for "all" students showed a higher percentage of students in the literature logs + instructional conversation condition receiving 4's than any other group ($df = 3$; $\chi^2 = 7.50$; $p = .0575$; $p < .05$ for post-hoc comparison between literature logs + instructional conversation and read and study; $p > .1$ for all other comparisons).

Among fluent-English-proficient students, however, although the percentage of students receiving a 4 was greater among the experimental groups than the read and study (control) group, results for the experimental groups did not differ significantly from one another nor from the control group. In contrast, among limited-English-proficient students, results were substantially and significantly higher only for students in the literature logs + instructional conversation group ($p < .05$ for post-hoc comparison between literature logs + instructional conversation and read and study and instructional conversation only). As with theme explanation, there was a substantial combined literature logs and instructional conversation effect for limited-but not fluent-English-proficient students.

Examples of Story Interpretations and Theme Essays

In this section we provide pre and post examples of written work for limited-English-proficient students in the read and study (control) group and in the literature logs + instructional conversation group. The examples illustrate (1) what students were able to achieve by reading and studying the story on their own, without the ben-

efit of the experimental conditions; and (2) what students achieved through the study's strongest treatment group, literature logs + instructional conversation. Omar participated in the read and study condition; Manny was in the literature logs + instructional conversation condition (student names are pseudonyms). Both students were limited-English-proficient fifth graders in the same class and began receiving transitional instruction at the beginning of the year. Both students were rated by their teachers as below grade level in reading but not experiencing severe problems.

Omar and Manny performed at similar levels on pretest measures: 55%–60% on factual comprehension (11 or 12 of 20 points); 30% on interpretive comprehension (3 of 10 points); and scores of 2 on the theme explanation and exemplification essays (materialistic concept of giving). Omar's posttest results were virtually identical to his pre results: 65% factual comprehension, 30% interpretive, and 2's on the essays. In contrast, Manny's post results showed gains: 75% factual comprehension, 60% interpretive, and 4's on both essays. (Note: Because the substance of what students wrote is the focus here, misspellings have been corrected and a few needed periods, capital letters, and apostrophes added to the students' samples; vocabulary and syntax are unchanged.)

Interpretive comprehension. One of the comprehension questions asked students to interpret a sentence from the end of the story: "She wanted to be part of the giving." Students were asked to explain what the sentence meant. The line comes at the climactic point in the story when Louella chooses to sing because she wants to be part of the giving going on between her classmates and the hospital patients. In both his pre and post responses, Omar, from the read and study group, provided answers that were generally accurate with the story. But his responses relied strictly on a literal explanation of story events—"she wanted

to part of the song" (pre) and "she wanted to part of the program" (post).

Omar (pre)

It means that she wanted to be part of the song. It's important because she wanted to be part of the song.

Omar (post)

It means that she wanted to be part of the program they were doing.

Manny's pretest response was similar to Omar's—"she wanted to sing with everyone." However, his posttreatment response revealed his emerging understanding of the concept of giving of oneself—"the things she was giving came from the heart . . . you can't just wrap it up and touch it." It also provided a more complete interpretation of the event in the story. Beyond just wanting to sing with everyone and become part of the group, she wanted to lift the hospital patients' spirits—"she wanted to give her music to them, give them encouragement."

Manny (pre)

It meant that she didn't want to just stand their doing nothing. She wanted to sing with everyone.

Manny (post)

She wanted to give her music to them, give them encouragement. It's important because the things she was giving came from the heart. You can't just wrap it up and touch it.

Theme explanation essays. The prompt for the explanation essay was identical at both pre and post occasions: What does it mean to be a giving person? Not surprisingly, simply reading and studying the story did not, in itself, stretch Omar to a more sophisticated understanding of the concept of giving. Both his pre and post essays addressed only the giving of material goods.

Omar (pre)

A giving person is some one who gives things away for free or buys things for other people.

Omar (post)

It means that the person gives a lot of things to other people. And a giving person wants to give something to some one because maybe they don't want it anymore.

In contrast, Manny, from the literature logs + instructional conversation group, showed substantial changes in his concept of giving. His pretest essay addressed exclusively the giving of material goods. His post essay spoke of nonmaterial things—"give someone your time and caring . . . your knowledge."

Manny (pre)

It means someone or something gives a lot to you or someone else. They do it because they love you or just because you're friends. She or he gives your gifts, gold, jewelry or money.

