EFFECTS OF READING STRATEGIES AND THE WRITING PROCESS WITH WRITTEN RECASTS ON SECOND LANGUAGE ACHIEVEMENT

Helen Ramirez, Ed.D.
Douglas County Schools, Castle Rock, CO

Don Jones, Ed.D.
Texas A&M University—Kingsville

This study examined the effectiveness of teaching methods used with a second language reading and writing unit. This investigation addressed discrepancies between assessment scores in the four communicative language skill areas of students in beginning-level Spanish classes at a suburban middle school. Accordingly, the purpose of this study was to explore how literacy-based practices that included teaching strategies used with reading, teaching use of the writing process with a writing assignment, and teacher employment of written recasts affect second language achievement. The theoretical base of the study consisted of second language theories and hypotheses that explained how second language learning occurs. The academic achievement of the students exposed to the literacy-based teaching methods was compared with the achievement of students not exposed to literacy-based teaching methods. A purposive convenience sample consisted of 116 students between the ages of 12 and 14 years enrolled in beginning-level Spanish classes. An independent-measures and repeated-measures t tests were used to assess among- and between-group differences from pretest, posttest, and delayed-posttest data collections. The between-groups analysis revealed a statistically-significant result in favor of the experimental group between the pretest and the posttest (t(114), p = .04, d = .36), and between the pretest and the delayed posttest (t(114), p = .03, d = .51). The findings led to a recommendation for further use and study of the methods, with additional assessment tools. The results inform instructional practices that increase students' opportunities to be exposed to comprehensible language, thus affecting positive social change.

Keywords: tolerance, intolerance, civility, diversity, forbearance, acceptance, acquisition (of language), corrective feedback, corrective recasting, strategy instruction, writing process (process writing)

INTRODUCTION

Researchers in the field of second language instruction, such as Long (2007) and VanPatten and Williams (2007), recognized a need for new teaching methods to meet the demands of a changing society and searched for the most effective methods of aiding learners in knowledge and use of a second language. Brown (2007) explained that the difference between current and past approaches to teaching a second language is the absence of the methods used in the first half of the 20th century because those methods were too narrow to apply to a wide range of learners in a variety of situations. The need to discover new, more effective methods is of particular significance in many schools because of requirements that students demonstrate second language proficiency on assessments. This study aimed to discover effective instructional methods to help students meet the second language proficiencies required of them.

Conscientious classroom teachers have made research-based changes to classroom instruction in an attempt

to improve student-learning outcomes. Richards and Rodgers (2001) contended that teachers searched for more effective ways of teaching a second language for more than 100 years. Debate among teachers and researchers about the best teaching practices centered on several areas, including (a) what the role of grammar should be, (b) how much focus should be on developing accuracy and fluency, (c) how the courses should be designed, (d) what the role of vocabulary was in learning, (e) what skills should be taught directly, (f) how learning theories should be applied in teaching, (g) how much memorization should be expected of learners, (h) what role motivation could play, (i) what the most effective strategies could be, (j) what the most effective techniques could be for teaching the four communication skills, and (k) what role technology should play in second language learning. Long (2007) and VanPatten and Williams (2007) agreed that second language research design and methodology had evolved in recent years, but a comprehensive second language theory was still lacking. As teachers attempted to discover the most effective methods, second language instruction experienced several transitions.

Brown (2007) and VanPatten and Williams (2007) asserted that there were two basic periods of second language instruction prior to the 1990s: the structuralist period and the nonstructuralist period. Richards and Rodgers (2001) explained that, in the 1990s, content-based instruction, task-based language teaching, and competency-based instruction replaced communicative-language teaching and focused on the outcomes of the learner, rather than on the methods of teaching. DuFour and Eaker (1998), Graham (2005), and Lambert et al. (2002) recognized that the famous report A Nation at Risk sparked a new era of improvement initiatives. DuFour and Eaker (1998) reported that more than 300 state and national task forces investigated the condition of public education in America within 2 years of the report (p. 3). According to DuFour and Eaker (1998), this investigation caused educational reform to move to standards-based instruction, also called the restructuring movement. Lambert et al. (2002) explained that because of the new reforms, society demanded different competencies from second-language learners, and instructors were forced to look for new ways to prepare their students.

Richards and Rodgers (2001) asserted that, by the 21st century, second language teachers adopted approaches used in general education, such as cooperative learning, the whole-language approach, and multiple intelligences. However, according to Long (2007) and Richards and Rodgers (2001), second language teachers still debated the best and most effective strategies to employ in the second language classroom. Asher (1993), Krashen (2003), and Ray and Seely (2004) still argued the value of purely communicative methods, while Montrul and Bowles (2010) found fault in completely doing away with direct instruction in vocabulary and grammar. Mok (2009) recently evaluated critical-thinking practices and reported promising findings, yet Gibbons (2002) contended that other second language instructors were compelled to design their curriculum goals to meet the demands of imposed standards and assessments. The debate has not concluded.

The purpose of this quantitative, experimental study was to test the hypothesis that literacy-based teaching methods used with an established curriculum for novice proficiency regular-education students studying Spanish in a suburban middle school would increase the academic achievement of the learners. Specifically, it investigated how teaching strategies used with reading, teaching use of the writing process with a writing assignment, and teacher employment of written recasts would affect second language achievement. It was hoped that more effective instructional practices than those that were used in the past would be identified.

