

Krys Deming
01/28/24
EDU 575

Annotated Bibliography

Problem of Practice: How does the integration of deep reading practices and comprehension skills contribute to the enhancement of writing acumen?
How can we support students in their writing by encouraging them to practice simultaneous reading and writing skills (i.e. annotation)?
How could we support all students in their deep reading journey, comprehension and fluency of text to then translate those skills to writing proficiency?
Mentor Texts?

Format from slides(delete later [or not]):

- ☐ 1 sentence stating the author's purpose
- ☐ 2-4 sentences of big ideas
- ☐ 1-2 sentences to evaluate the resource
- ☐ 1-2 sentences to reflect on the resource

Charles A. MacArthur, Steven Graham, & Jill Fitzgerald (2016). Handbook of writing research. The Guilford Press.

Summary: The purpose of this work was, primarily—as noted by the title—to collect works of research on writing as a whole. Chapter 13 specifically was read/utilized for the problem of practice, as it covered the connection between reading and writing skills (in terms of acquisitional practices and metacognitive skills). The findings of the chapter reveal many notable things about the connections between reading and writing skills and acquisition. Most notably (and in keeping with commonly-held belief) “research shows that students can be taught the cognitive and linguistic skills that underlie reading and writing, and there can be both reading and writing outcomes” (p. 203). The research also showed that students “can also be taught to think about readers’ comprehension needs during writing, how to read in ways that improve research papers, how to write as a study skill, and how to think about authors effectively during the reading of history; findings that have been replicated with varied instructional methods and sizable learning outcomes” (p. 203). Thoughts on the hows and whys to follow, but the important conceit is that this chapter addresses the pop in the affirmative.

Analysis: This article is thorough and meticulous when it comes to elaborating on the different converging research on the intersections of student reading and writing

acquisition. It's not realistic to write about all the different research discussed, but the most interesting in regards to the PoP is how "reading and writing may each draw on a common base of knowledge of linguistic features, but how this is done may differ across reading and writing important ways" with the reasoning likely being "bound up in the different purposes of reading and writing, and in the differences in their starting places" (p. 198). This, then, is the reason why "students must receive instruction in *both* reading and writing" because "the teaching of either alone would be insufficient because of the unique properties of each" (p. 198). Moreso, research also found that "a consistent application of reading knowledge to writing but less frequent application of writing knowledge to reading" (p. 198). However, Shanahan later emphasizes that the aforementioned knowledge and base of research occurred within "instruction that prioritizes reading over writing" and that "with greater attention to writing instruction, the patterns of relationships may change" (p. 204). Digressing, the immediate application to the PoP is twofold: 1) using reading as a way to inform and improve writing skills in students is considered good and worthwhile; and 2) it's still imperative to focus on writing skills in order to make sure students receive specific writing instruction and practice. This piece is relevant to addressing the PoP and will be used as a primary source.

Fitzgerald, Jill & Timothy Shanahan (2000). Reading and writing and their development. *Educational Psychologist*, 35(1), 39-50.

Summary: This work serves as an initial attempt to look closely at the metacognitive skills that link the acquisition of reading and writing in children from Pre-K-12th grade. The goal of the research is to evidence the long-held conception within academia that reading is inherently important for and beneficial to improving writing skills. The research evidences how reading and writing both pull on similar metacognitive skills and therefore do interact and grow through similar means and methods. Fitzgerald and Shanahan construct "a preliminary developmental model, covering a wide age span, that describes critical cognitive features or markers that are likely to be important to both reading and writing proficiency at different ages" (p. 43). This model has multiple stages showing parallel metacognitive skill development in reading and writing across different ages. They also, however, note that "the model is an initial, and very preliminary, attempt to highlight the notion that the nature of the relationship between reading and writing may change over time" (p. 43). Likewise, they address the fact that the model is meant to "be descriptive of proficient reading and writing development at any given level" but doesn't necessarily work to look at students "who struggle with reading and writing" and who therefore "are most likely to become unbalanced in their development

of reading and writing knowledge, showing lags of deficiencies in some areas and proficiency and growth in others” (p. 44).

Analysis: This article has useful information establishing how deep the connection between reading and writing acquisition is in terms of metacognitive skills. It also serves as a starting point for research in the field. However, the hypothetical nature of its findings—while fascinating and useful to an extent—don’t help establish how to work with students who are struggling and whom the PoP is primarily addressing. Especially post covid, most students don’t fit the equilateral diagnostics necessary for the model to work for them. In that sense, this article will be useful for looking at what skills do parallel overall, but not for what to look for in terms of contemporary utilization of reading/writing practices. In the article’s defense, it is over 20 years old. This article is a good secondary source.

Gloria Ladson-Billings (1995) But that's just good teaching! The case for

culturally relevant pedagogy, *Theory Into Practice*, 34:3, 159-165, DOI:

10.1080/00405849509543675

Summary: Ladson-Billings’s article is an exploration and explanation of culturally relevant (responsive) teaching practices and pedagogy. She defines CRT as “a pedagogy of opposition” that “rests on three criteria or propositions: (a) students must experience academic success; (b) students must develop and/or maintain cultural competence; and (c) students ,just develop a critical consciousness through which they challenge the status quo of the current social order” (p. 160). The article then goes on to describe how to meet the criteria, what meeting each of those criteria looks like, and what the results of doing so would be. Larson-Billings states that—beyond the premise of improving conditions for students to feel more empowered, acknowledged, and included in their education, but also because “this work is designed to challenge us to reconsider what we mean by ‘good’ teaching, to look for it in some unlikely places, and to challenge those who suggest it cannot be made available to all children” (p. 163).

