

How *Jamestown Reading Navigator*[™]
Supports Research-Based Instruction
for Struggling Adolescent Readers

Diverse Texts

Prepared for

Glencoe/McGraw-Hill

by

Interactive Educational Systems Design, Inc.

New York, NY



Glencoe

About This Paper

This paper presents research-supported best practices related to instruction of struggling adolescent readers—that is, students in grades 6–12 who are reading at least two levels below grade level—and describes how *Jamestown Reading Navigator*[™] supports those practices.

What Is *Jamestown Reading Navigator*?

Jamestown Reading Navigator is a reading intervention program designed specifically for students in grades 6–12 who are reading two or more reading levels below their grade in school. The program provides direct, explicit instruction and modeling of good reading practices, together with opportunities for students to practice and apply these reading strategies.

Jamestown Reading Navigator combines online activities featuring interactive multimedia for students to complete; engaging and appropriate online and print texts for students to read; an audio component for further guided or independent study; student writing in response to reading; student recording of fluency passages; an assessment program to monitor students' progress; an independent measure of progress monitoring; and teacher support materials, including professional development, lesson plans, instructional recommendations, and reteaching skills support. Major areas of focus for *Jamestown Reading Navigator* include

- Comprehension skills and strategies, designed for application to content-area reading
- Vocabulary
- Writing
- Fluency
- Decoding/phonics (for students with a particular need in this area)

The *Jamestown Reading Navigator* Learner Management System helps teachers manage individual student learning and provides ongoing, up-to-the-minute information on how students are performing. Online professional development modules and on-site professional development sessions offered by Jamestown Education help educators—teachers, administrators, literacy specialists, and others—learn how to implement *Jamestown Reading Navigator* more effectively. These sessions also provide information and suggestions to help educators develop effective strategies for working with struggling adolescent readers.

Jamestown Reading Navigator has been developed based on the most up-to-date research and expert thinking in adolescent literacy, drawing on more than 30 years of experience in reaching adolescent readers with the popular Jamestown Education print series. This paper describes the match between *Jamestown Reading Navigator* and the best available instructional thinking in a variety of specific areas that are important to the success of struggling adolescent readers, as described below.

Introduction

A Critical Need to Support Struggling Adolescent Readers

Problems with literacy have serious and long-lasting consequences. A lack of literacy skills is “one of the most commonly cited reasons” for students to drop out of school (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006, p. 7). A resource guide on adolescent literacy prepared for the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory described the problem as follows:

For secondary-level students . . . the social and economic consequences of not reading well can be cumulative and profound: the failure to attain a high school diploma, a barrier to higher education, underemployment or unemployment, and difficulty in managing personal and family life. Years of failing at what is deemed a hallmark of intelligence and worth can also leave struggling readers with emotional consequences, such as anxiety and low self-esteem, that affect personality and interpersonal relationships. These effects within and beyond the classroom walls show that by the secondary grades educators can no longer defer solutions to future development or instruction. (Peterson et al., 2000, p. 6)¹

¹ Peterson et al. (2000) is laid out in a paginated PDF format, but the format does not include page numbers. Page references for quotes from Peterson et al. (2000) that are given in this paper have therefore been calculated on the basis of page numbers shown in the document table of contents.

Numerous sources attest to the scope of the challenge. *Reading Next* cited both results from the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) and the opinions of experts in adolescent literacy that “as many as 70 percent of students struggle with reading in some manner” that requires instruction differentiated for their specific needs (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006, p. 8, citing Loomis & Bourque, 2001; NCES, 1999, 2006; Olson, 2006).

Adolescents struggle with literacy for a variety of reasons. For some, English may not be their first language. Others may have mild learning disabilities. In many cases, students may simply lack experience and skill with reading. Unfortunately, difficulties in reading don’t cure themselves, but instead tend to get worse as students get older—a phenomenon reading experts refer to as the “Matthew Effect” (Stanovich, 1986). These students need literacy instruction that addresses the specific challenges they face, using the best available research-based methods and principles, in order to improve their chances of succeeding both during school and afterward.

