Exploring Early Reading Instructional Strategies to Advance the Print Literacy Development of Adolescent SLIFE
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Guided reading can help adolescent refugee students with limited or interrupted formal schooling learn how to read. With developmentally appropriate instruction they can experience academic success in their resettlement countries.

Children and youth who have been forced into exile by armed conflict, communal violence (e.g., war, genocide), large-scale natural disasters, persecution (e.g., political, religious, ethnic), and social unrest in their homelands often face many years of displacement without access to the foundations of formal education—literacy and numeracy. Their academic success in resettlement countries is impaired because of gaps in formal schooling, poor quality education (e.g., in refugee camps), or no schooling at all. Consequently, they have not developed age-appropriate print literacy skills in their dominant language. In fact, many refugee children and youth do not have any print literacy skills (Matthews, 2008; Woods, 2009). Take, for example, Jaabriil (pseudonym), a student we met through our study. He was born in a refugee camp in Yemen, yet he identifies with the language, culture, and ethnicity of his family’s Somali roots. Jaabriil came to Canada when he was 12 years old. Although he spent two years in elementary school—grades 7 and 8—when we met him in the English literacy development (ELD) program in his first year of high school he had limited knowledge of Roman alphabet letter names or sounds, and his oral language skills in English were underdeveloped. Despite his many rich life skills and experiences, without knowing how to read and write in English, Jaabriil and other students...
like him will experience significant challenges navigating the sociocultural and socioeconomic landscape of their English-dominant host country, including access to high levels of education and integration into the labor market.

When refugees cannot be resettled back to their home countries they become candidates for permanent resettlement to another country through the United Nations (UN) resettlement program. Combined, Canada and the U.S. are the top receiving UN sponsored resettlement countries. In 2012 nearly nine out of 10 refugees resettled in Canada (9,600) or the United States (66,300) (UNHCR, 2012). Upon resettlement, refugees are quickly introduced into public school systems where educators have the greatest potential to lead refugee students toward social and academic success (Fazel, Doll, & Stein, 2009), to stabilize their lives, provide them with safe spaces, offer them rich learning opportunities, and teach literacy, which are all fundamental to issues of resettlement (Matthews, 2008; Naidoo, 2010; Woods, 2009). Adolescent refugee students are particularly vulnerable to experiencing poor academic achievement and school attrition (Freeman & Freeman, 2002; Gunderson, 2007). Gunderson (2007), for example, reported the disappearance rate of refugee students at the secondary level to be 75 percent or higher. School personnel and programs must provide meaningful opportunities for these vulnerable students to succeed not only in school, but also in life. Intensive supports are necessary to minimize the huge gaps in formal learning and address the psychosocial needs associated with flight and trauma common to refugees (Bigelow, 2010; Gunderson, 2009; Stewart, 2010).

The recent increase of literature on the post-resettlement educational needs of refugee students highlights that secondary school teachers have difficulty meeting refugee students’ academic and psychosocial needs (Dooley, 2009; Freeman & Freeman, 2002; MacNevin, 2012; Miller, Mitchell, & Brown, 2005; Woods, 2009). Teachers report (a) they have received little to no professional development on how to prepare such a vulnerable group of students for the academic rigors of secondary school; (b) a serious lack of age-appropriate and culturally responsive texts suitable for their students; and (c) they have significant professional knowledge gaps in the areas of early literacy development and trauma recovery, the latter of which would better prepare them to work with students who exhibit symptoms of post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) in the classroom.

Most secondary teachers are unprepared for the foundational print literacy needs of many adolescent refugees. Secondary ESL teachers have generally been trained in traditional ESL pedagogical practices, which largely assume dominant language literacy abilities. ESL pedagogies that focus on content area and/or general language development are not meeting the academic needs of adolescent refugees with limited print literacy abilities. As emphatically noted by Gunderson (2009),

Students of lower English ability and with less L1 [first language] background are not ready to learn [content] from text. No amount of help from the teacher will make these students successful content comprehenders. They must be immersed in a reading program. (p. 49)

Woods (2009) went on to say that “more ESL training and support will not be enough because these students need literacy programs, not just language programs” (p. 93). Secondary school teachers who work with refugee youth must transform and extend their pedagogic repertoires to include a greater emphasis on literacy development, including foundational literacy skills (Dooley, 2009; Woods, 2009). However, focusing on early reading needs is insufficient because these students’ needs run deeper and teachers’ responsibilities wider. Woods (2009) noted that the role of education for these students is threefold: (a) to provide access to quality teachers and learning; (b) to develop citizenship; and (c) to address mental health needs. This study did not ignore the sociocultural and psychosocial needs of the students; however, the purpose of this article was to acknowledge and respond to the dearth of evidence-based research that explicitly addresses refugee students’ print literacy needs and ESL/ELD teachers’ professional development needs.

