



Elementary English Learners' Use of Reading Strategies with Culturally Relevant and Culturally Distant Stories

Deoksoon Kim

To cite this article: Deoksoon Kim (2018): Elementary English Learners' Use of Reading Strategies with Culturally Relevant and Culturally Distant Stories, Journal of Language, Identity & Education, DOI: [10.1080/15348458.2018.1503960](https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2018.1503960)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2018.1503960>



Published online: 25 Oct 2018.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 57



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Elementary English Learners' Use of Reading Strategies with Culturally Relevant and Culturally Distant Stories

Deoksoon Kim

Boston College

ABSTRACT

The strength of English learners' second language reading is closely associated with academic success. Using qualitative research methods and verbal protocols, this study examines four elementary-level English learners' uses of reading strategies and describes how each English learner employs these strategies while reading both culturally relevant and culturally distant stories. The study describes two types of strategies: higher order thinking strategies and socio-contextual reading strategies. Together, the study draws on intensive ethnographic and verbal protocol research to map out a comprehensive set of 12 reading strategies and describes how English learners employ these strategies in context. This broad view of second language reading incorporates both the cognitive and linguistic skills required for decoding and comprehension, together with consideration of the non-cognitive factors and sociocultural contexts within which reading occurs. The study also shows how learners at different levels process culturally relevant and culturally distant stories differently.

KEYWORDS

Culturally relevant and distant materials; ESL; L2 reading strategies; narrative; second language acquisition and development; second language learning; second language reading

Introduction

English learners (ELs) are the fastest growing population in U.S. schools. In 2011–2012, 4.4 million ELs composed 9.1% of K–12 public enrollment. In eight states they represented over 10% of public school students (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2014). These ELs have great potential but educators must address their linguistic needs. This paper focuses on ELs' English literacy, "the ability and the willingness to use reading and writing to construct meaning from printed text, in ways that meet the requirements of a particular social context" (Au, 1993, p. 20). Literacy is crucial to ELs' academic success, enabling them to become active in English language activities (Cummins, 1992). In order to help educators facilitate ELs' literacy, we must study how they approach English texts.

We do not understand enough about second language reading. Thus we are unable to enhance ELs' literacy skills as well as we should (August & Shanahan, 2006). Most studies have focused on specific aspects of language acquisition (Ellis, 2008), such as second-language (L2) vocabulary acquisition (Haynes & Baker, 1993). Few studies address L2 reading comprehension and meaning construction, and few take a holistic approach to L2 reading that examines both cognitive and social aspects. This study examines diverse ELs' L2 reading strategies, which are central to ELs' academic success, describing how they read in English. I also describe how ELs use different strategies with culturally relevant and distant texts. Understanding ELs' reading strategies will help us understand and improve the education of ELs.

L2 reading as meaning construction

Literacy skills are linked to ELs' academic success (Cummins, 1992). In general, as Goodman (1987) says, literacy is *meaning construction*. But we must expand this, following Au (1993), to include the motivated ability to read and write in social context. Literacy is both cultural practice (Perez, 1998) and cultural socialization (Salinas, Fránquiz, & Guberman, 2006). Finally, we must add Rosenblatt's (1986) emphasis on the transaction "between a particular reader and a particular text at a particular time, and under particular circumstances" (p. 123). Rosenblatt describes the reader as having a lived-through experience (an "aesthetic" stance) or as obtaining information (an "efferent" stance).

Many influential accounts explore the cognitive (Eskey, 2005; Koda, 2005), social (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 2001) and cultural/critical (Freire, 2000; Gay, 2000) aspects of L2 literacy. These theories can be combined into a more comprehensive account of various dimensions of how ELs approach English text (Fitzgerald, 2003; Grabe, 2009). Learners use cognitive strategies in context, taking advantage of sociocultural affordances as they read. I adopt this more comprehensive approach in my account of ELs reading strategies.