The State of Research on Struggling Adolescent Readers

Over the last two decades, attempts to improve student literacy on the national level have focused largely on elementary instruction, and particularly on early literacy—that is, literacy at the primary grades. For example, the focus of the Reading First initiative was on improving literacy at the primary levels. Recently, however, a number of efforts—including research summaries for a variety of sources, publication of the *Reading Next* report and other documents from the Alliance for Excellent Education, and position statements from organizations such as the National Reading Conference and the International Reading Association—have helped create a higher profile for instructional issues related to adolescent readers, and particularly the large proportion of adolescents who struggle with reading.

Initiatives such as the No Child Left Behind Act have raised expectations for instruction. Instruction is expected to be backed with solid research that concludes it is likely to result in the desired impact on student learning. Unfortunately, research on what constitutes effective literacy instruction for adolescents is still limited. According to the editors of a volume intended to “compile from the best researchers in the field a summary and synthesis of adolescent literacy research and practice,”

As of 2003, there is not a body of research to tell us appropriate interventions that will help struggling middle and secondary school readers who can barely read. As of 2003, we still do not have a body of research to provide us with appropriate interventions to help high school readers who can read fluently but remain 3 or 4 years below grade level in reading. (Jetton & Dole, 2004, p. 6)

Although research on what constitutes effective literacy instruction for adolescents is limited in significant ways, there is substantial support in research and expert opinion for a variety of specific instructional recommendations. The state of knowledge with regard to effective instruction for struggling adolescent readers fits the description of *best available evidence* as characterized by U.S. Department of Education Assistant Secretary Grover J. Whitehurst: that is, “the integration of professional wisdom with the best available empirical evidence in making decisions about how to deliver instruction” (Whitehurst, 2002).

The Reading Next Report

A critical milestone in recent efforts to highlight the challenges related to adolescent literacy was the publication of *Reading Next*, a report to Carnegie Corporation of New York focusing on the needs of adolescent readers (defined in the report as those in grades 4–12), with a special emphasis on the needs of struggling readers. Preparation of this report included the following steps.

- A panel of five nationally known and respected educational researchers was convened in spring 2004, together with representatives of Carnegie Corporation of New York and the Alliance for Excellent Education.
- These panelists drew up a set of recommendations for how to meet the needs of struggling readers, including 15 specific elements of effective adolescent literacy programs that had “a substantial base in research and/or professional opinion” (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006, p. 12). These included both elements with an instructional focus and recommended infrastructure elements to improve adolescent literacy.

- The resulting paper was reviewed and augmented at the 2004 meeting of the Adolescent Literacy Funders Forum (ALFF).
- An Appendix was compiled of literature supporting each of the report’s main recommendations.
- In 2006, a second edition of the report was published.

The *Reading Next* recommendations thus represented a synthesis of research-informed expert opinion that serves as an important touchstone for much of what is known about effective adolescent literacy instruction. Several caveats, however, are in order with regard to using the recommendations as a yardstick for measuring instructional programs in general, and *Jamestown Reading Navigator* in particular.

- While all 15 elements identified by *Reading Next* are characterized as having “a substantial base in research and/or professional opinion” (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006, p. 12), the report nonetheless cautions that “the optimal mix of these factors has yet to be determined. . . . Nor does the remediation of adolescent literacy difficulties involve indiscriminately layering on all fifteen key elements. Choices should be matched to school and student needs” (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006, p. 29). The expectation is not that each literacy program should necessarily include all 15 elements, but that developers and adopters of such programs should select those elements that seem best matched to their specific circumstances.
- The focus of *Reading Next* is explicitly on “the large population of struggling students who already decode accurately but still struggle with reading and writing after third grade” (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006, p. 11). The report thus does not include recommendations related to areas such as decoding and fluency that may be important for readers who are struggling at a more basic level.
- Several of the elements of *Reading Next* relate to how infrastructure impacts adolescent literacy learning. The most that any purchased instructional program can do in these areas is to provide support to schools and districts as they implement these elements.

Development of This Paper

Development of this research-based white paper included the following steps.