Manny (post)

It means to give someone your time and caring. Given them your knowledge. And to stay with it whatever you are giving them. It also means to think about who you are giving to. A giving person is probably trying real hard to be giving all the time.

Theme exemplification essays. The pre and post exemplification prompt was: Describe a time when you or someone you know was being very giving. The contrasts between Omar and Manny's pre and post exemplification essays were similar to those in the explanation essays—virtually no change in Omar's concept of giving, but substantial change in Manny's. Both of Omar's essays reported examples of individuals who gave material gifts to someone else.

Omar (pre)

One time my friend gave me a lot of pogs and cards and even 4 sega video games. He gave them to me as a present for free cause he liked me.

Omar (post)

My sister's friend had a lot of toy stuffed bears and she gave them to my little

brother and to the brothers of her friend. I gave a lot of toys to my cousin's friend so they could play with more toys.

Manny's pre essay was similarly focused on giving material goods—his aunt's generous trips with Manny to the toy store. His post essay, in contrast, provided a fairly detailed account of his father's efforts to help Manny with his schoolwork. Manny specifically mentioned his father giving "his time" and "knowledge." In fact, his closing paragraph described his own reflections on the patience his father employed, another instantiation of giving of oneself.

Manny (pre)

Every time my niña came she took me to Toys R Us. She would get almost everything I wanted. She would take me and my grandma for something to eat. She wouldn't just get anything she wanted. She'd get us exactly what we wanted.

Manny (post)

One time my dad was trying to teach me my ABC's and how to read and spell and learn how to count. I was little. It took a couple days but my dad didn't give up and so I didn't give up.

He used his time and gave his knowledge to me. I finally learned and I want to thank my dad. I want to be giving back to him.

I'm sure he got frustrated sometimes but he didn't say, "Okay, Manny you're stupid. It's just hopeless, I don't want to teach you nothing no more."

Discussion

We began this study knowing that the language arts transition program we are investigating produces superior achievement when compared to the school district's standard approach to transition (Saunders, 1998). We do not know in detail—and this line of research is designed to explore—the relative contribution of the various program components. This study was the first in our "component-building" series; we investigated the effects of literature logs and instructional conversations on limited- and

fluent-English-speaking students' comprehension of a story and its themes.

Limitations

One important limitation of this study is that students in the various experimental conditions (literature logs only, instructional conversation only, and literature logs + instructional conversations) not only had qualitatively different instructional experiences, they also received different *amounts* of instructional time with the teacher. Thus when the three experimental conditions are compared to the control condition (read and study only), or when the literature logs + instructional conversations condition is compared to literature logs alone or instructional conversations alone, we do not know whether the superior effects produced by different experimental conditions are due to the superiority of the instructional *method* or to students' receiving *more instruction* from the teacher. (Note that this limitation does not apply to the direct comparisons between instructional conversations and literature logs, because students in each of these conditions received identical amounts of instruction. Any difference in outcomes when these two conditions are directly compared can be attributed to different methods, not instructional time.)

Another limitation derives from certain categories of students excluded from the data analysis. Special education students were excluded ($N = 3$; 2.2% of the enrollment in the five participating classes), as were students who had recently arrived at the school and were therefore not familiar with the instructional procedures investigated here ($N = 4$; 2.9%). In addition, 12 students (8.7% of the classes' enrollment) were excluded because they were absent for some portion of the study. Our results, therefore, can only be generalized to regular education students who are not new to the school and who attend school consistently.

Conclusions

With these limitations in mind, we draw three main conclusions from this study:

1. The combined use of instructional conversations and literature logs can improve factual and interpretive story comprehension for all students, regardless of language proficiency (limited-English or fluent-English speakers). Students in the instructional conversation + literature log condition averaged higher levels of factual (77%) and interpretive comprehension (61%) than students in the other conditions. Although, as already discussed, the design of the study does not permit separating the effects of literature log + instructional conversation from instructional time per se, time spent on literature logs + instructional conversations seemed to be well spent in that it was associated with better story comprehension. We cannot rule out the possibility, however, that equivalent amounts of time spent with some other instructional techniques could produce comparable results.

2. In contrast to the general effect on comprehension for both limited- and fluent-English-proficient students described above, the combined effects of literature logs and instructional conversations on understanding of story theme depended on language proficiency. Limited-English-proficient students benefited considerably from the combined effects of literature logs and instructional conversations. Fully English-proficient students showed no such effect; there were no statistically significant differences on the posttest measures of students' theme understanding. Although the small numbers in the study (13 fully English-proficient students/group) make it difficult for modest observed differences to be statistically reliable (and we should therefore be cautious about rejecting the hypothesis that literature logs + instructional conversations are beneficial for fully English-proficient students), we can say at a minimum that the effects of both literature logs and instructional conversations on understanding of a story's theme are more pronounced for limited- than fluent-English-proficient students.