Cognitive aspects of L2 reading

Cognitive approaches to L2 reading generally fall on a continuum from bottom-up (Eskey, 2005; Koda, 2005) to top-down approaches (Carrell, 1988). A bottom-up approach emphasizes L2 readers' vocabulary knowledge (Haynes & Baker, 1993) and the language of the text (Eskey, 2005). Bottom-up processing involves word recognition, spelling and phonological processing, morphosyntactic parsing, and lexical recognition and access (Hinkel, 2006). In contrast, Hirsch (2006) works from the top down, focusing on readers' background knowledge.

Many argue that bottom-up and top-down approaches can enhance each other (Koda, 2005; Nunan, 2003), and that they should be adopted together. Grabe (2009) adopts key concepts from both bottom-up and top-down accounts, elaborating implicit and explicit dimensions of language learning, selective attention, noticing, consciousness, and inferencing. But Grabe also argues that cognitive approaches do not fully explain how ELs make meaning in context. They must connect contextual information and practices to their cognitive processing; "Every L2 student has a prior history that includes a range of sociocultural influences from both L1 and L2 social and educational experiences" (Grabe, 2009, p. 173). In order to conceptualize and facilitate L2 reading, we need to understand not only cognitive and linguistic processing but also cultural contexts and prior experiences.

Sociocultural aspects of L2 reading

Reading is also sociocultural, meaning construction that occurs within sociocultural practices (Perez, 1998). Eksner and Orellana (2012) explore how children and adults collaborate in the construction of knowledge, examining "language-brokering activities" (p. 196) as socially situated tasks in which speakers help each other. Learning to read and write involves the learner working herself into a new set of social and cultural activities, becoming the type of person who engages in those activities, and thus changing the self and perhaps creating agency (Reyes, 2003).

Davidson (2010) argues for the integration of cognitive and sociocultural perspectives on reading. Students are socially situated in school settings, and literacy development occurs through an interaction between cognitive, motivational, environmental and social factors. Perez (1998) and Moll et al. (2001) discuss the importance of ELs' *funds of knowledge*, referring to the "historically accumulated and culturally developed bodies of knowledge and skills essential for household or individual functioning and well-being" (p. 133) that children encounter in language-learning experiences at home. Salinas, Fránquiz, and Guberman (2006) build on Gonzalez, Moll, and

Amanti (2005) to show how instruction can include ELs' previous historical knowledge. This approach uses social context to help students develop both cognitive and cultural aspects of literacy.

Integrating the cognitive and sociocultural perspectives

Rosenblatt (1995) describes how “the stream of consciousness includes both cognitive and affective elements” (p. 350) in reading. Experiential qualities of what is being evoked during the reading event include thinking and intellectual association as well as affective aspects such as feeling, images, and sensations (Rosenblatt, 1995). Park (2012) develops this approach in her reimagination of reader-response pedagogy. She adopts aspects of Rosenblatt, but also includes cultural and critical perspectives on language learners' experiences. She describes reading as not only a cognitive activity, but also “a critical and communal practice” involving a reading community. Lewis (2000) extends Rosenblatt (1995) in a different direction, addressing the aesthetic pleasure of reading as well as the social and political dimensions of texts, inviting students to engage in both the personal and the critical.

We must explore L2 reading holistically, describing how ELs construct meaning from texts within social contexts (Fitzgerald, 2003). We must also investigate diverse ELs. This study does this by focusing on reading strategies used by diverse learners. Reading strategies are cognitive tools. I investigate how ELs use these tools in social and cultural contexts, adopting a simultaneously cognitive and sociocultural approach, one that also attend to the personal and the critical.

Purpose and research questions

This study investigates four elementary ELs' meaning construction while reading texts in and out of school. I use verbal protocols and qualitative observations to uncover diverse ELs' reading strategies. The research questions are: (a) What strategies do four diverse elementary English learners employ when they read culturally relevant and culturally distant stories?; (b) How does each English learner use these strategies to make meaning while reading in various social settings?; and (c) What are the similarities and differences in strategy use when reading culturally relevant and distant materials?

