

George Mason University  
College of Education and Human Development

---

EDRD 829.001 Advanced Foundations of Literacy Education

---

Graduate School of Education  
Literacy Program Area  
Spring 2013

INSTRUCTOR            Dr. Betty Sturtevant                            [esturtev@gmu.edu](mailto:esturtev@gmu.edu) (preferred)  
703-993-2052 office (leave message)  
Office: Thompson 1602

OFFICE HOURS        by appointment

Location:    Nguyen Engineering Building 1107; Thursdays, 4:30.

COURSE DESCRIPTION

Examines foundational theory, research, and methodology related to literacy. Includes historical and theoretical foundations; research methodologies; and issues such as literacy acquisition, beginning reading, comprehension, struggling readers, and language diversity.

**Prerequisite(s):** EDUC 800, EDRS 810, or permission of instructor.

REQUIRED TEXTS

Robinson, R. D. (2005). *Readings in reading instruction: Its history, theory, and discussion*. Boston: Pearson Allyn and Bacon. ISBN 0-205-41058-8

Kamil, M., L., Pearson, P. D., Moje, E. B. & Afflerbach, P. P. (Eds.). (2011). *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 4). New York: Routledge. ISBN-10: 9780805853438. (Available as an E- book in the library). Selected chapters.

Ruddell, R. B., & Unrau, N. (Eds.). (2004). *Theoretical models and processes of reading*, fifth edition. Newark, DE: International Reading Association. (Available on library 2-hr. reserve). Selected chapters.

Additional articles selected by students and instructor.

RECOMMENDED TEXT

*Publication manual of the American Psychological Association, 6<sup>th</sup> Edition*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Information on APA, 6<sup>th</sup> Edition, is also available at the Purdue writing center website:

<http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/560/01/>

#### ADDITIONAL RESOURCES:

The following are links to the **Handbooks of Reading Research, Volumes I, II, and III** (also in the library on reserve – paper copy)

Vol. 3 (2000)

<http://www.routledge.com/books/details/9780805823998/>

(Also, IRA provides shortened versions of some chapters of Vol. 3:

<http://globalconversationsinliteracy.wordpress.com/>

<http://www.readingonline.org/articles/handbook/index.html>)

Vol. 2 (1991)

<http://www.routledge.com/books/details/9780805824162/>

Vol. 1 (1984)

<http://www.routledge.com/books/details/9780805824162/>

#### STUDENT OUTCOMES

- A. Students will gain an historical perspective on literacy research and practice both nationally and internationally.
- B. Students will develop an understanding of the breadth of the field, trends over time, and policy related to literacy.
- C. Students will gain increased awareness of literacy leaders, past and present, and the major professional organizations that have influenced the field both nationally and internationally.
- D. Students will increase their ability to analyze, summarize, and compare published research and research syntheses related to literacy.
- E. Students will study and analyze one literacy issue (of their choosing) in depth, and will write a paper giving an historical perspective on this issue.
- F. Students will write and submit a proposal to an academic conference, following all required procedures.

#### RELATIONSHIP TO PROGRAM GOALS

EDRD 829 is designed to enable doctoral students to understand the historical, theoretical and research foundations of the field. This foundational knowledge supports learning in other doctoral courses and helps to build the basis for independent and collaborative scholarship. Scholarly skills embedded in this course include critiquing of published research, writing a scholarly paper giving an historical analysis of an important issue, and writing a scholarly conference proposal.

REQUIREMENTS – Due dates are on schedule. Percentages reflect percentage of total grade.

- A. Reading/discussion/class attendance: Attendance and participation in all class discussions is essential to the success of the class. Reading of all assignments prior to the discussion is expected. Please make notes or mark pages related to issues you wish to discuss. If you must be late or absent for an unavoidable reason, please speak to the instructor in advance. Unexcused absences and late work may result in a lowered grade. (10%)
  
- B. Goal setting reflection (5%): Write a 3-4 page (double-spaced) reflection related to your own literacy background and knowledge of literacy research. In this essay, describe some of A) your past experiences as a literacy learner and teacher, B) your current beliefs/knowledge about literacy learning and teaching, and C) specific areas in which you hope to learn more. This will be in first person. References are not required, but use APA if you have them. No cover sheet or running heads.
  
- C. Write two critiques of research studies. The first (5%) will be done on an assigned reading, and will only be graded for completion (as a practice critique). The second (10%) should analyze a quantitative or qualitative study on the topic of your paper. (Format – see later in this syllabus). The critique will be in third person, and does *not* strictly follow APA. Bring copies for the whole class. You will be asked to orally share your article and critique with the class.
  
- D. Historical paper. Approximately 10 pages, not including references (follow APA in all aspects of the paper) (40%). Select an issue related to literacy and pose it as a question. (We will brainstorm in class). Your paper will provide a historical perspective on this question. More details to follow. You may use a topic you have written about in another course, as long as 90% of your sources are new to you.
  
