

Literacy Learner Analysis

Robb Arndt

TE 846 – Michigan State University

## Literacy Learner Analysis

### I. Brief Background and Reason for Project Focus

Differentiated Literacy Instruction (DLI) is essential to develop both student skills and Motivations in literacy. DLI places students in groups smaller than that of the traditional classroom, allowing the teacher to work with that small group on more targeted instruction based on their literacy level. Thanks to Reutzel, Clark, and Flory (2014), we know that, “effective classroom environments include a variety of grouping strategies, effective classroom routines, class management that encourages self-regulation, and effective instructional interventions that do not occur by accident” (p.372). DLI moves the class into smaller groups whereby the teacher can provide a variety of routines, activities, and lessons that are most applicable to the individual groups of students. As Reutzel, Clark, and Flory demonstrate in Figure 16.1 (p. 374), a daily literacy instruction block should contain a variety of instruction, activity, and assessment. DLI enables teachers to put students into the group most appropriate to their level of literacy and enable them skill-appropriate practice. After all, “balanced instruction requires not only a *rich knowledge base* but also the ability to *adapt and orchestrate a range of classroom experiences* that will provides students with authentic opportunities to exercise and grow their literary toolkit” (Griffo et. al., 2014, p. 44). Using DLI better enables a teacher to orchestrate these “range of classroom experiences” to better reach each individual student.

When done correctly, DLI provides each student with an authentic learning experience. This aspect of authenticity creates learning that is more meaningful, and therefore longer lasting, for each student, “authentic learning in classrooms today should therefore should not narrowly focus on students acquiring information via traditional text types, but rather on students seeking out, managing, transforming, and applying information utilizing different forms of media and learning to share information around the world” (Griffo et. al., 2014, p. 50). Thus, DLI not only

## Literacy Learner Analysis

provides students with an opportunity to learn at the most appropriate level, it also brings an authenticity to the learning process that is relevant to the students daily lives and forces them to take an active role.

I am a six-year educator now two years removed from the classroom. For this project, I will be working with a student whom I taught two years ago and later became my advisee. My goals with this project are to build upon the work we did together in the classroom and better equip him for the demands of his future classrooms, while also instilling a greater sense of motivation and confidence in him around his own literacy abilities and strategies. Through this work, my goal is to a) become a stronger, more effective and versatile educator and b) refresh my teaching skills should I return to the classroom. This project will be my first formal use of differentiated instruction, and I look forward to seeing the results. For this project, I worked with the student, alias, Jim Lahey, about whom I have provided a brief summary below.

## II. The Student, Home, and Family Literacy Practice

Jim Lahey enrolled in Millbrook in the fall of 2015 as a 10<sup>th</sup> grader after spending the first ten years (including kindergarten) of his formal educational career in private day schools in southwestern Connecticut. Jim is a Caucasian male who is a native English speaker. Jim has received personal tutoring and instruction, outside of the regular school day, since grade 5 and has an Individualized Education Program. At Millbrook, he continued to receive personal attention outside of the classroom in the form of enrollment in the Academic Center (which provides one-on-one tutoring), which he visited four times each week. These sessions were divided between focus on the Humanities and Math & Science, and Jim saw a different tutor for

## Literacy Learner Analysis

different disciplines. Jim was a member of my 10<sup>th</sup> grade English class in the 2015-2016 school year.

Jim is a most well-intentioned student but frequently has difficulty either a) beginning work on an assessment or activity, b) sustaining his focus to work all the way through the assignment or c) responding to feedback from his teachers or tutors in an effective manner. In this project, I will focus on the Jim's motivation around literacy.

Jim is the eldest of three boys in his family. His parents are married, live together and are involved in their son's day to day education, even after his placement at a boarding school. English is the only language spoken in Jim's household. In discussion with Jim's parents, both expressed that their desire to enroll Jim in a boarding school stemmed from a belief that he would benefit from the smaller classes and personalized attention that he would receive. Of the parents, one graduated from a boarding school and was confident that this opportunity would provide the most effective support for Jim's educational needs. While educational support was the motivating factor in electing to enroll their son in boarding school, they also cited a desire for him to join a small, immersive community that would allow him to become more comfortable and adept around his peers.

In discussing literacy in his home, Jim reported that both of his parents read frequently. He said they preferred newspapers and magazines but would each occasionally read fiction novels as well. Both parents would read to their sons periodically when they were younger and then progressed to encouraging the boys to select their own texts by bringing them to the library and helping to find texts that interested them. As the eldest of three boys, Jim also shared that he eventually experienced some frustration around his younger brother developing traditional literacy skills faster than he did. Jim typically found interest in texts about tennis or fishing. In

### Literacy Learner Analysis

describing this literacy history, Jim noted that it had been several years since he read a text centered on one of these subjects and complained that the texts he had to read for school were “too boring.” Similarly, Jim parents reported that as a younger student he was open to reading and especially enjoyed when his parents or elementary teachers would read to him or the class. As the classroom texts gained complexity, Jim’s struggles began to increase and his frustration level rose (Appendix A).