METHODS

Research Question and Hypotheses

The following research question guided this study: Is there a statistically significant difference between post treatment grammar and vocabulary test scores of a control group that completed an established second language curriculum and an experimental group that completed the same second language curriculum with literacy-based teaching methods employed during the reading and writing activities?

H_0: There is no statistically significant difference between post treatment grammar and vocabulary test scores of a control group that completed an established second language curriculum and an experimental group that completed the same second language curriculum with literacy-based teaching methods employed during the reading and writing activities.

H$_1$: There is a statistically significant difference between post treatment grammar and vocabulary test scores of a control group that completed an established second language curriculum and an experimental group that completed the same second language curriculum with literacy-based teaching methods employed during the reading and writing activities.

Description of the Design and Approach

Only one teacher was chosen to administer the entire study to ensure consistency in instruction and grading. The following considerations were important in the selection of the teacher: (a) experience with using a variety of second language instructional methods, (b) basic background knowledge in general education practices, (c) several years of experience working with second language learners, (d) a high level of proficiency in use of the Spanish language, (e) an employee at a public middle school, and (f) a teacher with whom there was no association outside of work. The above criteria were meant to ensure that the participants in both the control group and the experimental group would benefit from a quality instructional experience, to ensure that the teacher had the skills, desire, and dedication necessary to complete the required elements of the study with fidelity, and to eliminate bias. Three meetings were arranged at the teacher's workplace to provide training in the literacy-based teaching methods. A separate meeting that focused on the administration and scoring of the pretest, posttest, and delayed posttest was also arranged.

A purposive sample was obtained through clustering based on the participants' enrollment in the beginning-level middle school Spanish classes of the teacher who provided the instruction. In order to participate in the study, the first language of the participants must not have been Spanish. The size of the sample was limited to four classes of approximately 29 participants each, with a total sample size of 116 participants ($n = 116$). To avoid bias, 52 were placed in the experimental group by randomly selecting two classes from the teacher's four sections, and 64 from the two remaining classes were placed in the control group. Selection of this sample was based on assertions by Creswell (2003) and Gravetter and Wallnau (2005) that the larger the sample size, the more accurately the results will represent the population. Gravetter and Wallnau (2005) explained that the power of the hypothesis test is significantly reduced with smaller sample sizes. Creswell (2003) further explained that the experiment should be planned so that the size of the treatment group provides the greatest possibility that the outcome is due to experimental manipulation in the study. The sample in this study was large enough to ensure the reliability and validity of the results.

The study began with all participants in the experimental group and the control group receiving initial communicative instruction for approximately 1 week. A pretest was then completed during one class period. The participants then experienced either the control condition or the experimental condition, based on their placement in one of the two groups. The reading and writing activities took between 3 and 4 weeks to complete. The participants in both the experimental group and the control group were then administered a posttest. Two weeks following the posttest, a delayed posttest was administered. An experimental design was preferred to a preexperimental design so that results of a control group could be compared to those of the experimental group, and thus would provide a more complete picture of the findings.

Initial Instruction

The initial instruction was not considered the focus of the study, but merited a description. The curriculum used was the normal curriculum adopted by the school district, and was thematically based on vocabulary and grammar topics that logically related to each other. The participants, before the time of the study, were instructed using primarily communicative methods. Presentation of new material occurred through the use of visual aids and electronic presentations. Essential grammar points were directly taught using graphic representations and then examples were provided. Students participated in pair, small-group, and whole-group activities in oral form. A variety of learning games were used to practice the essential grammar and vocabulary. Oral, auditory, reading, and writing activities were practiced, with lesser amounts of class time devoted to reading and writing. Reading and writing assignments were normally completed individually, with teacher support provided to individual students as needed. Exploring culture and making connections between learning in the classroom and the world beyond the classroom was encouraged. The infusion of technology using online vocabulary and grammar practice tools was also part of the classroom routine. Homework was assigned on a nearly daily basis, with a variety of options for the completion of each assignment. Projects were assigned and were evaluated as measures of proficiency. Pretests were given before

the unit, and at the end of each chapter, students normally took a chapter test. The length of time spent on each chapter varied based on the amount of grammar and vocabulary presented and practiced, and based on the teachers' perceptions of students' needs for instructional pacing. Typically, the teachers spent between 4 and 6 weeks on any particular chapter.

Reading-Strategy Instruction

The teacher employed literacy-based teaching methods in the form of reading-strategy instruction provided to the participants in the experimental group after the initial instruction and the pretest were completed. The reading-strategy instruction was presented electronically. The presentation provided a brief explanation and/or operational definition of each strategy to be used during the extended second language reading assignment. The strategies included the use of scanning, skimming, guessing, predicting, cognates, phonological awareness, identifying grammar structures, using a dictionary, summarizing, using graphic organizers, and connecting the reading to the participant's background knowledge. The students were guided on how to use each strategy as it related to the extended reading assignment and were asked to practice each strategy in a small portion of the reading assignment before they completed the entire assignment independently. Some teacher-guided whole-class dialogue took place to explain the ways participants could use strategies to increase their understanding.