3. The effects of instructional conversa-

tions are somewhat stronger than the effects of literature logs on factual and interpretive comprehension (for both limited- or fluent-English-proficient students). The evidence here is indirect: the comprehension scores of students in the literature log + instructional conversation group were significantly higher than literature log scores, but they were not different statistically from scores of students in the instructional conversation group. On interpretive comprehension, moreover, students in the instructional conversation condition had higher scores than students in the control condition, whereas students in the literature log condition were not statistically different from students in the control condition. Finally, scores in the instructional conversation condition were consistently higher, although not statistically significantly so, than those in the literature log condition when the two were compared directly.

Implications

As we have documented previously (Saunders & Goldenberg, 1997), teachers see transition instruction as requiring a wide range of components, from skill-building to the study of literature. However, they lack clear evidence regarding the effects of various components on student learning. Teachers need to know that the instructional activities on which they spend time have a measurable and meaningful effect on student achievement. This study provides such evidence and has these implications for practice.

First, teachers can use instructional conversations and literature logs together, as part of their language arts instruction, with the knowledge that as a pair they help promote students' comprehension of narrative material they are reading. Second, if teachers have to decide whether to use instructional conversations or literature logs, they should use instructional conversations, which have somewhat stronger effects. Third, for English-language learners, teachers should use both instructional conversa-

tions and literature logs because the combined effect on understanding a story's theme is stronger than the effect of either one individually. For fluent-English-proficient students, however, specifically for theme understanding, both methods are not needed. Teachers could do one or the other, although instructional conversation would be the more efficient choice given its apparent comprehension effects.

A final implication, although not directly addressed by our design and data, is that transition students can participate successfully in grade-appropriate language arts curriculum if they are given the kind of support provided by instructional conversations and literature logs (or, again, other approaches with demonstrable effectiveness). The story used in this study, "Louella's Song," is an upper-grade selection; the theme of altruistic, nonmaterialistic giving is appropriate for young adolescents. It is critical that students making the transition to English instruction receive learning opportunities with engaging but high-level materials, to promote academic development and success in mainstream English. Students were more successful in dealing with the story and the theme when provided with the sorts of instruction and the learning opportunities examined in this study.

Educators must go even further, however, and create or search for instructional strategies that produce higher achievement than obtained in this study. Despite our findings that one or both of the experimental components we studied produced effects on comprehension and thematic understanding, students' absolute performance levels were not optimal. Factual comprehension for the highest-achieving group (instructional conversation + literature logs) was only 77%; interpretive comprehension for this same group was only 61%. Only 69% of the students in this group could fully explain the story theme; only 55% could provide an original example to illustrate the theme. We are encour-

aged by the fact that the components of this language arts program might help improve these students' literacy attainment. But clearly there is much more work to be done if educators are to bring all students up to the high levels of performance educators and the public demand and these students and their families deserve.

There is currently a great deal of rhetoric around the topic of high standards for all students, particularly students from diverse ethnic and linguistic backgrounds. The challenge, as always, is to convert this rhetoric into actions with measurable results. Both researchers and practitioners must face the challenge squarely and continue to develop, implement, study, and validate empirically strategies to help all children develop language and literacy skills necessary for success in school and beyond.

Appendix

Descriptions of Each Component in the Language Arts Model

Literature Units

(Experience-Text-Relationship Approach)

On average, students engage in four literature units across the year. Titles are chosen to fit the students' grade level and language proficiency (in particular across transitions 1 and 2). The literature unit is propelled by an ongoing process of reading, writing (literature logs), and discussion (instructional conversations). Discussions are conducted in small groups of 6-10 students and managed through a specifically designed rotation system (teacher-specific). The instructional framework for the literature units is called Experience-Text-Relationship (Mason & Au, 1986): throughout the course of the unit, the teacher tries to help students understand the relationship between their own experiences, the content of the literary selection, and one or more major themes that apply to the selection (e.g., friendship, sacrifice, perseverance, commitment, justice, cultural identity). In addition to those

three critical elements (experience, text, theme), the teacher enriches the unit with lessons, activities, and supplementary readings that build background knowledge necessary for developing a deeper understanding of the selection and theme(s). Typically, units culminate with a writing project (see "Culminating Writing Projects") through which students elaborate on some aspect of the literature unit.