Design

I observed four second- and third-grade ELs in two language-arts classrooms at an urban middle-class public elementary school in the American Southwest. This was a predominantly qualitative mixed-methods study that used verbal protocols to collect students' responses while they were reading stories (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Qualitative research offers holistic descriptions of participants' voices (Merriam, 2009), describing their participation in and understandings of literacy events. Verbal protocols are useful for investigating reading comprehension (Chamot & El-Dinary, 1999; Ericsson & Simon, 1984/1993), capturing thinking processes as they occur (Ericsson & Simon, 1993). I use both retrospective protocols (gathering information using prompts after reading) and concurrent protocols (gathering information during the task). In a typical session, I recorded ELs' immediate responses while reading (Davis & Bistodeau, 1993) and used prompts like “What are you thinking as you are reading this?” and “How do you feel after reading this story?”

Setting and participants

Brown Elementary School (all names are pseudonyms) is located in a middle-class area of a Southwestern city. The school had EL students from various countries. The school was ranked in the top 30% of city schools at the time of the study. The 599 students identified as White (57%), Hispanic (25%), Asian/Pacific Islander (12%), and other (6%). I observed Ms. Green's language-arts and literature classroom for 10 months and Ms. Lopez's classroom for 5 months. These were both

Table 1. Participants' background information.

Name	Ethnicity	Gender	Age	Length of Residency in the U.S.	Home Language	English language proficiency	L1 proficiency
Hiroki	Japanese	Male	7	18 months	Japanese	Intermediate	Fluent
Jaewon	Korean	Male	7	Born in the U.S.	Korean	Fluent	Fluent
Maria	American Mexican	Female	8	10 months	Spanish	Beginner	Fluent
Evert	American Swedish	Male	9	1 week	Swedish	Newcomer	Fluent

certified ESL teachers. Both paid attention to ELs and promoted interaction among students using small-group activities. Ms. Green emphasized collaborative learning and encouraged students to work in groups and help one another.

Using purposive sampling (Merriam, 2009), I selected three second-grade and one third-grade EL as participants. Evert, the third grader, joined the class as part of his ESL pull-out program, because the teacher was ESOL certified. The four ELs had different first languages and cultures and had spoken English for less than 3 years. They had various levels of English proficiency and different L2 learning experiences. I assessed each EL's English proficiency using teachers' evaluations, standardized test scores, school diagnostic reports, STAR reading tests of students' reading comprehension, classroom assessments, and my own observations. I assessed their L1 proficiency using their parents' evaluations, school documents, and my own observations. On the STAR English Reading Diagnostic report, Jaewon received a Grade Equivalent (GE) score of 2.6 and national percentile of 76. Hiroki had a GE score of 2.2 and 49%. Maria's GE score was 1.6 and 10%. Evert had just arrived in the United States, with no English proficiency, and did not take the test during the research period.

Materials

The literacy materials included culturally relevant and culturally distant content. I chose readings based on ELs' L1 background, cognitive abilities, reading level, and English proficiency, following Bishop's (1993) attention to cultural authenticity, the characters' language, picture quality, and how people of color are characterized. As Gay (2000) points out, *culturally relevant* is not a simple matter of match or mismatch. Cultural relevance is not alignment with a fixed set of beliefs and practices, because cultures are dynamic. We must attend to heterogeneous ethnicities, languages, practices, beliefs, and values (Bishop, 1993). Cultural relevance requires attention to the ethnicity of characters, settings, times, ages and gender of the characters, the language and dialect used, the genre of the text, readers' background experiences (Ebe, 2011), habitual activities and values that immigrant children will likely find familiar, without assuming all people from a culture are the same. *Culturally relevant* stories, as I defined them, included concepts, ethnicities, first language, values, beliefs, and experiences familiar in the EL's home culture, focusing on seminal experiences such as arrival in the United States and adjusting to a new language and culture. Ebe (2011) argues that culturally relevant literature contains real life images, familiar plots or events, and connections with real life.