- E. Conference proposal. You will write and submit a proposal for [a ‘paper’ or a ‘roundtable’] at the Literacy Research Association Conference, which will be held in Dallas in early December, 2013. You can have multiple authors, but you must be first author of this proposal and must write the proposal (though you can get ideas and feedback from your co-authors). There is a proposal format that must be followed, which we will discuss in class. If you are accepted, you are not obligated to attend, although it is strongly encouraged. (30%) Proposal information:  
[HTTP://WWW.LITERACYRESEARCHASSOCIATION.ORG/IMAGES/CONFERENCE/2013CALLFINAL.PDF](http://www.literacyresearchassociation.org/images/conference/2013callfinal.pdf)

## F. GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR WRITTEN ASSIGNMENTS

All written assignments prepared outside of class will be evaluated for content and presentation as graduate-level writing. The American Psychological Association (APA) style, 6<sup>th</sup> edition, will be followed for all written work, **unless otherwise specified**.

### Expectations for Writing

- Present ideas in a clear, concise, and organized manner. (Avoid wordiness and redundancy.)
- Develop points coherently and thoroughly.
- Refer to appropriate authorities, studies, and examples to document where appropriate. (Avoid meaningless generalizations, unwarranted assumptions, and unsupported opinions.)
- Use correct capitalization, punctuation, spelling, and grammar.

### **Some of the prominent academic journals in field:**

*Reading Research Quarterly*

*Journal of Literacy Research (formerly Journal of Reading Behavior)*

*Literacy Research and Instruction (formerly Reading Research and Instruction)*

*Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy (formerly Journal of Reading)*

*The Reading Teacher*

*Reading and Writing Quarterly*

Yearbook of the Literacy Research Association (formerly NRC)

Yearbook of the Association of Literacy Educators and Researchers (formerly CRA).

### **Literacy Organizations (you are strongly encouraged to join at least one – use student rates):**

Literacy Research Association \*LRA - (most prominent literacy research association)

Association of Literacy Educators and Researchers - ALER

International Reading Association - IRA -- (also has state affiliate – VSRA; local affiliate – GWRC)

American Educational Research Association (AERA) – has literacy-related Special Interest groups (SIG)

## Schedule

(Subject to modification when necessary; any changes will be provided in writing)

	Date	Class Topics	Reading due	Written work due
1	Jan 24	Literacy – what is it?  The importance of an historical perspective; Associations as an important influence on the field	N/A	
2	Jan 31	The past 50 years of reading/literacy research  Reading research that has made a difference  Writing your proposal	Alexander & Fox, TMPR, chapter 2 (on Blackboard)  Richardson, Chap 1 (all selections)	Reflection on Goals due (B on assignment page).  All classes: Make notes on readings <i>for your own use</i> during discussion – key terms, questions you have, surprises, etc. (not to turn in)
3	Feb 7	Comprehension  Library Orientation	Robinson, 4  HRR, IV: Chp 10, Duke & Carlisle  R. Anderson, TMPR: Ch 20, p. 594	Proposal – title and outline
4	Feb 14	Spelling, Vocabulary, & Fluency  How to write your critique	Robinson 5 & 7;  HRR IV: Rasinski et al.	Proposal draft in full
5	Feb 21	Cultural Perspectives	Rueda, ch 5, p. 84 HRR IV.  Brice Heath, TMPR ch 8, p. 187.  **Jimenez, TMPR, ch 9, p. 210 (reprint from	(you will receive proposal draft with comments)

			AERJ, Vol 37(4), 2000.	
6	Feb 28	Content Literacy/Disciplinary Literacy	Robinson, 6. O'Brien, Stewart, Moje, 1995 (BB). Bean, T. HRR Vol III ch 34, p. 649. Shanahan & Shanahan (BB).	Submit your proposal to website. Final deadline March 1.
7	March 7	Technology in Literacy Learning & Assessment	Robinson, 9; Leu et al. (TMPR, Ch. 54, p. 1570)	
8	March 21 (March 14 is spring break)	International perspectives on literacy research	HRR, Vol III, sign up to read one of the following: Ch 1-5.	**First critique due – use Jimenez article, from week 5.
9	March 28	Affective dimensions of literacy	Robinson, ch. 10 Rodriguez-Brown, HRR Vol IV, ch 30, 726. Alvermann, HRR IV, ch 23, p. 561	
10	April 4	English Learners in U.S. Schools	HRR, Vol 4, chp30 (Li) HRR, Vol 4; Ch22 (Goldenburg)	.
11	April 11- no full class meeting – appointments will be in Thompson 1602	Individual meetings related to papers (individual apt.)	Reading for your paper	Turn in paper outline when we meet.
12	April 18	“Struggling” readers	Robinson, Ch. 8 Kucan & Palincsar, HRR IV, Ch. 15, 341	Second critique due (study of your choice)
13	April 25 Online class	Literacy and Policy Online class this week – instructions to follow.	Pearson: Reading Wars (on BB). Valencia & Wixson, TMPR – ch 69)	Look for policy initiatives on websites of: IRA www.reading.org; and Alliance