Importantly, Jim associated literacy solely with the classroom. He did not acknowledge any literacy activities that he participated in on his computer, phone, or outside the classroom. This may contribute to his frustration and lack of motivation surrounding literacy activities.

### III. Experiences with Literacy in Schools

In retelling his literacy instruction, Jim began in his kindergarten classroom and recalled learning the alphabet. He was less clear on the progression from this point and simply recalled attempting to read various picture books with his parents and, later, his tutors. While discussing this history of skill acquisition, Jim frequently cited his frustration with the texts his classes used, repeatedly calling them “boring” (Appendix A). Interestingly, he used this categorization more frequently as he described classes later in middle school and into high school. This seemed to clearly indicate that Jim was using this complaint as a curtain behind which he could hide his comprehension struggles.

As a result of this complaint, the most significant instructional challenge with Jim is to create engagement with the text and demonstrate value with literacy. Jim has clearly established a pattern of separation from text when he begins to feel challenged and places the text in opposition to himself. The first challenge will be to demonstrate the value of literacy to Jim in

## Literacy Learner Analysis

either traditional text (book) form or, more likely, utilize literacy resources that speak to areas of interest for him (such as tennis and fishing). Then, I will look to develop comprehension strategies with Jim that focus on this accessible text but have application to future texts as well.

### IV. Classroom Emotional Climate

As a 12<sup>th</sup> grade student at Millbrook School, Jim's typical classroom environment consists, on average, of thirteen other students and a teacher. In the 12<sup>th</sup> grade, students have more agency in their course selection than do younger students but still must take at least five courses, one of which is an English class. The 12<sup>th</sup> grade English curriculum (non-AP) consists of dystopian texts, texts that focus on issues of race and justice, science and technology, and, finally, self-identity. There are few opportunities for students to explore lengthy texts outside of those that are part of the curriculum; however, there are several assessments, both summative and formative, that ask students to find either one or a few outside texts to support their claims about the novels. This is an attempt at authentic learning as Griffo et. al. cite in Gambrell & Mandel Morrow (2015), "Authentic learning today therefore should not narrowly focus on students acquiring information via traditional texts types, but rather on students seeking out, managing, transforming, and applying information utilizing multiple forms of media (Howland et. al., 2012) and learning to find and to share information around the world" (p. 50). By encouraging students to locate their own supporting texts, the teacher enables them to look outside the "traditional text type" while also equipping them with the skills and knowledge to identify that which makes for a strong and weak supporting text. This is consistent with the CCSS that Leu, Zawilinski, Forzani, and Timbrell cite in their chapter on online literacies in Gambrell and Mandel-Morrow's text (2014). As a result, students participating in twelfth grade

## Literacy Learner Analysis

English have some opportunities to practice independence and explore areas of greater interest to them but it is limited.

Jim's engagement in his daily literacy activities is inconsistent. Hesitancy, long sighs, disengaged body language (leaning away from the text, taking repeated bathroom breaks), and hyper social concern (frequently looking around the room) characterize his behavior. In more personal settings, such as one-on-one with the teacher or tutor, Jim may engage briefly or simply attempt to persuade the teacher/tutor that he does not need the support. When pushed, Jim is capable of performing literacy activities, albeit it slowly. Examining Guthrie's "Key Motivations to Read" in Gambrel and Mandel Morrow (2015) quickly shows the root of Jim's struggles as he struggles in each area: interest, confidence, and dedication (p. 62-63). As Guthrie writes, "An interested student reads because he enjoys it, a dedicated student reads because he believes it is important, and a confident student reads because he or she can do it" (p. 62). From a young age, literacy activities have been difficult for Jim, which has shaken his confidence in his own abilities. His awareness of his ability relative to his peers and brothers have further broken that confidence and his interest in the traditional classroom texts has waned, especially as he has matured. Guthrie continues, "Retreating from all text interactions, they reduce their own opportunity to do what they want to do more than anything – to be a good reader. Their low confidence undermines that even further in a cycle of doubt and failure." (p. 63). Jim's classroom behavior and attempts to dodge accountability with his teachers and tutors aligns with this description and, as he (Jim) recounted, has been consistent since middle school. As such, these factors have combined to erode his dedication to literacy practices. As Jim's answers to the literacy survey demonstrate (Appendix A), he brings little interest or confidence to literacy practices. This is especially concerning as we know that students who avoid reading halt their

## Literacy Learner Analysis

learning (Guthrie 2014). Therefore, given our knowledge that motivation is a malleable trait in an individual, (Linnenbrink & Pintrich 2002) the goal of this study with Jim is to increase his confidence in his literacy abilities.