Early Reading Instruction for Nonliterate and Semiliterate Adolescent SLIFE

To better understand the various print literacy needs of adult ELLs who have six or fewer years of
education in their countries of origin and/or exile, Florez and Terrill (2003) created a six-level taxonomy of print-based literacies: preliterate, nonliterate, semiliterate, nonalphabet literate, non-Roman alphabet literate, and Roman-alphabet literate. According to their taxonomy, the students in our study fall under the nonliterate and semiliterate categories: nonliterate SLIFE are those whose dominant language has a written form, but the learner does not have any print literacy skills; and semiliterate SLIFE are those who have minimal print literacy skills in their dominant language. We refer to the students as nonliterate or semiliterate SLIFE not to contribute to a deficit literacy perspective, but to emphasize the critical need to teach these students print literacy skills that are necessary for success in a society that privileges print literacy.

While it is generally thought that primary-aged SLIFE should initially acquire functional oral language abilities before beginning formal print literacy instruction, Gunderson (2009) emphasized that nonliterate and semiliterate adolescent SLIFE should be introduced to print literacy instruction immediately. However, little empirical research supports recommended early reading strategies such as language experience approach, guided reading, directed reading-thinking activities, word banks, and read alouds for older ELLs, let alone for those with limited dominant language print literacy skills. Francis and Vaughn (2009) insisted that “[d]espite the extraordinary need for high-quality research on teaching English language learners effectively, there is an inadequate research base for older English language learners” (p. 290).

Instructional practices that are often recommended for SLIFE are those that weave together literacy and content via theme-based, content-focused methods (Freeman & Freeman, 2002; Spaulding, Carolina, & Amen, 2004). Popular evidence-based instructional approaches that focus on academic literacy for ELLs are the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) (Echevarría, Vogt, & Short, 2000); the Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA) (Chamot & O’Malley, 1994); and, more recently, the Mutually Adaptive Learning Paradigm (MALP) (DeCapua & Marshall, 2010), which frames an intervention focused on students’ past learning experiences, academic knowledge, content area literacy, and vocabulary acquisition. While these instructional practices are valuable and serve many students, we have found that they do not adequately serve the needs of nonliterate and semiliterate adolescent SLIFE.

This study examined the use of guided reading and running records as a foundational pedagogical framework to increase adolescent refugee students’ access to English language print literacy. Understanding the sociocultural complexities of literacy development, we focused on one of the principles of guided reading: “teach the reader, not the text” (Fountas & Pinnell, 2012, p. 280). We carefully considered a balanced reading approach that reflected multiple dimensions of literacy instruction along both context and content continua (Pearson, Raphael, Benson, & Madda, 2007). While the focus of the article is on English print literacy development it is critical to highlight that reducing literacy needs to a basic skills or mechanics approach would do a disservice to SLIFE. A skills-based approach might serve to promote dominant-culture literacy skills and values and, while well-intentioned, might devalue students’ multiple ways of reading the world, which could further alienate them from classroom-based learning.

Taking a balanced literacy stance was challenging for many of the secondary ESL/ELD teachers who participated in the early reading professional development sessions we organized. They had to readjust their pedagogy from one focused on literature study to one focused on literacy study. To make literacy development the central focus, we aimed to help teachers shift their practice away from traditional ESL methods designed for those who have dominant language literacy skills toward a method that responds to both the foundational literacy needs of adolescent SLIFE while at the same time considering the larger philosophical and practical goals of a balanced and multicultural literacy approach. We found that using the principles of guided reading and running records shows promise to accelerate adolescent refugee students’ literacy skills and transform their teachers’ pedagogy to a more student-centered and balanced approach.

Guided Reading
Guided reading is an important contemporary reading instructional practice (Iaquinta, 2006). It is a socially supported practice that can provide useful information about how to support all students as they process texts. Guided reading allows the teacher to, first, model strategic and fluent reading to students; then, observe students as they process new texts; and, finally, provide supportive opportunities to help
students develop the skills and strategies they require to become independent readers of increasingly challenging texts over time (Fountas & Pinnell, 1996, 2012). Through daily practice, guided reading increases students’ confidence as consumers of text by providing them with enjoyable, successful experiences in reading for meaning and helping them to establish good reading strategies and habits (Fountas & Pinnell, 1996). Furthermore, guided reading creates opportunities to learn to read and read to learn. It also provides opportunities to take advantage of the more advanced cognitive skills (e.g., memory and analytic reasoning) of older learners (Harper & de Jong, 2004), as well as take advantage of their life experiences.