Extended Reading

The reading selection matched the proficiency of the participants in the study and was tied to the initial instruction by topic, vocabulary, and grammar structures. It also contained cognates, high-frequency words, a few low-frequency words, and words easily communicated through the title and accompanying drawings. The reading assignment was one page in length and was considered an extended reading because it presented a story in its entirety.

As the students in the experimental group completed the extended-reading assignment, they were encouraged to use the presented strategies. The teacher monitored the use of strategies and made suggestions for strategy use as needed. The students were asked to write in Spanish the key information from the story on a graphic organizer as they completed the assignment. They were asked to circle cognates they found and underline grammar they identified. They were also asked to write any new words they learned from reading, and identify the meaning of the word by either guessing or using a dictionary.

Writing-Process Instruction

Literacy-based teaching methods used with writing were instruction in the writing process, presented to the participants in the experimental group through an electronic presentation. The students were first introduced to the five generally recognized steps in the writing process. The steps of prewriting and drafting were then explained separately, and reasons for using the steps when writing were discussed. Examples of how to use the steps were then given in Spanish and explained in English. The steps of revising, editing, and publishing were explained and discussed in English.

Extended Writing

All participants in the experimental group and the control group wrote either an essay or a story in Spanish of at least five paragraphs in length, using the same prompt. They were instructed to focus on using vocabulary and grammar from the current chapter, but could also include other vocabulary and grammar structures with the purpose of enhancing the content and interest level of their writing piece. The participants in the experimental group were expected to use the writing process as they produced their writing piece. The teacher monitored their use of the writing process and provided suggestions and feedback to aid in producing a quality product. As participants in the experimental group created their drafts, the teacher provided written corrective feedback in the form of recasts, and they were encouraged to repair all erroneous written output. Because the class periods were approximately 47 minutes long, the teacher was able to provide feedback on only a few sentences for each student per class period and then expected them to apply the feedback to other sentences as they continued to write. As recasts were provided, the students began to recognize their own errors and replace them with correct models. The self-correction aided them in producing fewer errors of the same type. As the students revised their own writing and participated in peer

revision, the recasts they received during the drafting phase aided them in recognizing their own errors and the errors of their peers. All participants were given the option to either neatly hand write a final copy or word-process a final copy of the writing piece.

Control Condition

The participants in the control group were given the same reading piece and the same writing prompt as the experimental group. However, the participants in the control group did not receive the literacy-based teaching methods—instruction in reading strategies or the writing process—nor did they receive the teacher interventions through recasts. Instead, they were directed to complete the reading and writing assignments as the teacher employed the teaching methods normally used before this study. The teacher provided instructional support to individual students as needed.

Instrumentation and Materials

According to Creswell (2003), the three traditional forms of validity to identify when choosing a data-collection instrument are content validity, predictive or current validity, and construct validity. Reliability should be established by the scores resulting from past use of the instrument with reports of internal consistency and test–retest correlations, along with reports of consistency in test administration and scoring. The assessment that served as the testing instrument was a test commonly used by teachers in the district, and it encompassed the vocabulary and grammar that was taught to students in the initial instruction and practiced through the reading and writing assignments. It required students to read and comprehend questions or prompts in Spanish and then write their answers in Spanish according to what they read. Thus, both reading and writing abilities could be assessed though the examination. It required specific responses to each reading prompt, leading to only one correct answer per question, and therefore ensured that all students would be evaluated according to the same criteria. Since only one teacher graded all of the assessments, consistency was ensured. The data obtained from the assessment tool were in the form of raw test scores. The test scores indicated the level of vocabulary and grammar knowledge of the participants on the specific topic of study. The data were converted to a scale from 0 to 100 to determine ranges of scores.

Data Collection and Analysis

Initially, descriptive statistics were used to summarize, organize, and simplify the data obtained from the pretest, posttest, and delayed posttest. All statistical analysis was accomplished using quantitative measures. The descriptive statistics analyzed the frequency, mean, and standard deviations, and the variability of the data. An independent-measures and repeated-measures t tests were used to compare pretest, posttest, and delayed- posttest scores. The results of this analysis indicated whether or not there were statistically significant differences between the 3 test iterations. It was expected that both the experimental group and the control group would experience growth in their scores from the pretest to the posttest. The function of the delayed posttest was to measure retained learning of each group between the posttest and the delayed posttest. For this study the statistic was considered significant at the $p < .05$ level, meaning that the chances that the treatment had an effect were significantly higher than expected by chance. Cohen's d is often used with t tests because it provides a standardized measure of the mean difference between treatments (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2005, p. 282). Therefore, it served as the post hoc test for this study to determine the level of significance greater than chance.

Test Scoring, Coding, Data Entry, and Screening

The data were obtained from the administrations of a pretest, a posttest, and a delayed posttest given to each of the participants of the study. The three iterations of the test were scored by the same individual, the teacher who conducted the classroom study. The tests were scored on a 100-point scale. Individual scores for each test were recorded on an Excel spreadsheet. The scores were coded with the letter e representing the experimental group, and the letter c representing the control group, combined with a numerical system that tied each individual to either class 1 or class 2 of their sample group. Names were not included to ensure the anonymity of the individual participants in the study.