Given Guthrie's words on extrinsic motivation, "extrinsic rewards do not motivate reading achievement in the long term...it encourages students to become more interested in the reward than the learning" (p. 62-63) the ultimate goal of such a study would be to establish lasting intrinsic motivation for Jim to participate in literacy activities. This is beyond the scope of a two-lesson study; however, it remains a goal for my continued relationship with Jim.

## V. Pre- and Post-Assessments Given and Summary of Test Results

The Pre-Assessment asks Jim to read an excerpt from "Big Two-Hearted River", by Ernest Hemingway. The assessment then asks Jim to summarize the reading in his own words and to answer two brief questions about the river, based on his understanding of the excerpt. These final two questions focus on the presence of the trout in the river and will hopefully draw Jim's attention to these fish, if he does not focus on them initially. The last question asks Jim to identify why the trout stand out to Nick (the protagonist) and is designed to enable Jim to find common ground with Nick as they both enjoy fishing. This should generate interest within Jim as well as demonstrate the teacher's investment in him, "Bozo found that boys respond when teachers become aware of their students' personal interests and needs" (Guthrie, 2015, p. 66). Thus, not only is this pre-assessment designed to evaluate Jim's ability to read, summarize, and identify key details of a passage, it should also provide him with some connection to the text and desire to continue the story, "texts or materials that trigger or capitalize on a student's interests contribute to motivation" (Duke et. al, 2011, p. 60). Given that Jim reports he has experienced



## Literacy Learner Analysis

little, if any, connection to classroom texts in his recent educational career, the pre-assessment will hopefully demonstrate to him that there are texts with which he can connect, and the subsequent lessons and further exploration of this text will reinforce that belief (Guthrie, 2015). Additionally, according to Linnenbrink and Pintrich (2002), utilizing a text that is of interest to Jim could engage him, “in such a way that they (he) use better strategies for learning and ultimately achieve at a higher level” (p. 319). This text is both of a topic of interest and of a manageable length which should make it accessible to Jim.

The results of the pre-assessment demonstrate that Jim can read a passage and summarize it in his own words. This is consistent with the observations of his teachers and tutors that he has the foundational skills and knowledge to complete literacy activities. He is also able to pick out the salient details of the text, as evidence by Jim’s answer to the second question and his observation that Nick is closely focused on the trout. Jim’s answer to the third question is more speculative than his answers to the previous two, but given his lack of familiarity with Nick or the story, this is not surprising. The answer to this question also demonstrates Jim’s struggle with vocabulary and spelling as he misspells “adventurous”.

The Post-Assessment (Appendix H) asks Jim to complete similar activities. He first reads another excerpt from “Big Two-Hearted River”, this time from the end of the story, and then summarizes it in his own words. This is consistent with the first question of the pre-assessment as it is a foundational skill for good readers (Duke et al., 2011, p. 56). The second and third questions are similar to those of the pre-assessment but focus on a different piece of the setting in the story. In the pre-assessment, it was the trout, now it is the swamp. The second and third questions on both assessments ask Jim to both a) identify Nick’s feelings toward these pieces of setting b) identify how he (Jim) knows this to be the case and c) go a step further to think about

### Literacy Learner Analysis

why this is the case. By including the third question asking “why”, these assessments require Jim to move toward a claim about Nick’s character that he could later support with text (a skill on which the second lesson focuses), which is one of the reading standards for grades 9-12 (Standards for English Language Arts, p. 40).

Jim’s performance on the post-assessment (Appendix H) demonstrates that he is capable of picking out aspects of the text enable him to answer comprehension questions. Specifically, his answers to the second and third questions require him to identify the salient aspects of the text, which he does briefly but capably. Jim’s answer to the third question, proposing an argument about Nick’s character, builds upon the activity of the second lesson, although Jim’s answer is less declarative than I would have hoped after our lesson. The fourth question requires Jim to identify the process he used in answering the questions on the post-test, and he cites the activities from our lessons. It is encouraging that he notices Nick’s repetition of wanting to avoid the swamp or at least delay his entry. Jim’s ability to answer the questions of the post-test with clear and relevant responses related to the text indicate a level of comprehension ability that is promising.