The culturally relevant stories included *I Hate English* (Levine, 1989) for Evert and Maria, because of the protagonist's frustrations in learning English; *Pettson and Findus* (Erbert & Nordqvist, 2001), a Swedish folk tale, for Evert; *Family Pictures: Cuadros de mi Familia* (Garza, 1990) for Maria, because it discusses Mexico; *Woodcutter and Tiger Brother* (Rhee, 1988) for Jaewon, because it discusses Korea; and *Passage to Freedom: The sugihara story* (Mochizuki, 1997), a Japanese story, for Hiroki. Culturally distant materials included *Wilfrid Gordon MacDonalld Partridge* (Fox, 1984) and *The Wall* (Cruz, 1984) for Evert and Maria, and *Follow the Dream* (Sis, 1991) and *Encounter* (Yolen, 1996) for Jaewon and Hiroki. I provided different texts for the two pairs of students because of their different English proficiency. The study did not compare their reading performance, but rather examined their use of reading strategies with culturally relevant and distant texts. This study draws on a larger

data set that included protocols from students' responses to twelve books. For this study, data come from nine of these twelve protocols.

Data collection and analysis

This qualitative 15-month study explored how the ELs adopted L2 reading strategies in the language-arts classroom. I relied on four sources of data, including:

- Observation: As a participant observer for 15 months, I visited the classrooms once or twice a week and visited the students' homes eight times.
- Interviews: I conducted two interviews with each participant, their parents, and their teachers (about 50 minutes each). Evert's mother participated in Evert's first interview as a translator. After that, Evert was able to participate with limited help from his mother.
- Documents: I reviewed ELs' classroom documents (reading responses, journals, and test scores).
- Verbal protocols: Each student completed verbal protocols for each story. Each protocol included both oral think-aloud commentary while reading and retrospective commentary on the reading experience. Participants read a short story with me present. They described what they were thinking and how they were reading to me, during and immediately after completion of the task. I also prompted them with questions about their reading, asking them to retell the story, describe their thought processes, and provide their reactions. The full protocol can be found in the Appendix.

Data analysis involved three stages of coding. During *open coding*, I coded key words or concepts to capture what each participant said. In analyzing the data at this first stage, I drew in part on themes from previous studies (Olshavsky, 1975; Scotto-Boyan, 2002). Olshavsky discusses three categories of responses: behavior related to words, behavior related to clauses, such as inference, and behavior related to story. Scotto-Boyan (2002) describes nine strategies: literal text, linking prior knowledge to text, prediction, inference, linking prior text and prior dialogue, hypothesis generating or evaluation of text, re-reading text, seeking additional information through questioning, and reading ahead. I borrowed from this work in doing my open coding. I also used categories from the literature like logical conclusion, prediction, inference, reasoning, presumption, and speculation in order to identify the strategy in any given piece of data.

During axial coding, the second stage, my coding sewed together saturated subcategories to form new thematic categories. *Axial coding* involves relating codes to each other, "making a family" as it is described in *Atlas.ti*. I reviewed emerging concepts and clustered them with similar concepts. For example, logical conclusion, prediction, inference, reasoning, presumption, and speculation can be clustered as *inferential thinking*. This process of clustering yielded the 12 reading strategies that I describe below. I subsequently grouped these strategies into two main categories: higher order thinking strategies, primarily cognitive in nature, and social-contextual reading strategies more closely linked to sociocultural contexts and emotions.

At the third stage 3 I compared new themes across the four participants to identify similarities and differences. For example, "connecting to background knowledge" was something that all four subjects did similarly, but there were also significant differences in the L2 learning experience across beginner and more advanced ELs. I also analyzed other qualitative data, including transcribed interviews, observation notes, and reflective journals, using the same coding procedure.

I used my own experiences as an EL to help understand these ELs' situations. As an East Asian immigrant, I know what it means to learn English, though I did so as an adult. Mindful of my biases, I triangulated across data sources, identifying robust findings. I conducted member checks with participants by explaining what I had understood them to say during the interviews. I also did peer debriefing with two colleagues with expertise in the field, during four sessions in which we reviewed

25% of the data. I kept a reflexive journal (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) to enhance the study's trustworthiness. Qualitative research does not yield immediate generalizations, but by capturing voices we can provide thick description (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), and multiple sources of data allow triangulation to enhance trustworthiness and provide potential generalizability.