- A top-level review of *Reading Next* was conducted to identify claims and recommended practices, including both those that are associated with the 15 key elements of adolescent literacy identified in the report and those that appear elsewhere in the report. As part of this review, information was collected about the sources in the Appendix to *Reading Next*, which listed literature supporting each of the 15 key elements.
- Well-known experts in the field of adolescent literacy were consulted to identify key, current, and reputable sources related to instruction for struggling adolescent readers. These included both experts who had been consulted during the development of *Jamestown Reading Navigator* and an independent expert not previously associated with the program.²
- Key documents were identified for review, with priority given to two types of documents:
 - *Broad policy-oriented research reviews and surveys of expert opinion, developed by reputable institutions and authors, with a goal of identifying key elements in effective adolescent literacy programs*
 - *More focused research syntheses and meta-analyses from reputable sources, describing the state of research and/or theory related to a specific relevant topic in adolescent literacy (e.g., comprehension, writing, formative assessment)*

² Key contributors included Dr. Thomas W. Bean, professor in literacy/reading and coordinator of doctoral studies in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction, University of Nevada at Las Vegas; Dr. William G. Brozo, professor of literacy, Graduate School of Education, George Mason University; and Dr. Douglas Fisher, professor of language and literacy education, San Diego State University. Drs. Brozo and Fisher had previously consulted with the development team for *Jamestown Reading Navigator*. These experts provided input into interpretation of the research literature, as well as recommendations of sources to review, but are not responsible for writing the summaries of the literature or for developing the correlations of the instructional recommendations to *Jamestown Reading Navigator*.

In addition to these two types of documents, some specific research reports were also identified for review, in the case of studies that were particularly germane to topics under investigation.

- Sources were reviewed and summarized, with special reference to
 - *Specific instructional recommendations*
 - *The nature of the evidence supporting each recommendation*
- Instructional recommendations were consolidated from multiple sources.
- Cross-comparison of the research-based recommendations and *Jamestown Reading Navigator* verified that *Jamestown Reading Navigator* supports each research-based recommendation listed in this paper.

In the final paper as presented here, each section spells out specific instructional recommendations that are supported by a mix of research and expert opinion. A table then provides information on how *Jamestown Reading Navigator* aligns with each recommendation.

Key policy-oriented documents and research syntheses that were reviewed for this paper are listed in the References section of the complete White Paper.

DIVERSE TEXTS

“Adolescents deserve access to a wide variety of reading material that they can and want to read.”—Position statement from the International Reading Association’s Commission on Adolescent Literacy (Moore et al., 1999, p. 4)

Diverse texts are described by *Reading Next* as one of 15 “promising elements of effective adolescent literacy programs . . . that had a substantial base in research and/or professional opinion.” (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006, p. 12)

What Is Meant by “Diverse Texts”?

Reading Next defines diverse texts as “texts at a variety of difficulty levels and on a variety of topics” (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006, p. 4). The focus of diverse texts, as an element of adolescent literacy instruction, is on making sure that students have access to texts that fit their reading capabilities and interests.

Why Do Adolescent Readers Need Diverse Texts?

The IRA’s Commission on Adolescent Literacy identified several “reasons for providing adolescents access to inside- and outside-of-school reading materials they can and want to read” (Moore et al., 1999, p. 4), based on literacy research and expert opinion:

- “*Time spent reading is related to reading success.* . . .
- “*Time spent reading is associated with attitudes toward additional reading.* Students who habitually read in the present tend to seek out new materials in the future. These students are on the way to lifelong reading.
- “*Time spent reading is tied to knowledge of the world.* . . .
- “*Reading is a worthwhile life experience.* Readers can find comfort and delight in print. Vicariously stepping into text worlds can nourish teens’ emotions and psyches as well as their intellects” (Moore et al., 1999, p. 5; emphasis in original).

In order to harness these advantages of broad reading, it is important to provide students with access to texts that they are able to read and will be motivated to read.

Research supports the availability of diverse texts as a factor in student literacy and content-area achievement. For example, Guthrie et al. (2000) identified “use of abundant texts and resources” as one of the factors that was “associated positively with change in achievement” in reading, science, mathematics, and writing of fifth-grade students in 33 schools on the Maryland statewide performance assessment (p. 211).³ Allington (2006) cited research that associated more books in classroom libraries with higher achievement on a school level, more frequent reading by students, and more students reading books they could read successfully (p. 70, citing Allington et al., 1996; Guice et al., 1996; Johnston et al., 1998).