### VI. Lesson Plan Matrix

<b>Lesson Foci/Date</b>	<b>Objectives</b>	<b>Instructional Materials</b>	<b>On-going Assessment</b>
Exposure to story and personal connection 6/1	Student will make a personal connection to the story by recounting (first orally, then written)	-“Big Two-Hearted River” Part I -KWL Chart	-Written personal story and written paragraph connecting story to “Big Two-Hearted River”

## Literacy Learner Analysis

	their most memorable fishing experience.		-KWL Chart
--	--	--	------------

<b>Lesson Foci/Date</b>	<b>Objectives</b>	<b>Instructional Materials</b>	<b>On-going Assessment</b>
Using textual evidence to support claims 6/4	Student will create a claim about the protagonist of the story and then support that claim with textual evidence.	“Big Two-Hearted River” Parts I & II -KWL Chart	Deconstructed “Perfect Paragraph” -KWL Chart

## VII. Reflections on the Literacy Lesson Plans

As previously recounted in section IV, Jim’s struggles stem from a self-awareness of his ability relative to that of his peers and a desire to avoid exposing the depth of his struggles. A result of this is disengagement with the text and literacy process, and initial resistance to special help from a teacher or tutor. As such, the goal of this study was to give Jim general reading strategies that would increase his confidence in his own abilities, motivation to pursue reading opportunities, and persistence when facing a reading challenge by showing him that he is capable of more than he thinks (Guthrie, 2014).

The pre-test (Appendix B) asked Jim to read a passage from Part I of “Big Two-Hearted River”, summarize it in his own words, and answer two questions identifying Nick’s focus on the fish in the river, speculate about his character, and two questions designed to better understand

## Literacy Learner Analysis

Jim's reading comprehension process. Importantly, these four questions were split into two groups, with each group containing a content and reading comprehension knowledge question. These were paired together to ask Jim to think simultaneously about the story and his reading process.

Jim's responses to the pre-test were informative in shaping the structure of the two lessons. The pre-test was an open-ended assessment designed to "identify the knowledge students bring to their reading and writing and if and how this is activated, strategies and skills they are using confidently and with flexibility, and those that are in process and require further attention" (Risko & Dalhouse, 2014, p. 109). The questions on the pre-test were also designed to draw Jim's attention to the fish in the story and activate his prior knowledge and interest in the sport of fishing. This is consistent with Brozo's findings on the importance of teachers demonstrating knowledge of students' interests and needs (Guthrie, 2014, p. 66). The first activity of the first lesson, therefore, was designed to explicitly highlight this personal interest in recounting a personal fishing narrative. While demonstrating the ability to summarize and identify important plot points and concepts, the brevity of Jim's answers on the pre-test indicated that he would benefit from more explicit and specific instruction in the first lesson through use of a KWL chart. The second lesson would continue this progression, finish the KWL chart, and ask Jim to use his work from the chart to begin to think analytically about the text. His answers to the final question on the pre-test demonstrates the importance of encouraging Jim to support his opinions with evidence from the text. This is a skill on which he has received prior instruction in his classes but upon which he can still improve.

### 1. Lesson 1 (appendix C)

The first lesson began with a discussion of Jim's interest in fishing and recounting his

### Literacy Learner Analysis

most memorable fishing experience (appendix D, part I). Jim documented this narrative prior to moving into Part I of “Big Two-Hearted River” with me. Jim and I read these pages together, with Jim following along silently while the I read aloud. Given my knowledge and experience with Jim’s resistance to reading in the past, I structured the lesson this way to follow the principles of the gradual release of responsibility model (Fisher & Frey 2010). I encouraged Jim to stop me if he had questions, and I modelled this behavior several times throughout the text, pausing to wonder aloud, a) why everything was burned? b) why had Nick come here? c) where was Nick going? d) why is he happy? Unfortunately, Jim did not voice any questions himself.

After reading, I introduced Jim to a Know-Want-Learned chart (KWL - appendix E), which we completed together. Jim’s responses to the “What I Know” section demonstrate that Jim was focused on the woods and fish while listening/reading the first part of the story. His “What I Want to Know” section demonstrates either that a) although he did not voice any questions himself, he had the same that I voiced or b) he was simply repeating the questions I asked and was interested in the fish. Finally, the “What I Learned” section was, initially, predictably brief as Jim did not yet have full exposure to the story. We did make some progress, however, as I did not allow Jim to settle with one answer and pushed him to move beyond his first simple bullet point. He was immediately able to identify the reference to Hopkins. The final piece of the lesson was for Jim to write a brief connection between his personal narrative and what he knew about Nick so far. In this connection (appendix D, part II), Jim indicated that he identified Nick’s similar interest in fishing.

### 2. Lesson 2 (appendix F)

Between the first and second lesson, Jim finished reading the story on his own. The

### Literacy Learner Analysis

second lesson began with a brief discussion between us about the events of the second part of the story and connection to the personal narrative Jim worked on at the beginning and end of the first lesson. This was to work as both an re-introduction into the lesson and also a quick evaluation to confirm that Jim had completed the story. We then returned to his K-W-L chart, which also allowed me to confirm that he had finished the story. Jim added to his list in the first two columns of the chart (appendix E – additions in italics).