Literature Logs

Teachers divide the literary selection into "chunks" (manageable portions of reading) and assign a literature log entry for each chunk. Students complete the log entry at an independent center, and typically small-group discussions begin with some or all students sharing their logs. Literature log prompts might ask students to (a) write about a personal experience (related to the story), (b) elaborate on something that has happened in the story (e.g., assume the role of the character), or (c) analyze/interpret some aspect of the story or theme. In preparing a literature unit, teachers develop specific log prompts for each chunk, but oftentimes, prompts emerge naturally from small-group discussions.

Instructional Conversations (Small-Group Discussions)

Throughout the course of the literature unit, teacher and students meet in small groups to discuss the story, log entries, related personal experiences, and the theme(s) for the unit. The amount of time allotted to the discussion segment and frequency vary from teacher to teacher, but on average students spend at least 45 minutes a week engaged in discussion. The discussion provides the teacher with the opportunity to (a) hear students articulate their understanding of the story, theme(s), and related personal experiences; and (b) in the process of facilitating the discussion, challenge but also help students to enrich and deepen their understandings. Facilitated by the teacher, the small-group discussions, also referred to as instructional conversations (Goldenberg,

1992/1993), allow students to hear, appreciate, and build on each others' experiences, knowledge, and understandings.

Culminating Writing Projects (Writing-as-a-Process Approach)

On average, students complete four major writing projects across the year, taking the pieces through the entire process of writing: prewriting, drafting, sharing, receiving feedback, revising, editing, and preparing a final, polished piece of work (Calkins, 1986, 1991; Graves, 1983, 1991). Typically these projects are directly related to the literature units that conclude with a culminating writing assignment (e.g., fully developing a literature log or a writing assignment tailored to the themes and content of the literature study). The key to this process is revision. Three things seem to promote meaningful revision: (a) helping students learn to share their work and receive/provide feedback; (b) discussing examples (student or published) of the kind of writing students are working on, highlighting for students things they might incorporate in their own pieces when they revise; and (c) one-on-one conferences with the teacher.

Comprehension Strategies

Students are taught strategies to use while they are reading in order to monitor their own comprehension (McNeil, 1984; Palincsar & Brown, 1985). The two essential strategies are pausing intermittently during reading to (a) summarize what they have read and (b) formulate and answer testlike questions about the reading material. Strategies are introduced during 2-week training modules provided at the beginning and middle of the year. Students practice the strategies in pairs at the assigned independent reading center.

Assigned Independent Reading

Students are regularly assigned reading selections from available materials (basals; literature titles, and any other sources) to read independently. Optimally, selections are related to the themes and topics being dis-

cussed in the literature units. Students complete various accompanying assignments to promote comprehension, and teachers hold the students accountable for what they read (summaries, comprehension questions, graphic organizers, paired and group activities). Readings and assignments are completed in class as part of an independent center or for homework.

Dictation

The most extensive dictation program (Seeds University Elementary School, University of California, Los Angeles, 1992) includes: students engage in dictation exercises weekly, taking a cold dictation of a grade-level-appropriate passage (at the beginning of the week), studying the features of that passage and practicing the dictation (throughout the week), and then completing a final dictation (at the end of the week). But, as we have found, even a less extensive dictation program (2 times per week) is beneficial. Two elements are critical for successful dictation: (1) explanations from the teacher about language and punctuation featured in the dictation passage, and (2) opportunities for the students to proofread and check their dictation against the actual passage.

Written Conventions Lessons

Students receive directed lessons about the conventions of written language (punctuation, capitalization, grammar, word usage). Lessons include a presentation from the teacher, opportunities for guided and independent practice, and then application to writings the students are working on (e.g., literature logs, writing projects, even dictation passages). The key is connecting what is studied in the lessons to the actual writing students are doing.

Oral English Language Development (ELD) through Literature

Used in grades K-3, the ELD program is based on a natural language approach and children's literature (Beltran & O'Brien, 1993). Literature provides a meaningful,

motivational, and enjoyable context for learning and practicing specifically targeted English oral-language skills. It also exposes children to English print well in advance of formal transition to English reading. On average, students receive 30 minutes of ELD per day. Lessons are conducted in small groups organized by English language-production level. Organizing groups by production level allows the teacher to focus more on students' needs.