Allington (2006) also cited research to the effect that

[School] library adequacy is among the better predictors of reading achievement with a correlation of .85 between library adequacy and NAEP reading achievement scores. In other words, you could quite accurately rank the states’ NAEP scores just by knowing their ranking on school library quality. (p. 73, citing McQuillan, 1998)

Taken together, this evidence suggests that providing appropriate, diverse texts for students can be a powerful tool to improve their literacy.

Instructional Recommendations

- **Providing access to texts.** As described above, sheer quantity of available texts can have an important impact on students’ literacy development. Unfortunately, research suggests that many students who are most at risk of literacy problems are likely to have less access to texts at home, in the classroom, and in school libraries, due to factors such as income and teacher practice. Allington (2006) cited the following findings from research:
 - *School libraries vary greatly in “size and adequacy of their collections; the availability, supportiveness, and expertise of the library staff; and the actual access children have to the library and its books” (p. 71, citing Krashen, 1993; McQuillan, 1998).*
 - *School libraries in wealthy communities have twice as many books as school libraries in low-income areas (p. 72, citing Guice et al., 1996; Krashen, 1993; McQuillan, 1998; Neuman & Celano, 2001).*
 - *Classrooms of exemplary teachers have more books than other classrooms (p. 70, citing Allington & Johnston, 2002; Pressley et al., 2000).*
 - *Children from lower-income homes are less likely to have books at home (p. 72, citing Neuman & Celano, 2001).*
 - *Children from wealthier families have better access to series books, meaning they have better access to the advantages in reading achievement offered by reading books in a series (p. 82, citing Neuman & Celano, 2001; Strickland & Walmsley, 1993).*
 - *Children need access to the library before and after school. However, in poorly funded schools, children may visit the library only “once a week and are restricted to a single book exchange” (p. 73, citing Guice et al., 1996).*

Taken together, these findings suggest that there is value to providing substantial additional quantities of texts for students to read, beyond the supplies that are already available in schools and classrooms.

- **Non-textbook reading.** Several sources emphasize the importance of providing texts outside of, and in addition to, “appropriate grade-level textbooks that may already be available in the classroom” (*Reading Next*, Biancarosa & Snow, 2006, p. 18), including authentic texts. For example:
 - *Peterson et al. (2000) stated, “Authentic texts (such as newspapers and trade books) and choice in selecting reading materials are especially important for fostering reading persistence in struggling secondary readers” (p. 11, citing Cope, 1993; Worthy, 1996).*

³ Use of abundant texts and resources was defined by the researchers as follows, based on survey results from a questionnaire on school reading instruction: “The teacher emphasizes literature-based units that employ trade books and literature. Multiple sources, including classroom books, library and media center, and community organizations, are used for instruction. A range of professional colleagues participates in thematic units. Examples are: ‘Our media specialist collaborates with us in the development of literature-based units’ and ‘We visit community resources that will enrich our understanding of what we are studying.’ The scale had five items with a Cronbach alpha reliability of .40” (p. 216).