The Excel file was converted to SPSS for the subsequent data management and statistical analyses. The data were

screened for missing scores on each of the three test administrations. Several were identified and were replaced with the group mean on that particular test administration, since the sample mean is a predictable measure (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2005, p. 156). The scores were then screened for individual extreme scores (outliers), by group, that might adversely influence the group's mean, and no outliers were found.

Data Analysis

Analysis 1. This analysis tested for differences between the experimental and control groups on each of the three administrations of the grammar and vocabulary test. It was expected that the experimental group would score higher than the control group on the posttest and delayed posttest if the literacy-based teaching methods were effective. The independent-samples t test was used for this analysis. The independent-measures *t* test allows researchers to compare the mean scores of two groups on a chosen variable (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2005), in this study the differing instructional methods. The scores were first examined for normality and homogeneity of variance, which are assumptions underlying the t statistic (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2005, p. 262), and no discrepancies were found.

Table 1 provides the descriptive statistics and the *t*-test results. Observation of the pretest means indicates that the experimental and control groups were similar on grammar and vocabulary at the beginning of the study ($M = 45.56$, $SD = 21.50$ and $M = 42.59$, $SD = 24.20$ respectively). Using the .05 level of probability as a reference point, the small difference of 2.97 (*Diff* column) points was not statistically significant ($t(114) = .69$, $p = .49$). This analysis establishes that the two groups were not different in their performance prior to the introduction of the literacy-based instruction to the experimental group.

On the posttest, it can be seen that the experimental group scored higher than the control group. The difference of 7.11 points was statistically significant ($t(114) = 2.09$, $p = .04$). Likewise, the difference of 8.59 points in favor of the experimental group on the delayed posttest was also statistically significant ($t(114) = 2.93$, $p = .03$). These results thus provide statistical support for the hypothesis that the students who received the literacy-based instruction would score higher on grammar and vocabulary than the students who did not receive the literacy-based instruction.

Table 1

Pretest, Posttest, and Delayed Posttest Differences for Grammar and Vocabulary for the Experimental ($n = 52$) and Control Groups ($n = 64$)

Measure	Experimental		Control					Cohen's
	M	SD	M	SD	Diff	t(114)	p	d
Pretest	45.56	21.50	42.59	24.20	2.97	.69	.49	.12
Posttest	84.33	15.96	77.22	19.83	7.11	2.09	.04	.36
Delayed Posttest	86.35	14.35	77.77	16.67	8.59	2.93	.03	.51

Notes. M = mean. SD = standard deviation. Diff = the difference between the mean scores. t = the t statistic based on the degrees of freedom. p = the probability of a result simply by chance. d = the Cohen's d report of effect size.

Statistical significance only indicates the probability of there being a difference, and provides no information about the importance of a difference. It is recommended that researchers provide a report of the effect size in addition to the statistical significance (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2005). The effect size is an indicator of the practical importance of a difference and can be used regardless of whether or not there is statistical significance. Cohen's d is often used for this purpose, and is shown in the last column of the Table 1. According to Gravetter and Wallnau (2005), one convention for the interpretation of Cohen's d is: A mean difference less than 0.2 standard deviations indicates a small effect size, a mean difference around 0.5 standard deviations indicates a medium effect size, and a mean difference greater than 0.8 standard deviations indicates a large effect size (p. 200).

Using those values, the difference on the pretest (*Diff* = 2.97) can be interpreted as being not important (*d* = .12) and

<div style="writing-mode: vertical-rl">ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES JOURNAL: EDUCATION, PRACTICE, AND RESEARCH</div>

provides further indication that the two groups were similar at the beginning of the study. The posttest effect size (d = .36) suggests the difference between the two groups of 7.11 can be considered as small to medium while the delayed posttest difference (*Diff* = 8.39) reflects a medium sized difference in respect to importance.

      Analysis 2. While primary interest was in determining if the experimental and control groups differed on the three test administrations, this analysis was concerned with the within-group differences over the three test administrations, and not the between-group differences. That is, whether each group differed from time to time on the three test administrations. The paired-sample t test (repeated-measures design) was used for this purpose. A repeated-measures t test allows researchers to study the learning of individuals over time (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2005). Table 2 presents these results for each group. The means for each group are the same as those shown in Table 1, except arranged differently for ease of showing the differences between times one, two, and three within each group.

The difference between the posttest – pretest, and the delayed posttest – pretest means for both groups was highly statistically significant (p > .00) for both groups. The effect sizes (Cohen's d) indicate these differences to be of very large practical importance. Thus, regardless of group membership, both groups improved greatly over time, except that the experimental group improved somewhat more than the control groups as shown by the results reported in Analysis 1. The delayed posttest – posttest differences, although not statistically significant, show that both groups maintained their performance over that time period.

Table 2

Within Group Comparisons for Pretest, Posttest, and Delayed Posttest Differences

Pair	M_1	M_2	Diff	t(51)	p	Cohen's d
Experimental Group						
Posttest—Pretest	84.33	45.56	38.77	15.85	>.00	1.80
Delayed Posttest—Pretest	86.35	45.56	40.79	15.92	>.00	1.90
Delayed Posttest—Posttest	86.35	84.33	2.02	1.31	.20	.09
Control Group						
Posttest—Pretest	77.22	42.59	34.63	14.20	>.00	1.43
Delayed Posttest—Pretest	77.77	42.59	35.17	14.47	>.00	1.45
Delayed Posttest—Posttest	77.77	72.22	.55	.27	.79	.02

Notes. M_1= mean of first assessment listed. M_2= mean of second assessment listed. *Diff* = the difference between the mean scores. t = the t statistic based on the degrees of freedom. p = the probability of a result simply by chance. d = the Cohen's d report of effect size.