Guided reading must be part of a balanced literacy program that includes opportunities for a wide range of oral language, reading, and writing activities. Normally guided reading is conducted using a book at a student’s instructional reading level, meaning that the student can accurately decode 90–94% of the words with excellent or satisfactory comprehension (Fountas & Pinnell, 1996, 1999). Guided reading groups tend to be homogenous, yet are also flexible and dynamic in order to respond to the students’ evolving strengths and needs.

Students in a guided reading group read the text softly to themselves while the teacher listens and provides guidance as required; round robin reading, the “outmoded practice of calling on students to read orally one after the other” (Harris & Hodges, 1995, p. 222), must be avoided. While the teacher is working with a guided reading group, the other students should be working independently at learning centers that support literacy development (e.g., listening, word work, independent reading, and writing). For more information on the research base of guided reading and how you might implement it in your classroom, you might consult an online brief written by Pinnell and Fountas (n.d.) (Full citation can be found in the references).

Running Records
When students vocalize their reading during guided reading teachers can assess their text-processing strategies using running records. Running records are reliable, accessible, and practical tools to understand the skills and strategies (e.g., concepts of print, decoding strategies, types of miscues, self-monitoring and self-correcting abilities, phrasing, word stress, intonation) readers use when actively engaged in oral reading of instructional-leveled texts (Clay, 1998, 2005). When teachers analyze students’ reading behaviors they will gain greater insight into students’ cognitive processes (Clay, 1991) to help detect inefficient or ineffective reading patterns and to offer students corrective support (Fountas & Pinnell, 2012). The information obtained from running records can be used to determine students’ reading level range (i.e., independent, instructional, and/or frustration), track student progress, create class profiles to form flexible instructional groups, and communicate progress to students and their parents/guardians.

Running record data can help teachers select books that are appropriate for guided reading lessons and recommend books that students can experience success when reading independently. In addition, running record data shared with students can provide tangible signs of growth that contribute to feelings of success.

To take a running record of a student’s oral reading, the teacher would sit beside the student who reads a text of at least 100 words without interruption. For early readers, the text length may be shorter. As the student is reading the text aloud, using running record notations (e.g., +, SC, R, −), the teacher should record everything the student says during the reading (e.g., correct responses, attempts at decoding a word, repetitions, omissions of words, word substitutions, appeals, told words, self corrections) and any observable behaviors (e.g., length of pauses, looks at pictures, looks at punctuation marks, tracks words with finger, reads with expression, reads fluently). Miscues, or the oral utterances that a reader makes, that do not match the printed text can be analyzed in terms of the three cueing systems (i.e., visual, structural, and/or meaning). While taking a running record the teacher should not provide instruction; rather, he or she should encourage the student to figure out the text on her or his own. This information will help the teacher to understand how the student processes text—information that will inform future instruction. From the running record data, teachers can also calculate the self-correction rate and the accuracy rate. The teacher should also get a sense of the student’s comprehension of the text by asking selected comprehension questions.

Guided reading can take advantage of adolescent refugee students’ life experiences.
questions or by asking the student to engage in a retelling of the text.

Theoretical Framework
The theories undergirding this study are the interactive reading model (Rumelhart, 1994), emergent literacy (Clay, 1998), and funds of knowledge (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992). The interactive reading model assumes that the reader uses knowledge at all levels of abstraction (e.g., word level knowledge, syntactic knowledge) in order to interpret and comprehend printed text. It emphasizes both word level identification skills (e.g., decoding) and interpretation skills (e.g., prediction, inference) that are essential when transacting with printed text. An interactive reading perspective views reading as a cognitive process, understands that meaning comes from the synthesis of information from both sensory and thinking aspects of reading, and understands that reading proceeds from whole to part and from part to whole.

Emergent literacy understands that literacy development is a gradual process and that all children and youth can learn to communicate via printed text. An emergent literacy perspective specifically refers to “the reading and writing behaviors that precede and develop into conventional literacy” (Sulzby & Teale, 1996, p. 728). Emergent literacy assumes that there are developmental precursors to reading and writing, for example, phonological awareness, letter knowledge, language, and conceptual knowledge. These skills, sources of knowledge, and attitudes can be taught (National Reading Panel, 2000). While many adolescent refugee students in our study had little to no print literacy abilities and had huge gaps in their formal education they had rich oral language experiences upon which print literacy instruction can be built. Perry (2008), for example, documented how the oral storytelling abilities of young Sudanese men informed their English language writing experiences.