- A report to the National Association of State Boards of Education endorsed “supplementing textbooks with trade books, multimedia, technology, literacy, journals, Internet, and hands-on experiences” (NASBE, 2006, p. 26, citing Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000).
- Describing the needs of adolescent English language learners, Short and Fitzsimmons (2007) stated, “Appropriate grade-level textbooks are important tools, but are more difficult for ELLs to read . . . so they must be supplemented by a selection of more accessible texts to reach multiple proficiency levels and connect to students’ background experiences” (p. 38, citing Hornberger, 2003).
- More specifically, Allington (2006) cited research and expert opinion favoring having children read magazines (Foertsch, 1992) (pp. 77–78).
- **Reading level.** Critical concerns expressed in the research literature include the importance of offering texts at a variety of difficulty levels to ensure that texts are available at each student’s reading level and matching students with texts at their specific level.
 - According to Reading Next, “Too often students become frustrated because they are forced to read books that are simply too difficult for them to decode and comprehend simultaneously. Learning cannot occur under these conditions” (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006, p. 18).
 - Allington (2006) summarized a variety of research results related to the importance of students’ reading texts at their appropriate difficulty level.⁴ For example, in a study of fourth-grade students, Gambrell, Wilson, and Gantt (1981) found that “oral reading error rates of 5 percent or greater were linked to significant increases in off-task behavior” (Allington, 2006, p. 58). More broadly, a meta-analysis of 180 intervention studies with learning disabled students by Swanson and Hoskyn (1998) identified “[c]ontrol of task difficulty” as one of only “three factors that contributed unique variance to achievement. . . . When students were given tasks that were difficult, achievement gains were hard to come by” (Allington, 2006, pp. 58, 60). Research by O’Connor and colleagues (2002) found that among struggling readers in grades 3–5, the poorest-achieving readers in the group that received tutoring and also read texts that were matched to their reading level performed better than the poorest-achieving readers who received tutoring but were using texts from the regular education classroom (Allington, 2006, pp. 60–61).
- **Interesting topics for adolescent readers.** Reading Next noted the importance of providing texts that, while easy enough for struggling students to read, are also interesting to students. In this connection, the report also called for texts that “represent a wide range of topics,” offering “more choices for [students’] self-selected reading and research projects” (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006, p. 18).
 - Along similar lines, the NASBE (2006) report on adolescent literacy identified “[p]roviding interesting texts that are familiar, vivid, important, and relevant” as a research-based instructional practice that promotes student engagement (p. 26, citing Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000).
 - Allington (2006) cited a meta-analysis of 22 experimental or quasi-experimental studies of reading motivation and achievement by Guthrie and Humenick (2004) that found that “[e]nsuring students had easy access to interesting texts” was “the most influential [classroom] factor” related to student success (pp. 61–62).
- **Student choice of texts.** An important goal in making varied texts available to students is to facilitate student choice.
 - In its description of research-based instructional practice that promotes student engagement, the NASBE (2006) report endorsed “allowing students to have meaningful choices in what, when, and how to read” (p. 26, citing Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000).
 - Allington (2006) argued, “Choice is important because it seems largely related to interest and to control” (p. 62). He cited results from Guthrie and Humenick’s (2004) meta-analysis, which found that “providing choices for students over what to read, who to read with, and where to read produced an effect size nearly as large as access to interesting texts” (p. 62), and from Hidi and Harackiewicz (2000), who “found that giving students choices, ‘even when seemingly trivial and instructionally irrelevant, seems to enhance interest’ ”(Allington, 2006, pp. 62–63, quoting Hidi & Harackiewicz, 2000, p. 154).

4 Much of the research cited by Allington (2006) was focused on elementary students.

- **Connection to student experience.** According to *Reading Next*, “[I]t is crucial to have a range of texts in the classroom that . . . connect to students’ background experiences” (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006, p. 18). Similarly, Peterson et al. (2000) stated, “Reading success may not be enough to build self-efficacy, but it can be helped by . . . allowing a choice of tasks and materials that are personally meaningful” (p. 19, citing Alexander, 1997; Cope, 1993; Taylor & Adelman, 1999; Worthy, 1996).
- **Diverse populations represented.** In a similar vein, *Reading Next* mandated, “The range of topics [in diverse texts] should include a wide variety of cultural, linguistic, and demographic groups. Students should be able to find representatives of themselves in the available books, but they should also be able to find representatives of others about whom they wish to learn” (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006, p. 18).

How Jamestown Reading Navigator Aligns with Recommendations Related to Diverse Texts

The following table describes how *Jamestown Reading Navigator* supports use of diverse texts with students, following the instructional recommendations described above.