Pleasure Reading

A portion of time each day, or at the upper grades as part of a weekly system, is scheduled for students to select and read things on their own for pleasure and interest. Students keep and review with the teacher a record of their ongoing readings (reading inventory) and often complete assignments related to their readings: preparing summaries and synopses, oral presentations for book-sharing time, drawings, and so on. Three things help promote pleasure reading: (1) teachers introduce students to numerous selections (trips to library, a full classroom library, lending read-aloud selections, making recommendations); (2) teachers explicitly teach students how to choose and try out books (reading the cover synopsis, reading a portion of the book, reading various books from the same author); and (3) students have a chance to discuss with each other and the teacher what they are reading.

Teacher Read-Alouds

At least three times per week, teachers read to students for approximately 20 minutes. Read-alouds (Trelease, 1985) serve various purposes: promote pleasure reading, expose students to the language of expert writers and the fluency of an expert reader, engage students in reading material they may not yet be able to read themselves, and increase students' familiarity with different genres of writing.

Interactive Journals

Used primarily in grades K-2 and at the beginning of transition, interactive journals

provide students with regular, nonthreatening opportunities to write about topics of their own choice and to participate in a written dialogue with the teacher (Flores et al., 1991). Teacher response occurs as often as possible and provides students with examples of conventional writing. Interactive journals help kindergarten and first-grade students break the written language code, and later in grades 1 and 2, they help students develop initial writing fluency. Transition teachers use interactive journals during the first semester of transition when students are making their first attempts at English writing. The immediate response from the teacher provides both emotional support for students and a highly contextualized and therefore comprehensible English text for students to read.

Note

Thanks to the participating students at Hazeltine Elementary School, Los Angeles Unified School District, and the members of the "Literacy Network" teacher research team who helped design and conducted the instructional unit: Linda Cohen, Jennifer DiLorenzo, Suellen Helm, Marla Lefevre, and Daphne Searl. The Literacy Network, a systemwide Title VII project, is underwritten by the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs, U.S. Department of Education. This work was also supported under the Education Research and Development Program, PR/Award No. R306A60001, the Center for Research on Education, Diversity and Excellence, as administered by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, National Institute on the Education of At-Risk Students, U.S. Department of Education. The contents, findings, and opinions expressed here are ours and do not necessarily represent the positions or policies of the supporting agencies. We also thank the anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments.

A version of this article was published by the Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence (CREDE) as *Research Report No. 6*, available from CREDE, Center for Applied Linguistics, 4646 40th Street N.W., Washington, DC 20016-1859.

References

- Au, K. H. (1979). Using the experience-text-relationship method with minority children. *Reading Teacher*, 32, 677-679.
- Au, K. H. (1992). Constructing the theme of a story. *Language Arts*, 69, 106-111.
- August, D., & Hakuta, K. (Eds.). (1997). *Improving schooling for language-minority children: A research agenda*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Beltrán, D., & O'Brien, G. (1993). *English language development through literature*. Workshop and documentation presented at the annual conference of the California Association for Bilingual Education, Anaheim, CA.
- Berman, P., Chambers, J., Gandara, P., McLaughlin, B., Minicucci, C., Nelson, B., Olson, L., & Parrish, T. (1992). *Meeting the challenge of language diversity: An evaluation of programs for pupils with limited English proficiency* (Executive summary, Vol. 1). Berkeley, CA: BW Associates.
- Calkins, L. M. (1986). *The art of teaching writing*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Calkins, L. M. (1991). *Living between the lines*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Cummins, J. (1989). *Empowering minority students*. Sacramento: California Association for Bilingual Education.
- Feldman, D., Gagnon, J., Hoffman, R., & Simpson, J. (1987). *Statview II*. Berkeley, CA: Abacus Concepts.
- Fleischman, H., & Hopstock, P. (1993). *Descriptive study of services to limited English proficient students: Vol. 1. Summary of findings and conclusions*. Arlington, VA: Development Associates. (Available from Development Associates, 1730 N. Lynn St., Arlington, VA 22209, (703) 276-0677.)
- Flores, B., Garcia, E., Gonzalez, S., Hidalgo, G., Kaczmarek, K., & Romero, T. (1991). *Bilingual holistic instructional strategies*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Gándara, P., & Merino, B. (1993). Measuring the outcomes of LEP programs: Test scores, exit rates, and other mythological data. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 15, 320-338.
- García, E. (1992). Effective instruction for language minority students: The teacher. *Journal of Education*, 173(2), 130-141.
- Gersten, R. (1996). Literacy instruction for language-minority students: The transition years. *Elementary School Journal*, 96(3), 227-244.
- Gersten, R., & Jiménez, R. (1993, April). Lan-