				for Excellent Education <a href="http://www.all4ed">www.all4ed</a>
14	May 2 Bring snacks to share (optional)		Sharing of papers- <i>prepare one visual illustrating 3-4 key findings in your paper- you will show it via the computer in the classroom.</i> Half of class.	Paper due- final copy to BB before class.
Exam week	May 9 Bring \$3 if you would like to share pizza. Celebrate end of term!		Same as week 14.	

Literacy Program Area (Doctoral)  
Critique of a Research Study

A critique consists of a description of a research study and its results followed by your comments/analysis (called “critical comments”) about the strengths and weaknesses of the study.

A critique should include the following sections:

- Reference
- Purpose
- Method
- Results
- Conclusions
- Critical comments

A critique should be brief (2 typed pages ONLY, single spaced with spaces between paragraph)

The *reference* for the article being critiqued should be in APA style (6<sup>th</sup> edition). It should appear at the top of page 1. (You do not need a cover page).

The *Purpose* can be quoted directly in the author’s words. If you summarize, be very cautious about representing the author’s meaning

*Method* refers to how the study was conducted. In this section you should briefly describe what was done in the study. The following questions cover some of the information that is important.

- (For quantitative studies) What variables were studied? How was each variable measured?
- (For qualitative studies) What questions were studied? What methods of data collection were used?)
- Mixed design would include both of the above.
- What was the size of the sample or who were the participants? How were the participants or sample selected? What are the demographics/characteristics of the sample/participants?
- How long did the investigation last?
- How were the data analyzed?

In the *Results* section, briefly describe what was found in the study and the conclusions the investigator drew from the findings.

The last section, *critical comments*, is very important. For the *critical comments* section, think about the following issues: 1) new conceptual contributions of the study; 2) new methodological contributions of the study; 3) validity of the study; 4) research design, 5) the adequacy of the written report and suggestions for improvement, 6) suggestions for future research directions and effort. Think about what might have been left out of the report, and if any conclusions were over-stated (did conclusions go beyond the logical inferences that can be made from the study?). Both strengths and weaknesses are included in this section; it is not appropriate to discuss only one or the other.



**Additional Suggested Reading (some of the below are required- see schedule).**

- Alvermann, D. E. & Moore, D. W. (1991). Secondary school reading. In Barr, R., Kamil, M., Mosenthal, P., and Pearson, P. D. (Eds.), Handbook of Reading Research (Vol. II). New York: Longman.
- Alvermann, D. E., O'Brien, D. G. & Dillon, D. R. (1990). What teachers do when they say they're having discussions of content area reading assignments: A qualitative analysis. Reading Research Quarterly, 4, 296-322.
- Anderson, R. C. (1994). Role of the reader's schema in comprehension, learning, and memory. In R. B. Ruddell, M. R. Ruddell & H. Singer (Eds.). Theoretical models and processes of reading (4th edition), 469- 482. International Reading Association, Newark: DE.
- Au, K. H. (1995). Multicultural perspectives on literacy research. Journal of Reading Behavior, 27, 85-100.
- Brown, A. L. (1980). Metacognitive development and reading. In R. J. Spiro, B. Bruce, & W. Brewer (Eds.), Theoretical issues in reading comprehension. Hillsdale, NJ: Earlbaum.
- Dillon, D. R, O'Brien, D. G. Wellinski, S. A., Springs, R., & Stith, D. (1996). Engaging at risk high school students: The creation of an innovative program. In D. J. Leu, C. K. Kinzer, and K. A. Hinchman (Eds.) Literacies for the 21st century: Research and practice (45th Yearbook of the National Reading Conference), 15-46, Chicago, IL: The National Reading Conference.
- Dillon, D., O'Brien, D., Moje, E. & Stewart, R. (1994). Literacy learning in secondary school science classrooms: A cross-case analysis of three qualitative studies. Journal of research in science teaching, 31, 345-362.
- Guthrie, J. T. et al. (1996). Growth of literacy engagement: Changes in motivations and strategies during concept-oriented reading instruction. Reading Research Quarterly, 31, 306-333.
- Jimenez, R. T., Garcia, G. E., Pearson, P. D. (1996). The reading strategies of bilingual Latina/o student who are successful English readers: Opportunities and obstacles. Reading Research Quarterly, 31, 90-113.
- Moore, D. W. (1996). Contexts for literacy in secondary schools. In D. J. Leu, C. K. Kinzer, and K. A. Hinchman (Eds.) Literacies for the 21st century: Research and practice (45th Yearbook of the National Reading Conference), 15-46, Chicago, IL: The National Reading Conference.
- Moore, D. W., Readence, J. E., & Rickelman, R. J. (1983). An historical exploration of content area reading instruction. Reading Research Quarterly, 18, 419-438.
- O'Brien, D. G., Stewart, R. A., & Moje, E. B. (1995). Why content literacy is difficult to infuse into the secondary school: Complexities of curriculum, pedagogy, and school culture. Reading Research Quarterly, 30 (3), 442-463.