The independent- and repeated-measures t-test results led to a rejection of the null hypothesis and concluded that there is a significant difference between the scores of the two samples. Specifically, the data led to the conclusion that students who were instructed using literacy-based second language teaching methods had higher scores than those instructed using the normal second language teaching methods. Following are the conclusions, interpretations, implications, and recommendations based on the results.

DISCUSSION

Continuing is a detailed review of the study that evaluated two instructional models used with second language reading and writing. It was hypothesized that the implementation of literacy-based teaching methods would result in increases in second language vocabulary and grammar acquisition and enhanced reading and writing skills beyond those previously observed by the teachers at the local school. The findings are discussed and recommendations for further research are made.

Interpretation of the Findings

The findings of the statistical analysis resulted in a rejection of the null hypothesis that there is no statistically

significant difference between post treatment grammar and vocabulary test scores of a control group that completed an established second language curriculum and an experimental group that completed the same second language curriculum with literacy-based teaching methods employed during the reading and writing activities. Although individual differences such as IQ, gender, and personality can influence scores and outcomes in a hypothesis test (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2005, p. 287), it is highly unlikely that the internal validity was compromised, because both the independent-measures and repeated-measures t tests were used in the analysis. In effect, based on the data, the conclusion was made that there is a significant difference between the posttest scores of the experimental group and the control group. Students instructed using the literacy-based teaching methods had higher scores on the posttest and delayed posttest than did those instructed with the regularly used methods. Therefore, the literacy-based teaching methods employed with the experimental group were effective in aiding beginning learners in the attainment of higher levels of second language acquisition.

Relation of the Findings to the Literature Review

Second language learners at novice proficiencies may need higher levels of support from a more experienced second language user than do second language learners at higher proficiency levels. As proficiency levels increase, the need for support may diminish. Nation (2006) reported that as a second language learner's lexical coverage nears 98%, the learner is able to acquire new language much as for the first language. Further, as the second language learners' background knowledge of the sound and letter systems, and of vocabulary, grammar, and language structures of the second language increase, the learners' dependence on the teacher or other aids diminishes. Carduner (2007), Pellicer-Sánchez and Schmitt (2010), Sang-Keun (2008), and Zhou (2009) found that explicit instruction was helpful to language learners' ability to use the language. Ammar (2008), Dekhinet (2008), Ishida (2004), Loewen and Philp (2006), Lyster and Izquierdo (2009), Nassaji (2009), Révész and ZhaoHong (2006), and Sheen (2008) all found that providing corrective feedback to second language learners aided in the development of their understanding of the language. Walters (2006) and Zhenhui (2007) found that teaching strategies to second language learners aided them in their comprehension, and their ability to use the language. Iwahori (2008) reported that as learners acquired more language strategies, the learners became increasingly independent in their efforts and abilities to use the strategies with the second language. Ito (2009), Pulido (2007), and Walter (2007) all found that as second language proficiency increased, learners were able to independently achieve higher comprehension rates. Therefore, it is assumed that at higher levels of proficiency, learners will less often rely on more proficient language users as the previously used support systems become internalized.

Several activities during the course of the study provided insights into how learners of a second language might achieve acquisition. When the second language learners in this study were introduced to new second language input, they were asked to recognize sound patterns, letter patterns, and some words that were similar to those of their first language. However, much of what the learners saw or heard of the second language was foreign to them. It was with instructional support that the new sounds, letters, and words began to make sense and become familiar to the learners. A more proficient user of the second language, the teacher, provided support in several ways. The teacher used images that related directly to the word or words the learners saw or heard. Images provided clues to the learners about the meanings of the messages. The teacher also employed hand motions or other gestures to make the meanings of the second language messages clear. Support was given in the form of direct instruction in phonetic awareness and syntactic awareness. Support was also delivered in the form of direct instruction of aspectual features of the language. Instruction was given in the use of top-down strategies (Baker & Boonkit, 2004; Yang & Wilson, 2006), including guessing meaning from context, making predictions, using background knowledge, and identifying text structures, and in using bottom-up strategies (Baker & Boonkit, 2004; Yang & Wilson, 2006), such as looking up unknown words in a dictionary or glossary, and analyzing sentence grammar. Processes that aided the learners in organizing information and following through with logical stages of communication were also directly taught. The teacher provided correct models of the language to the learners. Comparisons were made between the first language of the learner and the new, second language. Corrective feedback was provided to the learners when they produced an erroneous second language output. There may have been other forms of support given to the second language learners by the teacher that are not listed here.