Summary of Diverse Texts Recommendations	Application Through <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i>
<p>Literacy programs should provide substantial quantities of texts for students to read.</p>	<p><i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> provides a substantial offering of texts for students to read. These include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poems and selections from a variety of genres (e.g., short stories, essays, plays, biographies, poetry, journals, speeches) that students read online, adding up to more than 146 unique texts • The print-based <i>inClass Reader</i> anthologies, one per trek (level), providing 92 separate selections • <i>InTIME Magazine</i> issues, also print based, two per trek in Treks 2–4, providing approximately 100 articles total <p>The program also provides a list of suggested additional readings for each quest (unit) in Treks 2–4 in the Resources section of the <i>Teacher Resource Guide</i>. These represent additional book-length texts that teachers could make available to their students.</p>
<p>Texts for student reading should extend beyond regular textbooks to include other kinds of texts, including authentic texts.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Online text selections in <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> include authentic literature and content-area nonfiction. • Most of the <i>inClass Reader</i> anthology selections are authentic texts or are derived from authentic texts. • The <i>inTIME Magazine</i> articles are adaptations of authentic texts, revised to meet the readability levels of students using <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i>. • Suggested additional book-length texts are all authentic fiction or nonfiction texts. • An optional on-site professional development session on Shared and Independent Reading provides teachers with strategies for implementing classroom activities centered on authentic texts.

Continued ➔

Summary of Diverse Texts Recommendations	Application Through <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i>
<p>Literacy programs should feature texts across a broad range of reading/difficulty levels.</p>	<p><i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> provides texts at readability grade levels 1–9, differentiated by trek:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trek 1: grade levels 1–2.9 • Trek 2: grade levels 3–4.9 • Trek 3: grade levels 5–6.9 • Trek 4: grade levels 7–9.9 <p>Readability levels were calculated using the Dale-Chall Readability formula (Chall & Dale, 1995).</p> <p>All the texts that are associated with each <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> trek fall within the levels listed above. Within each trek, both the online selections and the <i>inClass Reader</i> selections gradually increase in reading level over the course of the trek.</p>
<p>Students should be matched with texts that are at their level.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An initial placement test consisting of text passages followed by reading skill and vocabulary comprehension questions is used to assign students to their appropriate trek in <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i>. The teacher is also encouraged to consider other factors such as standardized tests, previous student work, and teacher observation in making placement decisions. • Once the initial placement has been made, students are assigned to read online texts, <i>inClass Reader</i> anthology selections, and <i>inTIME Magazine</i> articles that are at the appropriate level for them. • Suggested additional readings for Treks 2–4 are linked to specific treks and quests, providing guidance to teachers in matching them to students’ appropriate reading levels. Additionally, Lexile scores are provided for the suggested readings. • The teacher is encouraged to monitor students’ work and change their placement in the program if they are working at a level that is too easy or too difficult for them.
<p>Level-appropriate texts should be made available on a wide range of topics that are likely to be interesting to adolescents.</p>	<p><i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> has employed a variety of strategies to ensure that both online and print reading selections focus on a broad range of topics that are likely to be interesting to students, as well as appropriate for their reading level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adolescent literature journals were surveyed to identify potentially interesting authentic literature selections. • Teachers who had experience with the age group served by <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> advised the development team on topics that would be most interesting to students. Examples of topics and themes that were included are cars, cell phones, friendships, personal health, sports, the environment, and becoming independent. • Many of the selections are written about adolescents or written from an adolescent’s perspective. Some selections were written by adolescents. • Photographs and images enhance the content. Accompanying audio also can help make the text of online selections more interesting to students. • Results from field testing and from a student advisory group included positive feedback that the text selections in <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> are high interest and engaging.

Continued ➔

Summary of Diverse Texts Recommendations	Application Through <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i>
Students should be able to make meaningful choices about texts they read.	<p><i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> incorporates student choice at several points in the text selection process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students in Treks (levels) 2–4 choose which of two selections they want to read in even-numbered journeys (lessons) in the online program. • From four selections in each <i>inClass Reader</i> unit, students choose two or more to read. • For independent reading, students can choose to read from the <i>inTIME</i> Magazines. • Recommendations for additional book-length texts provided in the Resources section of the <i>Teacher Resource Guide</i> can broaden the pool of appropriate-level texts among which students can choose.
Texts should connect to students' own background experiences.	Text selections in <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> represent a range of different lifestyles, including diverse cultures, socioeconomic levels, social groups, and geographic locations, including urban and rural experiences.
Texts should represent a wide variety of different groups (cultural, linguistic, etc.).	<p><i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> represents the cultural and demographic diversity of the United States and of the world as a whole through selection topics and visual images.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Text selections include African American, Asian American, Hispanic American, and Native American perspectives. • Selections discuss music styles, dances, cuisines, and historical events associated with a variety of cultural backgrounds. • Visual images have been carefully selected to represent minorities, genders, ages, and people from all walks of life. • Suggested additional readings for each quest in Treks 2–4 represent a diverse range of cultural influences. • The <i>Reteaching Skills Support</i> materials for Literary Devices: Style, Mood, and Tone include a list of poets from different time periods and ethnic backgrounds that students might enjoy.