Most of the second lesson was spent on transitioning into analytical thinking. Jim and I used the questions he had established in the K-W-L chart to generate thinking about Nick as a character and used pieces of the text to answer these questions. Jim completed a “Deconstructed Character Analysis” (appendix G) that I designed to walk him through these steps.

After the character analysis, Jim completed the post-test assessment (appendix H). The results of Jim’s post-test led me to believe that Jim’s was able to internalize aspects of our lesson as he cites the character analysis in describing his comprehension process. Jim’s writing remains brief, but I was encouraged to see that he cited this as an example.

In reviewing my design for both lessons, there are a few changes I would make. First, I would release responsibility to Jim more gradually (Duke et. al., 2011, p. 65). I do believe that he finished reading the story on his own but believe it is also telling that the two textual examples he cited in his character analysis are from the first part of the story, when he was following along while I read aloud. Secondly, by questioning Jim during the reading I would require him to be a more active participant in our joint reading process to better equip him for independent reading.

Reflecting on Jim’s performance over the course of the lessons, I hesitate to say that my reading instruction made a meaningful contribution to Jim’s reading progress as I believe that the sample size is too small to definitively say that we made lasting progress. Only more prolonged

## Literacy Learner Analysis

observation would be able to answer that question. As I said previously, however, Jim's citation of our activities in describing his comprehension process on the post-test (appendix G – question 4) leads me to believe that our sessions were impactful for him. I believe that the read-aloud (Noskin, 2013) activity in the first lesson was successful in exposing Jim to the text as well as modeling possible thought patterns while reading. Throughout this lesson, I attempted to transition between direct instruction and strategy modelling as we moved through the text, eventually releasing responsibility toward the end of the lesson and moving into our second lesson (Duke et al., 2011). The second lesson was more difficult as we did not have the shared experience of the text to base our discussion. I had visions of using the discussion as a key tool in shaping that lesson (Gambrell, 2004, p.196) but found that Jim's retention was not as high as when we had read the text together. As I stated previously, if given the opportunity to do the lessons over again, I would require Jim to participate in a more active role in our read-aloud, and I would also slow the release of responsibility in our activities to better scaffold my instruction. Additionally, I would incorporate some degree of writing instruction, perhaps examining a successful character analysis prior to asking Jim to complete one, as Jim's written work is brief and can expand to include more depth (Bromley, 2014).

In all, I think that Jim's performance over the course of these lessons demonstrates that he is a capable literacy learner. His greatest challenge is to understand himself as a literacy learner and embrace the process through which he achieves comprehension. Based on the textual evidence that he selected to support his claim about Nick (Appendix G), it is apparent that he comprehended the first part of the story better than the second, when he was reading on his own. As such, reading instruction for Jim should include as many opportunities to process orally, while reading along, as possible. This would, I believe, enable Jim more efficient comprehension

### Literacy Learner Analysis

and increase his confidence in his literacy abilities. As his confidence grows, I would hope that his interest and dedication would as well (Guthrie, 2014). In conjunction, these two lessons demonstrate my understanding of the gradual release of responsibility model (although I believe I could use it better in the future) and the effectiveness of techniques such as strategy modeling, explicit instruction, and read-alouds.

### VIII. Recommendations to Teachers and Parents/Caregivers

To the Parents and Teachers of Jim Lahey,

Recently, I conducted two lessons with Jim in an effort to better understand him as a literacy learner. The goal of these lessons was to introduce Jim to strategies that would improve his confidence in his reading abilities. As a result of these lessons, the pre and post-test assessments and literacy survey (Appendix A-H), I believe that Jim's self-perception as a literacy learner is far below that which his abilities should dictate. Jim demonstrated the ability to summarize a reading after reading jointly with me and showed that he can create the beginning of an analytical argument with textual support.

During our first lesson, Jim's comprehension was heightened while reading in his head while I read aloud. Thus, I would encourage you and Jim to explore audio recordings of future classroom texts that will allow him to engage in a similar activity. Prior to the start of our lessons, Jim also expressed a frustration with school texts and a reluctance to read for pleasure. Our lessons focused on a text ("Big Two-Hearted River") which I selected to play to Jim's interest in fishing, and I believe that exposure to similar texts that speak to his passion in fishing



### Literacy Learner Analysis

(*A River Runs Through It*, by Norman MacLean) or tennis (*Open*, by Andre Agassi or *Levels of the Game*, by John McPhee) will show Jim that reading can be enjoyable. He has had a difficult literacy road to this point, but I believe that participation with texts that he views as relevant to his life will be helpful in generating a level of motivation to engage with the text that he has not had previously. I have enjoyed working with Jim over the course of this project and look forward to our continued relationship.