- guage-minority students in transition. Symposium presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta.
- Gersten, R., & Woodward, J. (1994). The language minority student and special education: Issues, themes, and paradoxes. *Exceptional Children*, 60(4), 310-322.
- Goldenberg, C. (1992/1993). Instructional conversations: Promoting comprehension through discussion. *Reading Teacher*, 46, 316-326.
- Goldenberg, C. (1996). Commentary: The education of language-minority students: Where are we, and where do we need to go? *Elementary School Journal*, 96(3), 353-361.
- Goldenberg, C., & Gallimore, R. (1991). Local knowledge, research knowledge, and educational change: A case study of first-grade Spanish reading improvement. *Educational Researcher*, 20(8), 2-14.
- Graves, D. H. (1983). *Writing: Teachers and children at work*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Graves, D. H. (1991). *Build a literate classroom*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Greenfield, E. (1993). Louella's song. In J. Pikulski (Sr. Author), *Dinosauring* (4th grade reader), 430-436. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Krashen, S. (1987). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. New York: Prentice-Hall.
- Los Angeles Unified School District. (1988 ed.; 1996 ed.). *Criteria for the addition of reading in English [CARE]: Description and testing materials*. Los Angeles: Office of Bilingual-ESL Instruction, Los Angeles Unified School District.
- Mason, J. M., & Au, K. H. (1986). *Reading instruction for today*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.
- McNeil, J. D. (1984). *Reading comprehension: New directions for classroom practice*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.
- National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. (1995, January 20). *Ask NCBE: How many school-aged limited English proficient students are there in the U.S.?* Washington, DC: Author. (Available from NCBE, 1118 22d St. N.W., Washington, DC, or on the Internet at gopher://gopher.ncbe.gwu.edu.)
- Palincsar, A., & Brown, A. (1985). Reciprocal teaching: A means to a meaningful end. In J. Osborn, P. Wilson, & R. C. Anderson (Eds.), *Reading education: Foundations for a literate America* (pp. 299-310). Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.
- Ramírez, J. D. (1992). Longitudinal study of structured English immersion strategy, early-exit and late-exit transitional bilingual education programs for language minority children (Executive summary). *Bilingual Research Journal*, 16(1 & 2), 1-62.
- Saunders, W. (1998, April). *Improving literacy achievement for English learners in transitional bilingual programs*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego.
- Saunders, W., & Goldenberg, C. (1997). *Identifying salient elements of a successful transition program*. (Year 1 Deliverable, Project 1.5: "Upscaling for transition: Schoolwide factors to support Latino students' transition from Spanish to English instruction"). Santa Cruz: Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence, University of California, Santa Cruz.
- Saunders, W., & Goldenberg, C. (in press). The effects of instructional conversation on transition students' concepts of friendship and story comprehension. In R. Horowitz (Ed.), *The evolution of talk about text: Knowing the world through classroom discourse*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Saunders, W., & Lennon, D. (1996). Developing academic literacy in English through a program of integrated language arts: Year 5 evaluation (Project, TOO3AOO185). Washington, DC: Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Affairs, U.S. Department of Education.
- Saunders, W., O'Brien, G., Lennon, D., & McLean, J. (1998). Making the transition to English literacy successful: Effective strategies for studying literature with transition students. In R. Gersten & R. Jiménez (Eds.), *Promoting learning for culturally and linguistically diverse students: Classroom applications from contemporary research* (pp. 99-132). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Saunders, W., Patthey-Chavez, G., & Goldenberg, C. (1997). Reflections on the relationship between language, curriculum content and instruction. *Language, Culture, and Curriculum*, 10(1), 30-51.
- Seeds University Elementary School. (1992). *Dictionation program: An approach to written language development*. Los Angeles: Seeds University Elementary School, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Slavin, R. (1984). Component building: A strategy for research-based instructional improvement. *Elementary School Journal*, 84, 255-269.
- Tharp, R., & Gallimore, R. (1988). *Rousing minds to life*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Thomas, W., & Collier, V. (1997). *School effectiveness for language minority students*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. Available on the internet at

<http://www.ncbe.gwu.edu/ncbepubs/resource/effectiveness/thomas-collier97.pdf>.
Trelease, J. (1985). *The read-aloud handbook*. New York: Penguin.