Reading is also heavily influenced by sociocultural contexts (RAND Reading Study Group, 2002). Of consequence to the study of literacy development in adolescent refugee students is that the interactive reading model takes into account their various life experiences and background knowledge. For example, while reading a book on water wells, Jaabriil, the refugee student mentioned earlier, was able to connect to his experiences building wells while living in a refugee camp. Moll and his colleagues (1992) might view this example from a funds-of-knowledge perspective, which considers the cultural and cognitive resources of the home and/or community as useful for classroom instruction.

Research Questions and Methods
Our research specifically sought to understand the impacts of an early reading instructional focus on: (a) the English language and literacy development of nonliterate and semiliterate adolescent refugees with limited or interrupted formal education; and (b) secondary ESL/ELD teachers’ practices in an ELD context. To examine these questions, secondary ESL/ELD teachers were first taught to use guided reading (Fountas & Pinnell, 1996) and running records (Clay, 2005) with leveled, informational texts. Throughout the intervention we primarily used informational texts, although not exclusively, to acknowledge students’ lived experiences, background knowledge, interests, and connections to the physical world. Additionally, we used informational texts to support students’ understanding of the genre and content specific vocabulary that they will encounter in mainstream secondary school classes. Transacting with informational texts will help students gain experiences with one form of semiotic capital valued in advanced schooling (Duke, 2000). Furthermore, age-appropriate, culturally responsive fictional texts were not easily available at emergent reading levels. We selected leveled informational texts from the following commercial series:

- National Geographic Windows on Literacy: www.ngsp.com
- Scholastic Alpha World: www.education.scholastic.ca/category/ALPHAWORLD
- Scholastic Fast Track: www.education.scholastic.ca/category/FAST_TRACK
- Nelson Focus: www.languagearts.nelson.com/reading/focus.html
- Nelson Education PM+: www.nelson.com/pmplus/

Beginning in the fall of 2010, nine secondary teachers, who actively worked in ELD programs across the school district, were invited to participate in professional development sessions that aligned with research-based early reading instructional strategies that we developed. These voluntary three-hour sessions took place every four to six weeks. In order to encourage maximum participation teachers were
Sofia (pseudonym), one of the teachers who participated in the professional development sessions, expressed an interest in improving her teaching practice and opened her classroom for the study. During five months we tracked the progress of students enrolled in the first of five ELD courses, delivered for 75 minutes a day during a semester. As Sofia worked out the kinks of the new instructional framework she relied on her traditional ESL pedagogical knowledge that focused on themed-based, literature-focused units. Once comfortable with collecting and analyzing running records, Sofia focused on setting up her classroom and acclimatizing students to new routines that would support guided reading instruction. She organized the leveled reading materials into bins that students could easily access. She rearranged her classroom environment to support collaboration by replacing traditional classroom chairs with attached desks with trapezoid tables on wheels that could be easily moved and rearranged to accommodate small-group and large-group instruction. To accommodate the resource intensive nature of the intervention Sofia negotiated a dedicated classroom in the school for her work with students in the ELD program.

Sofia began guided reading instruction in earnest in January 2012. She collected running records on each student at least once every two weeks while carrying out a differentiated early reading instructional program primarily using leveled informational texts. Running record data were recorded using the PM Benchmarks assessment system, which is the system used across the school district. Kristiina, the first author, and Stephanie, the third author, analyzed the running records Sofia collected to ensure inter-rater reliability and resolved any discrepancies in the data analysis with Sofia. We also measured the participants’ English language and reading progression using the following psychometric measures: Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-4 (Dunn & Dunn, 2007), Expressive Vocabulary Test-2 (Williams, 2007), and the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test-III (Woodcock, 2011). Data were collected in a pretest-posttest model with 12–14 weeks between tests. To support the assessment data, Kristiina also collected qualitative data using ethnographic methods (e.g., participant observation, interviews, and content analysis of instructional materials) approximately two times per week. During this time, Sofia consulted and debriefed with Kristiina and made adjustments to her practice where necessary. These observational data were useful to document the classroom teacher’s fidelity to implementing (Century, Rudnick, & Freeman, 2010) the critical components of the early reading instructional methods under examination.