Best, Robb Arndt

### References

- Bromley, K. (2014). Best Practices in Teaching Writing. In L.B. Gambrell & L. Mandel-Morrow (Eds.), *Best Practices in Literacy Instruction* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.), (pp. 288-314). New York: Guilford Press.
- Duke, N., Pearson, P.D., Strachan, S. & Billman, A. (2011). The Essential Elements of Fostering and Teaching Reading Comprehension. In S.J. Samuels & A.E. Farstrup (Eds.), *What Research Has to Say About Reading Instruction* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.), (p. 51-93). Newark: DE: International Reading Association.
- Gambrell, L. B. (2004). Literacy Motivation: Implications for Urban Classrooms. In *Teaching All The Children: Strategies for Developing Literacy in an Urban Setting*.
- Griffo, V., Madda, C., Pearson, P., & Raphael, T. (2014). Current Issues and Best Practices in Literacy Instruction. In L.B. Gambrell & L. Madel-Morrow (Eds.), *Best Practices in Literacy Instruction* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.), (pp. 37-60). New York: Guilford Press.

## Literacy Learner Analysis

- Guthrie, J. (2014). Best Practices in Motivating Students to Read. In L.B. Gambrell & L. Mandel-Morrow (Eds.), *Best Practices in Literacy Instruction* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.), (pp.61-82). New York: Guilford Press.
- Leu, D.J., Zawilinski, E.F. & Timbrell, N. (2014). Best Practices in Teaching the New Literacies of Online Research and Comprehension. In L.B. Gambrell & L. Mandel-Morrow (Eds.), *Best Practices in Literacy Instruction* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.), (pp. 343-364). New York: Guilford Press.
- Linnebrink, E. A., & Pintrich, P. R. (2002). Motivation as an Enabler for Academic Success. *School Psychology Review*, 31(3), 313-327.
- Noskin, D. P. (2013). Toward a Clearer Picture of Assessment: One Teacher's Formative Approach. *English Journal*, 103(1), 72-80.
- Reutzel, D.R., Clark, S.K., & Flory, M. (2014). Organizing Effective Literacy Instruction: Differentiating Literacy Instruction to Meet Student Needs. In L.B. Gambrell & L. Mandel-Morrow (Eds.), *Best Practices in Literacy Instruction* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.), (pp.365-389). New York: Guilford Press.

Literacy Learner Analysis

Risko, V. & Walker-Dalhouse, D. (2014) in Mandel-Morrow and Gambrell (2014), chapter 5:  
“Best Practices to Change Trajectory of Struggling Readers” (p. 107-126).

Standards for English Language Arts 6-12. (n.d.). *Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts & Literacy in History/Social Sciences, Science, and Technical Subjects.*

## Literacy Learner Analysis

## Appendix A.

## Literacy Survey

My friends think I am \_\_\_\_\_.

- a. A very good reader
- b. A good reader
- c. An OK reader
- d.  A poor reader

Reading a book is something I like to do.

- a.  Never
- b. Not very often
- c. Sometimes
- d. Often

I read \_\_\_\_\_.

- a.  Not as well as my friends
- b. About the same as my friends
- c. A little better than my friends
- d. A lot better than my friends

My best friends think reading is \_\_\_\_\_.

- a. Really fun
- b. Fun
- c.  OK to do
- d. No fun at all

When I come to a word I don't know, I can \_\_\_\_\_.

- a. Almost always figure it out
- b. Sometimes figure it out
- c.  Almost never figure it out
- d. Never figure it out

I tell my friends about good books I read.

- a.  I never do this
- b. I almost never do this
- c. I do this some of the time
- d. I do this a lot

When I am reading by myself, I understand \_\_\_\_\_.

- a. Almost everything I read
- b.  Some of what I read
- c. Almost none of what I read
- d. None of what I read

## Literacy Learner Analysis

People who read a lot are \_\_\_\_\_.

- a. Very interesting
- b. Interesting
- c. Not very interesting
- d. Boring

I am \_\_\_\_\_.

- a. A poor reader
- b. An OK reader
- c. A good reader
- d. A very good reader

I think libraries are \_\_\_\_\_.

- a. A great place to spend time.
- b. An interesting place to spend time
- c. An OK place to spend time
- d. A boring place to spend time

I worry about what other kids think about my reading \_\_\_\_\_.

- a. Every day
- b. Almost every day
- c. Once in a while
- d. Never

Knowing how to read well is \_\_\_\_\_.

- a. Not very important
- b. Sort of important
- c. Important
- d. Very important

When my teacher asks me a question about what I have read, I \_\_\_\_\_.

- a. Can never think of an answer
- b. Have trouble thinking of an answer
- c. Sometimes think of an answer
- d. Always think of an answer

I think reading is \_\_\_\_\_.