Practical Applications of the Findings

The findings have many practical applications. First, the teachers who design second language curriculums with the focus of acquisition of vocabulary and grammar structures in mind may look to the literacy-based teaching methods for guidance. Second, the teachers who are interested in maintaining a communicative atmosphere in the second language classroom while also addressing second language literacy development may also look to the design of this study to guide their choices of learning and teaching activities. Teachers searching for an alternative to presenting grammar structures through a lecture or traditional format, and vocabulary through rote memorization, may find that the literacy-based methods can provide effective, alternative instructional methods. Additionally, teachers preparing their second language learners for proficiency assessments may find that such literacy-based methods can aid the learners in attainment of higher scores. The teaching model in this study may provide solutions to a wide range of second language learning issues.

CONCLUSION

This study compared the vocabulary and grammar assessment scores of beginning second language students who experienced either literacy-based teaching methods or the normally employed teaching methods in reading and writing instruction. The students instructed using the literacy-based methods scored significantly higher than the students instructed using the normal teaching methods. This has important implications for educators in this field. Specifically, educators need to understand that second language teachers and researchers should continue to monitor the effectiveness of both models. The need to find successful methods of instruction in second languages has increased due to the nation's growing demand for workers fluent in second languages. The impact of more effective second language education is far reaching.

REFERENCES

Abu-Rabia, S. (2003). The influence of working memory on reading and creative writing processes in a second language. *Educational Psychology, 23,* 209–222. doi:10.1080/0144341032000039583

Almasi, J. F. (2003). *Teaching strategic processes in reading.* New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Altemeier, L., Jones, J., Abbott, R., & Berninger, V. (2006). Executive functions in becoming writing readers and reading writers: Note taking and report writing in third and fifth graders. *Developmental Neuropsychology, 29,* 161–173. doi:10.1207/s15326942dn2901_8

Ammar, A. (2008). Prompts and recasts: Differential effects on second language morphosyntax. *Language Teaching Research, 12,* 183–210. doi:10.1177/1362168807086287

Asher, J. J. (1993). *Learning another language through actions.* Los Gatos, CA: Sky Oaks.

Ayoun, D. (2001). The role of negative and positive feedback in the second language acquisition of the passé composé and imparfait. *Modern Language Journal, 85,* 226–243. doi:10.1111/0026-7902.00106

Baker, S. K., Chard, D. J., Ketterlin-Geller, L. R., Apichatabutra, C., & Doabler, C. (2009). Teaching writing to at-risk students: The quality of evidence for self-regulated strategy development. *Exceptional Children. 75,* 303–318. Retrieved from http://www.cec.sped.org/Content/NavigationMenu/Publications2/ExceptionalChildren/

Baker, W., & Boonkit, K. (2004). Learning strategies in reading and writing: EAP contexts. *RELC Journal, 35,* 299–328. doi:10.1177/0033688205052143

Berninger, V., Abbott, R., Abbott, S., Graham, S., & Richards, T. (2002). Writing and reading: Connections between language by hand and language by eye. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 35*, 39–56. doi:10.1177/002221940203500104

Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2010). The contribution of written corrective feedback to language development: A ten month investigation. *Applied Linguistics, 31,* 193–214. doi:10.1093/applin/amp016

Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (5th ed.). White Plains, NY: Pearson Education.

Carduner, J. (2007). Teaching proofreading skills as a means of reducing composition errors. *Language Learning Journal, 35,* 283–295. doi:10.1080/09571730701317655.

Cotterall, S., & Cohen, R. (2003). Scaffolding for second language writers: Producing an academic essay. *ELT Journal, 57,* 158–166. doi:10.1093/elt/57.2.158

Creswell, J. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dekhinet, R. (2008). Online enhanced corrective feedback for ESL learners in higher education. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 21,* 409–425. doi:10.1080/09588220802447669.

Dewey, J. (1944). *Democracy and education* [Original work published in 1916]. New York, NY: Macmillan.

Dodigovic, M. (2007). Artificial intelligence and second language learning: An efficient approach to error remediation. *Language Awareness, 16,* 99–113. doi:10.2167/la416.0.

Doughty, C. J., & Long, M. H. (2003). T*he handbook of second language acquisition.* Malden, MA: Blackwell.

DuFour, R., & Eaker, R. (1998). *Professional learning communities at work: Best practices for enhancing student achievement.* Bloomington, IN: National Educational Service.

Easterling-Adams, B. (2009). *Second language (L2) reading strategy instruction: Its effects on comprehension and word inferences ability.* Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED506763.pdf

Gibbons, P. (2002). *Scaffolding language, scaffolding learning.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Goff, D., Pratt, C., & Ong, B. (2005). The relations between children's reading comprehension, working memory, language skills and components of reading decoding in a normal sample. *Reading & Writing, 18*(7-9), 583-616. doi:10.1007/s11145-004-7109-0

Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). A meta-analysis of writing instruction for adolescent students. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 99*, 445–476. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.99.3.445.

Gravetter, F. J., & Wallnau, L. B. (2005). *Essentials of statistics for the behavioral sciences.* Belmont, CA: Thomson Learning.

Guangwei, H. (2007). Developing an EAP writing course for Chinese ESL students. *RELC Journal, 38,* 67–86. doi:10.1177/0033688206076160

Hao, X., & Sivell, J. (2002). *Integrating reading and writing in EFL composition in China.* Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED468599.pdf

Harklau, L., & Pinnow, R. (2009). *Adolescent second-language writing. Handbook of adolescent literacy research* (pp. 126–139). New York, NY: Guilford.