Participants
Eleven refugee students were enrolled in Sofia’s ELD class. The students ranged in age from 14–20. Six students came from Somalia, four from Iraq, and one from Colombia. The students arrived in Canada between the fall of 2009 and the spring of 2011. Of the 11 students, five attended refugee camp schools, one had never been to school, and the others had attended school irregularly until they were forced into exile by the outbreak of war or social unrest. Based on the assessments conducted at the school board’s language assessment center upon arrival to Canada, six
of the students were considered nonliterate in their dominant language and five students were considered semiliterate. (See Table 1 for an overview of students’ origins, language and literacy experiences, and prior formal schooling experiences). Generally speaking, the students did not have any oral English language abilities, had limited dominant language literacy skills, and had varying degrees of limited or interrupted formal schooling experiences. Sofia did not speak any of the students’ languages. Despite these print literacy and formal schooling deficits, Sofia acknowledged and integrated the students’ rich life experiences and funds of knowledge at all levels of instruction.

Findings
The students demonstrated impressive progress in their English print literacy development when the classroom teacher made a concerted effort to integrate early reading instructional methods into her teaching practice. The running record data showed that students’ total reading gains ranged from three to thirteen levels with an overall average reading level gain of 8.3 levels. Compared to running record data collected on a group of students (n = 11) with similar profiles that Sofia taught two years prior in absence of early reading instructional methods, students only made an average reading level gain of 1.2 levels with a range from zero to three levels over five months. Figure 1 visually represents the growth of students’ running record levels comparing the intervention group to the non-intervention group.

To supplement the running record data and gather another layer of data, we collected pre-intervention and post-intervention data using psychometric language and literacy measures (PPVT-4; EVT-2; WRMT-III) as explained earlier in the article. On average, students achieved statistically significant gains as demonstrated by a change in Growth Scale Value (GSV) scores in receptive and expressive vocabulary and in total reading achievement, specifically in passage and listening comprehension and word identification (See Figure 2). It is important to note that students continued to make gains at or slightly above the average rate for their specified chronological age even if their GSV scores stayed the same or if they didn’t achieve the statistically significant threshold.

Students who scored below the statistically significant thresholds had absenteeism rates surpassing
FIGURE 1  Comparing Running Record Instructional Reading Levels Between Students Who Received and Those Who Did Not Receive Early Reading Instruction

Running record scores for students who did not receive early reading instruction from February to June 2010.

Running record scores for students who received early reading instruction from January to June 2012.

Time in Months

FIGURE 2  Change in Growth Standard Value (GSV) from Pretest to Posttest: Receptive Vocabulary (PPVT-4), Expressive Vocabulary (EVT-2), and Total Reading Cluster (WRMT-III)

Group average GSV

PPVT-4 GSV>9 statistically significant value

EVT-2 and WRMT-III GSV=6 statistically significant value

Students (January – June 2012)
40 percent, high rates of tardiness, and suspected histories of PTSD and related symptoms. Not surprisingly, students who made significant progress attended school on a regular basis with absenteeism rates lower than 20 percent and, where necessary, received varying levels of mental health support.

Students’ Perspective
Throughout our study, we also documented students’ engagement in class. The students who exhibited significant behavioral outbreaks at the beginning of the school year demonstrated behavioral improvements as they learned to engage with print literacy and began to feel increased levels of school belongingness. School began to have purpose. Jaabriil explained his growth as follows:

When I first came to school, I had difficulty reading and writing. It was hard to study. I could not focus. I laughed in class and made noises. Then I came to [this school] in 2011. I took English class with Sofia. She helped me in the ELD class. I really appreciated that my teachers helped me. They helped my brain to see that I had to be serious and focus. I had to work in class. I thought about it and went home and started to practice. I studied as much as I could. Now I can read and write in English. I look back to last year and I couldn’t do a test. I couldn’t read or write. I wasn’t paying attention. The teachers did everything for me, but now I can do things for myself. I feel happy that I know how to read and write.

Teacher’s Perspective
Early reading instruction focused on using guided reading with informational leveled texts. Using these texts with her ELD students in a supportive literacy instructional environment, Sofia observed that students’ intellects were stimulated, their background knowledge activated, they were exposed to content specific vocabulary, and they learned to become more strategic readers. Sofia summarized her experiences in the following manner:

It is interesting to say [that guided reading and running records] was exactly what I thought I wouldn’t do. I was hesitant to do running records in such a structured and organized way….I started doing running records to follow up on [students’] reading. And it goes so easily. It is fair for the kids….I also noticed that the mix of fiction and non-fiction books was a source of success….I was amazed how the students’ vocabulary increased….When I don’t do guided reading, my instruction focuses on teaching points that I noticed while doing the guided reading and running records. I feel excited.