- a. A boring way to spend time
- b. An ok way to spend time
- c. An interesting way to spend time
- d. A great way to spend time

## Literacy Learner Analysis

Reading is \_\_\_\_\_.

- a. Very easy for me
- b. Kind of easy for me
- c. Kind of hard for me
- d. Very hard for me

As an adult, I will spend \_\_\_\_\_.

- a. None of my time reading
- b. Very little time reading
- c. Some of my time reading
- d. A lot of my time reading

When I am in a group talking about what we are reading, I \_\_\_\_\_.

- a. Almost never talk about my ideas
- b. Sometimes talk about my ideas
- c. Almost always talk about my ideas
- d. Always talk about my ideas

I would like for my teachers to read out loud in my classes \_\_\_\_\_.

- a. Every day
- b. Almost every day
- c. Once in a while
- d. Never

When I read out loud I am a \_\_\_\_\_.

- a. Poor reader
- b. OK reader
- c. Good reader
- d. Very good reader

When someone gives me a book for a present, I feel \_\_\_\_\_.

- a. Very happy
- b. Sort of happy
- c. Sort of unhappy
- d. unhappy

## Literacy Learner Analysis

## Appendix B.

## LLA Pre-Test

## Excerpt from “Big Two-Hearted River”

“He came down a hillside covered with stumps into a meadow. At the edge of the meadow flowed the river. Nick was glad to get to the river. He walked upstream through the meadow. His trousers were soaked with the dew as he walked. After the hot day, the dew had come quickly and heavily. The river made no sound. It was too fast and smooth. At the edge of the meadow, before he mounted to a piece of high ground to make camp, Nick looked down the river at the trout rising. They were rising to insects come from the swamp on the other side of the stream when the sun went down. The trout jumped out of water to take them. While Nick walked through the little stretch of meadow alongside the stream, trout had jumped high out of water. Now as he looked down the river, the insects must be settling on the surface, for the trout were feeding steadily all down the stream. As far down as the long stretch as he could see, the trout were rising, making circles all down the surface of the water, as though it were starting to rain.”

(182)

Please read the excerpt above, and then answer the following questions on the following side.

## Literacy Learner Analysis

1) After you have read the paragraph, summarize it in your own words.

A boy named Nick was on a hike or possibly exploring. He came down a hill into a meadow and walked towards the river that was in the meadow. He watched the river flow and noticed how fast it was going.

2) On what in the river is Nick most focused? How do you know this stands out to him?

Nick was heavily focused on the trout. I know this stands out to him because he goes deeply in detail on the fish observing them carefully.

3) Why do you think that this stands out to Nick? What does this say about his character?

This stands out to Nick because he is curious. The fish are really active and interesting to Nick and they are interesting. Nick's character is curious and smart he's also adventures.



## Literacy Learner Analysis

## Appendix C.

<b>Daily Instructional Lesson Plan</b>	
Content Area(s)/Course/Grade:  TE846 Lesson #1	Unit:
Lesson Topic:  “Big Two-Hearted River”	Date:6/1/18
Teacher:  Robb Arndt	School:
Indicator(s)/Sub-Outcome(s)/Expectation(s):  Student will read and discuss Part I of “Big Two-Hearted River” in conjunction with the instructor. Student will begin a KWL chart and craft a personal narrative related to the story.	
Student Outcome(s): Through reading aloud and completion of the personal narrative and KWL chart, the student will demonstrate initial comprehension of Part I of “Big Two-Hearted River” and will gain investment in the story.	
<b>Context for Learning</b>	
The instruction and activities with this student will take place in a one-on-one setting. The instructor and student will read all of Part I of “Big Two-Hearted River” together and the instructor will enable the student to pose questions when his comprehension wavers.	
<b>Instructional Delivery</b>	

## Literacy Learner Analysis

**Opening Activities/Motivation:**

The lesson will begin with a discussion of past fishing experiences, eventually focusing on one memorable experience. The student will document this experience on paper.

**Procedures:** After the student has documented his most memorable experience, the instructor and student will read Part I of “Big Two-Hearted River” together, pausing to highlight fishing aspects, focus on the student’s progressing comprehension, or to clarify events and characters. Upon completion of the story, the student will complete an initial KWL chart that will demonstrate and gauge knowledge, desire, and investment in the story. The lesson will conclude with a written paragraph connecting the student’s initial fishing experience to Nick’s in Part I.

**Assessment/Evaluation (Formative/Summative)**

This lesson concludes with the formative assessment of the written connection between the student’s personal experience and the events of Part I in “Big Two-Hearted River”.

## Literacy Learner Analysis

### Appendix D.

#### Part I. Personal Fishing Narrative

The first fishing trip I really remember was when I was around 9 or 10. I remember it was a competition on who could catch the biggest or most. I caught something like 4 red fish a trigger fish and a couple of others. I was with my dad and a bunch of his friends and my friends. I remember that the fish were very interesting to me their colors were bright and their eyes were popping out.