Analysis: Overall, this article does a great job articulating why culturally responsive teaching is important and a hallmark of good education. As it relates to the PoP, it serves as a good tertiary source due to how—while the nature of what it says doesn’t address specifically the relationship between reading and writing skills nor practices to implement to best utilize those connections—it is absolutely relevant to finding ways to use reading skills to teach writing skills in creating student engagement. In other words—as an example—mentor texts will only work well if students feel engaged in the

reading, feel it is relevant to them and their experiences, etc. Larson-Billings specifically says that “culturally relevant teachers utilize students’ culture as a vehicle for learning,” (p. 161), and that can be heavily utilized in mentor texts.

Hammond, Zaretta. Culturally responsive teaching and the brain:

Promoting authentic engagement and rigor among culturally and linguistically diverse students (2014). SAGE Publications.

Summary: Hammon’s chapter titled “Shifting academic mindset in the learning partnership” tackles how teachers can help students “believe in themselves as learners,” namely by “helping them cultivate an academic mindset” (p. 108; 109). The chapter covers the many ways of how best to encourage an academic mindset, the neuroscience of the academic mindset, useful strategies to cultivate an academic mindset, and signs to look out for when students are stuck in a fixed mindset. The chapter ends with the idea that culturally responsive teachers need to help students “shift their mindset by helping them create a powerful counter narrative about who they are as learners” (p. 120).

Analysis: This chapter is—in hindsight—a fascinating addition to the sources to support the PoP because it focuses on how to create growth mindsets within students, and, while not explicitly stated, that is largely part of what the PoP is trying to do in the long-term. The idea behind utilizing one skill students seem more comfortable with to help grow one that they aren’t is to show them that what they already know is transferable and usable to continue their own education and growth as academics. The implicit goal of teaching them how to use mentor texts is to show them how to look at examples of writing and use their critical reading skills to pull apart said examples to inform their own writing. With enough practice, modeling, and implementation, it is absolutely expectable that students learn how to do this and take agency in growing both their reading and writing skills. Granted, this is a lot of empty hypothesizing thus far, but mentor texts seem like a great example of the type of exemplification and scaffolding needed to build self efficacy, something that lies at the “core of the academic mindset” (p. 114).

Hollie, Sharroky. Culturally and linguistically responsive teaching and learning – classroom practices for student success, grades K-12 (2011). Shell Education.

Summary: Hollie's chapter essentially focuses on answering the question "How can I get each and everyone of my students to think 'Oh! I get this! I know about this! This makes sense to me and my life'?" By which the answer is subsequently utilizing culturally responsive teaching (p. 56). Flippancy aside, the chapter goes into depth about the best practices to make sure any teacher is engaging with CRT. In looking at various different examples from different teachers and school, they found that "at high-performing urban schools, teachers begin with the assumption that their students can learn challenging academic concepts if they find ways to present information that respond to their students' cultural, social and personal strengths, interests, and needs" as well as that these teachers "advanced student learning by responding to the social and personal needs of their students" (p. 63).

Analysis: Like the other articles and chapters engaging with CRT practices and pedagogy, this chapter works as a good tertiary source to help inform the best ways to introduce readings and mentor texts that can then be used to help improve writing skills in students. While it doesn't touch on the actual process of how the science of reading and writing skill acquisition happen and work, it does establish an initial barrier to engagement with students: it has to be something that they, ultimately, feel is relevant to them and their personal lives/experiences. For this reason, it can be used as a source that defines the nature of the mentor texts, even if it doesn't immediately seem impactful to the PoP.

Miller, B (2012). The reading writing connection. International Reading Association & National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 1-11.

Summary: The purpose of this essay is to look over the developments within the field of reading/writing research over the course of years and postulate where the nature of research should focus in the future AND create a call to action for further research to be done for the development of the field. An interesting finding that echoes other articles in this annotated bibliography is that there seems to be a prevalence of reading skill and interest over writing skill and interest. To quote a few instances: "good readers can have problems writing, but it is reportedly rare to have poor readers who are good writers"; "whereas students are often aware that they are having trouble reading, many early grade students and older struggling writers overestimate their writing abilities"; "...many students' attitudes towards writing decline with grade" and "data in writing indicate that the majority of 4th, 8th, and 12th grade students demonstrate only partial mastery of the writing abilities needed at their grade level" (p. 2). Numerous things immediately stand

out from this. The first is that it, seemingly, is a matter of intake vs outtake; a struggle of producing vs absorbing. The second point that stands out is that this article was written in 2012 and very purposefully warns of the encroachment of technology into the classroom (p. 4). Notably, 12 years after this article's publication, technology is a point of contention within every classroom and has a seeming tendency to exacerbate the issues above.

Analysis: The immediate concern about using this article is that it is from the Before Times™ and fails to accurately capture how much the classroom has changed since Covid. This isn't to say that the article isn't useful in some capacities. While it may be outside the scope of the current PoP, it does serve as a call to action for continued work in the field—something that seems even more relevant because of the aforementioned issues that it had no way of addressing or predicting. Additionally, it brings up the incredibly salient issue of whether or not teachers “have adequate preparation to provide needed instruction in reading and writing, although in recent years greater attention has been given to preparation for reading instruction” (p. 2). That last part combined with other research insinuating that there tends to be more writing instruction via reading than standalone writing instruction prompts the question of if there needs to be more focus once again on teacher writing instruction prep. This seems especially true combined with the heavy influx and outflux of teachers during and post covid that have created vacuums in the classroom. That may be food for thought for a different PoP though. As it stands, this seems to be a good secondary source.