Horst, M. (2005). Learning L2 vocabulary through extensive reading: A measurement study. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 61*, 355–382 doi:10.2307/326879

Hsu, J. (2004, May). *Reading, writing, and reading-writing in the second language classroom: A balanced curriculum.* Paper presented at the Annual International Conference on English Teaching and Learning in the Republic of China. Taichung, Taiwan. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED492895.pdf

Ishida, M. (2004). Effects of recasts on the acquisition of the aspectual form -te i-(ru) by learners of Japanese as a foreign language. *Language Learning, 54*, 311–394. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9922.2004.00257.x

Ito, F. (2009). *Threshold to transfer writing skills from L1 to L2.* Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED506378.pdf

Iwahori, Y. (2008). Developing reading fluency: A study of extensive reading in EFL. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 20,* 70–91. Retrieved from http://www.nflrc.hawaii.edu/rfl/April2008/iwahori/iwahori.html

Keating, G. (2008). Task effectiveness and word learning in a second language: The involvement load hypothesis on

trial. *Language Teaching Research, 12,* 365–386. doi:10.1177/1362168808089922

Kemper, D., Sebranek, P. & Meyer, V. (2005). *Write source.* Great Source Education Group: Wilmington, MA.

Kern, R., & Schultz, J. (2005). Beyond orality: Investigating literacy and the literary in second and foreign language instruction. *Modern Language Journal, 89,* 381–392. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4781.2005.00312.x

Krashen, S. D. (2003). *Explorations in language acquisition and use.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Kyung Sook, C., Dong Seop, C., & Krashen, S. (2008). An experimental study. *Knowledge Quest, 36*(5), 69–73. Retrieved from http://aasl.metapress.com/content/p3w01066662066t9/

Lambert, L., Walker, D., Zimmerman, D. P., Cooper, J. E., Lambert, M. D., Gardner, M. E., & Szabo, M. (2002). *The constructivist leader* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Laufer, B. (2003). Vocabulary acquisition in a second language: Do learners really acquire most vocabulary by reading? Some empirical evidence. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 59*, 567–587. doi:10.3138/cmlr.59.4.567

Lee, S., & Krashen, S. (2002). Predictors of success in writing in English as a foreign language: Reading, revision behavior, apprehension, and writing. *College Student Journal, 36*, 532–543. Retrieved from http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0FCR/is_4_36/ai_96619959/

Lesaux, N., Lipka, O., & Siegel, L. (2006). Investigating cognitive and linguistic abilities that influence the reading comprehension skills of children from diverse linguistic backgrounds. *Reading & Writing, 19,* 99–131. doi:10.1007/s11145-005-4713-6

Loewen, S., & Philp, J. (2006). Recasts in the adult English L2 classroom: Characteristics, explicitness, and effectiveness. *Modern Language Journal, 90,* 536–556. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4781.2006.00465.x

Long, M. (1996). The role of linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. Ritchie & T. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413–468). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Long, M. (2007). *Problems in SLA.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Lyster, R., & Izquierdo, J. (2009). Prompts versus recasts in dyadic interaction. *Language Learning, 59,* 453–498. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9922.2009.00512.x

Marzano, R. J. (2004). *Building background knowledge for academic achievement.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

McKeown, M., Beck, I., & Blake, R. (2009). Rethinking reading comprehension instruction: A comparison of instruction for strategies and content approaches. *Reading Research Quarterly, 44,* 218–253. doi:10.1598/RRQ.44.3.1

Mizza, D. (2008). Foreign language writing as a communicative modality in technologically-enhanced educational settings: Towards a socio-cognitive approach. *International Journal of Learning, 15,* 261–267. Retrieved from http://ijl.cgpublisher.com/product/pub.30/prod.1738

Mok, J. (2009). From policies to realities: Developing students' critical thinking in Hong Kong secondary school English writing classes. *RELC Journal, 40*, 262–279. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0033688209343866

Montrul, S., & Bowles, M. (2010). Is grammar instruction beneficial for heritage language learners? Dative case marking in Spanish. *Heritage Language Journal, 7*(1), 47–73. Retrieved from http://www.international.ucla.edu/media/files/vol7-1-S-Montrul-M-Bowles.pdf

Morris Kindzierski, C. (2009). "I like it the way it is!": Peer-revision writing strategies for students with emotional and behavioral disorders. Preventing School Failure, 54(1), 51–59. doi:10.3200/PSFL.54.1.51-59

Nassaji, H. (2009). Effects of recasts and elicitations in dyadic interaction and the role of feedback explicitness. *Language Learning, 59,* 411–452. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9922.2009.00511.x

Nation, I. (2006). How large a vocabulary is needed for reading and listening? *Canadian Modern Language Review, 63,* 59–82. doi:10.1353/cml.2006.0049

Pellicer-Sánchez, A., & Schmitt, N. (2010). Incidental vocabulary acquisition from an authentic novel: Do things fall apart? *Reading in a Foreign Language, 22,* 31–55. Retrieved from http://nflrc.hawaii.edu/rfl/April2010/articles/pellicersanchez.pdf