INTRODUCTION References

Biancarosa, C., & Snow, C. E. (2006). *Reading next: A vision for action and research in middle and high school literacy: A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York* (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education. Retrieved January 8, 2007, from <http://www.all4ed.org/publications/ReadingNext/ReadingNext.pdf>.

Jetton, T. L., & Dole, J. A. (2004). Introduction. In T. L. Jetton & J. A. Dole (Eds.), *Adolescent literacy research and practice* (pp. 1–11). New York: The Guilford Press.

Loomis, S. C., & Bourque, M. L. (Eds.). (2001). *National assessment of educational progress achievement levels 1992–1998 for reading*. Washington, DC: National Assessment Governing Board. Retrieved from <http://www.nagb.org/pubs/readingbook.pdf>.

National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). (1999). *Nation's report card: Reading 1998*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=1999500>.

National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). (2006). *Nation's report card: Reading 2005*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2006451>.

Olson, L. (2006). A decade of effort. *Quality Counts*, 25, 8–10, 12, 14, 16, 18–21.

Peterson, C. L., Caverly, D. C., Nicholson, S. A., O'Neal, S., & Cusenbary, S. (2000). *Building reading proficiency at the secondary level: A guide to resources*. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. Retrieved April 3, 2007, from <http://www.sedl.org/pubs/reading16/buildingreading.pdf>.

Stanovich, K. E. (1986). Matthew effects in reading: Some consequences of individual differences in the acquisition of literacy. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 21, 360–407.

Whitehurst, G. J. (2002, October). *Evidence-based education (EBE)* [electronic presentation]. Retrieved May 31, 2007, from <http://www.ed.gov/nclb/methods/whatworks/eb/edlite-slide001.html>.