Concluding Thoughts
With the increase of nonliterate and semiliterate SLIFE in resettlement countries, there is an urgent need to help teachers meet their students’ English language and literacy needs while at the same time acknowledging students’ rich life experiences. Adolescent SLIFE do not have the luxury of time to reach a level of English language, literacy, and academic content proficiency equal to those of their English-speaking peers, especially since, depending on the province or state, they age-out of public education between the ages of 19 to 21. Furthermore, time works against these students when we consider that ELLs in general require five to seven years to achieve academic language proficiency commensurate with age (Collier, 1989; Cummins, 1984) and SLIFE with limited print literacy skills may require seven to ten years or more to minimize the achievement gap (Collier, 1995). Based on our initial research and assuming that students’ physical and mental health needs are being adequately addressed, we believe it is theoretically possible for students to exit the five-course ELD program after 2.5 years with a fourth or fifth grade reading level. Achieving such a reading level may give students sufficient knowledge and skills to be successful in ESL supported content area classes and eventually transition to mainstream classes. Nonliterate and semiliterate SLIFE who begin the ELD program at the age of 14 or 15 might have enough time to earn sufficient credits to graduate from high school before ageing-out of the system and pursue postsecondary education.

As ESL/ELD teachers and administrators recognize that adolescent SLIFE need focused literacy programs, instead of traditional language programs (Woods, 2009), efforts should be directed to this end along with ways to validate students’ origins and life experiences. We agree with Banks (2003) that in order for minority students to become literate citizens in a democratic multicultural society they must be given the skills to identify as creators of knowledge, uncover the assumptions of knowledge, and view knowledge from diverse ethnic and cultural perspectives. Guided reading has the potential to address nonliterate and semiliterate adolescent refugee
FEATURE ARTICLE

Take Action

STEPS FOR IMMEDIATE IMPLEMENTATION

As a secondary school ESL/ELD teacher, you may not have had the opportunity to explore early reading instructional strategies. In order to begin thinking about implementing early reading instructional approaches with your SLIFE, we recommend the following steps:

1. Read widely on early reading instruction. We suggest beginning with the following resources: Clay, 1998, 2005; Coelho, 1998; Fountas & Pinnell, 1996; Freeman, Freeman, & Mercuri, 2002; Gunderson, 2009; Pinnell & Fountas, 2011 (Full citations can be found in the references).

2. Connect with an early literacy consultant, reading specialist, or related support teacher in your school and/or school board.

3. Create a literacy profile for each student in the class. Items to include in the profile might include: (a) language and literacy profile of the student’s dominant language and English language abilities (see, for example, Gunderson, 2009, pp. 253–262 for ideas); (b) prior schooling history; (c) immigration history; (d) current work samples (if any); (e) previous school’s records; (f) running record data showing instructional reading level with comprehension.

4. Introduce students to classroom-based learning centers, and familiarize them with routines in order to free your time to work with small, guided reading groups. Learning centers might include: (a) listening center; (b) writing center; (c) word work center; (d) independent reading center; (e) computer center; (f) guided reading center. Invite volunteers (e.g., peer tutors, community members, retired teachers) to the classroom to assist with centers.

5. Collect running record data from each student on a regular basis, and use the data to inform your teaching.

students’ print literacy gaps, while at the same time allowing them the time and space to realize that they are in charge of their literacies.

As teachers address these students’ academic needs, they will become more strategic in their language and literacy development and have forums to present their sophisticated understandings of the world in which they live. This study lays the groundwork for future research-based practice to help educators to effectively and efficiently provide adolescent SLIFE with the tools to access and transact with the culture of print that, to a large degree, dictates their future socioeconomic and sociocultural success.
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**More to Explore**

CONNECTED CONTENT-BASED RESOURCES

- Ontario Ministry of Education literacy modules: [http://e workshop.on.ca](http://e workshop.on.ca)
- Reading leveling system comparison chart: [http://e workshop.on.ca/edu/pdf/LevellingSystemComparisonChart.pdf](http://e workshop.on.ca/edu/pdf/LevellingSystemComparisonChart.pdf)
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees: [www.unhcr.org](http://www.unhcr.org)
- Learning About Refugees: [http://www.culturalorientation.net/learning/about-refugees](http://www.culturalorientation.net/learning/about-refugees)