Piaget, J. (1950). *The psychology of intelligence.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Pigada, M., & Schmitt, N. (2006). Vocabulary acquisition from extensive reading: A case study. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 18,* 1–28. Retrieved from http://nflrc.hawaii.edu/rfl/april2006/pigada/pigada.html

Pulido, D. (2004). The relationship between text comprehension and second language incidental vocabulary acquisition: A matter of topic familiarity. *Language Learning, 54,* 469. doi:10.1111/j.0023-8333.2004.00263.x

Pulido, D. (2007). The relationship between text comprehension and second language incidental vocabulary acquisition: A matter of topic familiarity? *Language Learning, 57,* 155–199. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9922.2007.00415.x

Révész, A., & ZhaoHong, H. (2006). Task content familiarity, task type and efficacy of recasts. *Language Awareness, 15,* 160–179. doi:10.2167/la401.0

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Rodrigo, V., Krashen, S., & Gribbons, B. (2004). The effectiveness of two comprehensible-input approaches to foreign language instruction at the intermediate level. *System, 32,* 53–60. doi:10.1016/j.system.2003.08.003

Salaberry, R., & Lafford, B. A. (2006). *The art of teaching Spanish.* Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Sang-Keun, S. (2008). "Fire your proofreader!" Grammar correction in the writing classroom. *ELT Journal, 62,* 358–365. doi:10.1093/elt/ccm089

Saville-Troike, M. (2006). *Introducing second language acquisition.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Sheen, Y. (2004). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in communicative classrooms across instructional settings. *Language Teaching Research, 8,* 263–300. doi:10.1191/1362168804lr146oa

Sheen, Y. (2008). Recasts, language anxiety, modified output, and L2 learning. *Language Learning, 58*(4), 835-874. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9922.2008.00480.x.

Shekary, M., & Tahririan, M. (2006). Negotiation of meaning and noticing in text-based online chat. *Modern Language Journal, 90,* 557–573. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4781.2006.00504.x

Soo-Ok, K., & Hae-Ri, K. (2008). Beyond raw frequency: Incidental vocabulary acquisition in extensive reading. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 20,* 191–225. Retrieved from http://nflrc.hawaii.edu/rfl/October2008/kweon/kweon.pdf

Stahl, K. A., & McKenna, M. C. (2006). *Reading research at work.* New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Strong, G. (1996). Using literature for language teaching in ESOL. *Thought Currents in English Literature, 69,* 291–305. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED407860.pdf

Taguchi, E., Gorsuch, G., & Sasamoto, E. (2006). Developing second and foreign language reading fluency and its effect on comprehension: A missing link. *The Reading Matrix, 6*(2), 1–18. Retrieved from http://www.readingmatrix.com/articles/taguchi_gorsuch_sasamoto/article.pdf

Tracy, B., Reid, R., & Graham, S. (2009) Teaching young students strategies for planning and drafting stories: The impact of self-regulated strategy development. *Journal of Educational Research, 102,* 323–332. doi:10.3200/JOER.102.5.323-332

VanPatten, B., & Williams, J. (2007). *Theories in second language acquisition: An introduction.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Walter, C. (2007). First- to second-language reading comprehension: not transfer, but access. *International*

Journal of Applied Linguistics, 17, 14–37. doi:10.1111/j.1473-4192.2007.00131.x

Walters, J. (2006). Methods of teaching inferring meaning from context. *RELC Journal, 37,* 176–190. doi:10.1177/0033688206067427

Zhenhui, R. (2007). Training in brainstorming and developing writing skills. *ELT Journal, 61,* 100–106. doi:10.1093/elt/ccm002

Zhi-Hong, C. (2007). The effect of learning strategies on reading comprehension. *Sino-US English Teaching, 4*(4), 15–18. Retrieved from http://www.linguist.org.cn/doc/su200704/su20070404.pdf

Zhou, A. (2009). What adult ESL learners say about improving grammar and vocabulary in their writing for academic purposes. *Language Awareness, 18,* 31–46. doi:10.1080/096584108023

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Dr. Helen Ramirez (helen.ramirez@yahoo.com) began her teaching career in 1989. She taught Spanish and Art classes for nearly 10 years at the high school level. During that time she committed to several leadership roles within the school. She was the Chairperson of the Graduation Requirements Committee, she served on the Hiring Committee and the Athletic Eligibility Committee, advised the Freshman class, advised the Foreign Language Club, trained three student teachers, and coached junior high track. Dr. Ramirez earned a Master's Degree in Educational Leadership in 1993. After relocating to Colorado where she presently resides, she became a Lead Teacher and Spanish Teacher at a local middle school. She then accepted her current position as a middle school Spanish and World Cultures Teacher, and additionally served as an Instructional Coordinator for several years. In 2004, Dr. Ramirez published a set of communicative teaching games titled *Los Aztecas y Los Conquistadores* through Teacher's Discovery. Dr. Ramirez earned her Doctor of Education in Teacher Leadership from Walden University in 2001. Her research centered on second language learning and literacy instruction.

Dr. Don Jones (don.jones@tamuk.edu) currently serves as a professor of education in the Ed.D. Program at Texas A&M University—Kingsville. His background includes extensive experience in higher education leadership, as well as public school administration, including service as an elementary principal, high school principal and in the superintendency. His areas of interest include philosophy, ethics, leadership and school board training and development.