#### Part II. Connection to “Big Two-Hearted River”

Nick shares my interest in fishing. He finds the fish very intriguing because when your young there is a lot to wonder about and be curious about.

## Literacy Learner Analysis

## Appendix E.

**K-W-L Chart**

<b>What I <u>K</u>now</b>	<b>What I <u>W</u>ant to Know</b>	<b>What I have <u>L</u>earned</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● He is happy in the woods</li> <li>● Feels connected to nature</li> <li>● Looking for something</li> <li>● Hopkins disappeared</li> <li>● Likes the trout in the river</li>   <li>● <i>Nick caught a lot of fish</i></li>   <li>● <i>He is going to be in the woods for a long time</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● What is he looking for?</li> <li>● Why is everything burned?</li> <li>● Is he going to catch the fish?</li>   <li>● <i>How long is Nick going to be in the woods?</i></li> <li>● <i>Why is he there?</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Nick is camping in the woods</li> <li>● He used to have a friend (Hopkins)</li> </ul>

## Literacy Learner Analysis

## Appendix F.

<b>Daily Instructional Lesson Plan</b>	
Content Area(s)/Course/Grade:  TE846 Lesson #2	Unit:
Lesson Topic:  “Big Two-Hearted River”	Date:6/4/18
Teacher:  Robb Arndt	School:
Indicator(s)/Sub-Outcome(s)/Expectation(s):  Student will read and discuss Part 2 of “Big Two-Hearted River” in conjunction with the instructor. Student will complete his KWL chart and outline an analytical paragraph about a character (Nick or the river) from the story.	
Student Outcome(s): Student will build upon their work and connection with the story from the initial lesson to begin to think analytically about “Big-Two Hearted River”. He will start to craft an analytical argument for the story.	
<b>Context for Learning</b>	
The instruction and activities with this student will take place in a one-on-one setting. The student will finish reading “Big-Two Hearted River” between the first and the second lesson. The second lesson will be spent primarily on working toward a completed, deconstructed, analytical paragraph.	
<b>Instructional Delivery</b>	

## Literacy Learner Analysis

**Opening Activities/Motivation:**

The lesson will begin with a review of the first lesson and comparison of the personal narrative to Nick's experience. The student will then review his KWL chart and add to it, now that he has finished the story.

**Procedures:** After the initial review of the previous lesson, the student will complete the KWL chart, which should demonstrate the growth in his comprehension over the course of the story. The instructor and student will then use his observations, questions, and gained knowledge to guide the formation of his deconstructed analytical argument.

**Assessment/Evaluation (Formative/Summative)**

This lesson concludes with a summative assessment in the form of a deconstructed analytical paragraph about "Big Two-Hearted River". It is summative in that it is the end of this unit.

## Literacy Learner Analysis

## Appendix G.

## “Big Two-Hearted River” Deconstructed Character Analysis

After reading the story:

- Make a claim about Nick or the river:

Nick is running away from something.

- Support this claim with one piece of text:

“Nick was happy. He felt he had left everything behind, the need for thinking, the need to write, other needs.” (179)

- Explain how this piece of text supports your claim:

Nick is happy because he has run away from whatever was behind him.

- Support this claim with a second piece of text:

“Nick was happy as he crawled inside the tent. He had not been unhappy all day. This was different though.” (184)

- Explain how these quotations, together, support your claim:

Nick says he is happy again and that it is different that he is not unhappy. He is happy because everything is behind him.

## Literacy Learner Analysis

## Appendix H.

## Excerpt from “Big Two-Hearted River”

“Nick did not want to go there now. He felt a reaction against deep wading with the water deepening up under his armpits, to hook big trout in places impossible to land them. In the swamp the banks were bare, the big cedars came together overhead, the sun did not come through, except in patches; in the fast deep water, in the half light, the fishing would be tragic. In the swamp fishing was a tragic adventure. Nick did not want it. He did not want to go down the stream any farther today” (198).

- 1) After you have read the paragraph, summarize it in your own words.



## Literacy Learner Analysis

Nick gets to the swamp but doesn't want to go in.

2) How does Nick feel about the swamp? How do you know?

Nick knows that there are big fish in the swamp but doesn't want to go in. I know this because the first sentence says he doesn't want to go.

3) Why do you think that Nick feels the way he does?

Nick might be scared of the swamp. He says he doesn't want to go in twice and talks about darkness.

4) What was your process in answering the questions above? Please describe each step that you used.

First I read the paragraph and saw that Nick repeats that he doesn't want to go in. Then I thought about the rest of the story and what Mr. Arndt and I did with our character paragraph and how Nick might be running away from something.