DIVERSE TEXTS References

- Alexander, P. A. (1997). Knowledge-seeking and self-schema: A case for the motivational dimensions of exposition. *Educational Psychologist*, 32(2), 83–94.
- Allington, R. L. (2006). *What really matters for struggling readers: Designing research-based programs* (2nd ed.). New York: Pearson Education.
- Allington, R. L., Guice, S., Michaelson, N., Baker, K., & Li, S. (1996). Literature-based curriculum in high poverty schools. In M. Graves, P. van den Broek, & B. Taylor (Eds.), *The first R: Every child's right to read* (pp. 73–96). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Allington, R. L., & Johnston, P. H. (Eds.). (2002). *Reading to learn: Lessons from exemplary 4th grade classrooms*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Biancarosa, C., & Snow, C. E. (2006). *Reading next: A vision for action and research in middle and high school literacy: A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York* (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education. Retrieved January 8, 2007, from <http://www.all4ed.org/publications/ReadingNext/ReadingNext.pdf>.
- Chall, J. S., & Dale, E. (1995). *Readability revisited: The new Dale-Chall readability formula*. Cambridge, MA: Brookline Books.
- Cope, J. (1993). *Exploring the reading development of 12th-grade Georgia high school students through reader autobiographies*. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 354 506)
- Foertsch, M. A. (1992). *Reading in and out of school: Achievement of American students in grades 4, 8, and 12 in 1989–90*. Washington, DC: National Center for Educational Statistics: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Gambrell, L. B., Wilson, R. M., & Gantt, W. N. (1981). Classroom observations of task-attending behaviors of good and poor readers. *Journal of Educational Research*, 74(6), 400–404.
- Guice, S., Allington, R. L., Johnston, P., Baker, K., & Michelson, N. (1996). Access?: Books, children, and literature-based curriculum in schools. *The New Advocate*, 9(3), 197–207.
- Guthrie, J. T., & Humenick, N. M. (2004). Motivating students to read: Evidence for classroom practices that increase motivation and achievement. In P. McCardle and V. Chhabra (Eds.), *The voice of evidence in reading research* (pp. 329–354). Baltimore: Paul Brookes.
- Guthrie, J. T., Schafer, W. D., Von Secker, C., & Alban, T. (2000). Contributions of instructional practices to reading achievement in a statewide improvement program. *Journal of Educational Research*, 93, 211–225.
- Guthrie, J. T., & Wigfield, A. (2000). Engagement and motivation in reading. In M. Kamil, R. Barr, P. Mosenthal, & P. D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 3, pp. 403–422). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Hidi, S., & Harackiewicz, J. M. (2000). Motivating the academically unmotivated: A critical issue for the 21st century. *Review of Educational Research*, 70(2), 151–179.
- Hornberger, N. (Ed.). (2003). *Continua of biliteracy: An ecological framework for educational policy, research, and practice in multilingual settings*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Johnston, P., Allington R. L., Guice, S., & Brooks, G. W. (1998). Small change: A multi-level study of the implementation of literature-based instruction. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 73(3), 81–103.
- Krashen, S. (1993). *The power of reading: Insights from the research*. Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited.
- McQuillan J. (1998). *The literacy crisis: False claims, real solutions*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Moore, D. W., Bean, T. W., Birdyshaw, D., and Rycik, J. A. (1999). *Adolescent literacy: A position statement*. Retrieved January 29, 2007, from http://www.reading.org/downloads/positions/ps1036_adolescent.pdf. Also published in the *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 43, 97–112.
- NASBE Study Group on Middle and High School Literacy. (2006). *Reading at risk: The state response to the crisis in adolescent literacy* (Rev. ed.). Alexandria, VA: National Association of State Boards of Education. Retrieved February 17, 2007, from http://www.carnegie.org/literacy/pdf/Reading_at_Risk_report.pdf.
- Neuman, S., & Celano, D. (2001). Access to print in low-income and middle-income communities. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 36, 8–26.
- O'Connor, R. E., Bell, K. M., Harty, K. R., Larkin, L. K., Sackor, S. M., & Zigmund, N. (2002). Teaching reading to poor readers in the intermediate grades: A comparison of text difficulty. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 94, 474–485.
- Peterson, C. L., Caverly, D. C., Nicholson, S. A., O'Neal, S., & Cusenbary, S. (2000). *Building reading proficiency at the secondary level: A guide to resources*. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. Retrieved April 3, 2007, from <http://www.sedl.org/pubs/reading16/buildingreading.pdf>.
- Pressley, M., Wharton-McDonald, R., Allington, R. L., Block, C. C., Morrow, L., Tracey, D., Baker, K., Brooks, G., Cronin, J., Nelson, E., & Woo, D. (2000). A study of effective first-grade reading instruction. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 5, 35–38.
- Short, D., & Fitzsimmons, S. (2007). *Double the work: Challenges and solutions to acquiring language and academic literacy for adolescent English language learners: A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education. Retrieved February 27, 2007, from <http://www.carnegie.org/literacy/pdf/DoubletheWork.pdf>.
- Strickland, D. S., & Walmsley, S. A. (1993). *School book clubs and literacy development: A descriptive study*. M. R. Robinson Foundation.
- Swanson, H. L., & Hoskyn, M. (1998). Experimental intervention research on students with learning disabilities: A meta-analysis of treatment outcomes. *Review of Educational Research*, 68(3), 277–321.
- Taylor, L., & Adelman, H. S. (1999). Personalizing classroom instruction to account for motivational and developmental differences. *Reading and Writing Quarterly*, 15(4), 255–276.
- Worthy, J. (1996). A matter of interest: Literature that hooks reluctant readers and keeps them reading. *The Reading Teacher*, 50(2), 2–10.

REFERENCES



The McGraw-Hill Companies

ONE PRUDENTIAL PLAZA
130 E. RANDOLPH STREET, #900
CHICAGO, IL 60601

1-800-334-7344
glencoe.com
glencoe.com/catalog