- Pearson, P. D. & Stephens, D. (1994). Learning about literacy: A 30-Year Journey. In R. B. Ruddell, M. R. Ruddell & H. Singer (Eds.). Theoretical models and processes of reading (4th edition), 469- 482. International Reading Association, Newark: DE.
- 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.
- Gee, J. P. (2004). Reading as situated language: A sociocultural perspective. In R. B. Ruddell & N. J. Unrau (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes in reading* (5th edition, pp. 116-132). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Greene, J. C. (2007). *Mixed methods in social inquiry*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.
- González, N., Moll, L.C., & Amanti, C. (2005). *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Guthrie, J.T. (2004). Teaching for literacy engagement. *Journal of Literacy Research* 36(1), 1-30. doi: 10.1207/s15548430jlr3601\_2
- Guthrie, J. T., & Davis, M. H. (Jan-Mar2003). Motivating struggling readers in middle school through an engagement model of classroom practice. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 19(1), 59-85. doi: 10: 1080/10573560390143030
- Gutiérrez, K. D. (Apr-Jun 2008). Developing a sociocritical literacy in the third space. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 43(2), 148-164. doi: 10.1598/RRQ.43.2.3
- Jiménez, R. T. (Winter2000). Literacy and the identity development of Latina/o students. *American Educational Research Journal*, 37(4), 971-1000. doi: 10.3102/00028312037004971
- Ivey, G., & Broaddus, K. (2001). “Just plain reading”: A survey of what makes students want to read in middle school classrooms. *Reading Research Quarterly*. 36(4), 350-377. Retrieved from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/748056>
- Ivey, G., & Broaddus, K. (2007). A formative experiment investigating literacy engagement among adolescent Latina/o students just beginning to read, write, and speak English. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 42(4), 512-545. doi:10.1598/RRQ.42.4.4

## COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

### GMU POLICIES AND RESOURCES FOR STUDENTS (modified 12/2012)

- a. Students must adhere to the guidelines of the George Mason University Honor Code [See <http://oai.gmu.edu/honorcode/>].
- b. Students must follow the university policy for Responsible Use of Computing [See <http://universitypolicy.gmu.edu/1301gen.html>].
- c. Students are responsible for the content of university communications sent to their George Mason University email account and are required to activate their account and check it regularly. All communication from the university, college, school, and program will be sent to students solely through their Mason email account.
- d. The George Mason University Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) staff consists of professional counseling and clinical psychologists, social workers, and counselors who offer a wide range of services (e.g., individual and group counseling, workshops and outreach programs) to enhance students' personal experience and academic performance [See <http://caps.gmu.edu/>].
- e. Students with disabilities who seek accommodations in a course must be registered with the George Mason University Office of Disability Services (ODS) and inform their instructor, in writing, at the beginning of the semester [See <http://ods.gmu.edu/>].
- f. Students must follow the university policy stating that all sound emitting devices shall be turned off during class unless otherwise authorized by the instructor.
- g. The George Mason University Writing Center staff provides a variety of resources and services (e.g., tutoring, workshops, writing guides, handbooks) intended to support students as they work to construct and share knowledge through writing [See <http://writingcenter.gmu.edu/>].

### CEHD TASKSTREAM Requirement **(Note: not applicable to this course).**

Every student registered for any Literacy course with a required performance-based assessment (PBA) (will be designated as such in the syllabus) is required to submit this assessment to TaskStream (regardless of whether a course is an elective, a onetime course or part of an undergraduate minor.) Evaluation of your performance-based assessment will also be provided using TaskStream. Failure to submit the assessment to TaskStream will result in a the course instructor reporting the course grade as Incomplete(IN). Unless this grade is changed upon completion of the required TaskStream submission, the IN will convert to an F nine weeks into the following semester.

## **PROFESSIONAL DISPOSITIONS**

Students are expected to exhibit professional behaviors and dispositions at all times.

## **CORE VALUES COMMITMENT**

The College of Education & Human Development is committed to collaboration, ethical leadership, innovation, research-based practice, and social justice. Students are expected to adhere to these principles. <http://cehd.gmu.edu/value>