Results

To understand how ELs make meaning while reading stories, it is critical to understand when, why, and how they use reading strategies in social context. This section describes their uses of the reading strategies. By exploring their varied use of strategies with culturally relevant and culturally distant texts, I analyze how cultural experiences and positions influenced their reading.

A comprehensive set of literacy strategies

To answer the first research question, I identified two broad types of reading strategies: higher order thinking strategies and social-contextual reading strategies. In the first category, ELs *connected to the text (intertextuality)*, connecting elements from the text to other texts they had read. They used *inferential thinking*, applying prior knowledge and textual information to draw conclusions, make critical judgments, and form original interpretations of the text. They *identified main ideas and significance*, which helped them grasp important information while reading. *Comprehension monitoring* enabled the ELs to monitor their own comprehension and determine the author's intention. ELs engaged in *questioning*, testing the significance or veracity of information. *Summarizing* helped ELs briefly identify the main ideas, and *synthesizing* created an overview. *Evaluation* helped ELs evaluate their understanding of new information.

Social-contextual reading strategies added a second dimension to reading, in which ELs went beyond cognitive aspects of the text. *Connecting to oneself* helped ELs relate the text to their prior experiences. In *connecting to the world*, readers drew on information about their own countries and cultures as well as the larger world. *Visualization* involved the creation of mental images while reading. The ELs used *rhetorical strategies*, translating materials into their L1 and/or drawing on their L1 literacy skills to comprehend the L2 text while attending to character and genre analysis, author's attitude, purpose, and setting. Finally, by utilizing *socioaffective strategies*, ELs interacted with peers, teachers, and family while comprehending stories.

Table A1 represents these 12 strategies, together with a description of each strategy and samples from the four ELs. The table can be found in the appendix. Most of these higher-order thinking strategies are similar to ones described in earlier work (e.g., Hartman, 1995; Keene & Zimmermann, 1997; Olshavsky, 1975; Scotto-Boyan, 2002). Among the social-contextual reading strategies, *visualization*, *rhetorical* and *socioaffective strategies* are more distinctive to this study.

English learners' responsive reading

This section answers the final two research questions, and describes each EL's use of reading strategies, highlighting his or her two most-used strategies. There were similarities and differences among the students, mainly resulting from the different texts, their varying English proficiency, and their cultural backgrounds.

Japanese-American, Hiroki

Hiroki was 7 years old, and an excellent problem solver who was fascinated with creating new ideas. Hiroki spoke Japanese fluently at home and had 18 months of L2 English experience, reaching an intermediate level. Sociable, he interacted with many classmates and volunteered in class. Hiroki often interacted with Jaewon, despite the distance between their desks. Hiroki and Jaewon were connected with and supported each other, and Hiroki described Jaewon as his best friend.

When I visited Hiroki's home, I discovered that his mother engaged him in extracurricular activities in Japanese social studies, Japanese history, and Kanji, using Chinese characters to practice his L1. He was a fluent and skillful reader in his L1. His goal in developing L2 reading skills was practical: "I will get a good job." After reading *Passage to Freedom*, a culturally relevant story for him, Hiroki used visualization to build complex mental images of the text. For example, he told me about a mental image of "the person twisting and tossing in his bed." He continued, "Yeah. I like to imagine 'cause then I'll have another picture that is not in the book." These mental images that Hiroki created from the text led him to deeper understanding.

Hiroki used eleven reading strategies (all except the rhetorical strategy) frequently and effectively, but he most frequently used higher order thinking strategies. When reading *Follow the Dream*, a culturally distant story about Christopher Columbus, Hiroki decided to advocate for Columbus and to justify his journey. Hiroki admired Columbus' adventurous personality. He said, "I thought that he was pretty brave to go see—to go around the world. This book is more informative" about Christopher Columbus's journey as an explorer and "this [*Encounter*, a story about Columbus that takes a Native American perspective] is part of a different story about this event."

Utilizing the *comprehension monitoring strategy*, Hiroki connected these two cultural and evaluative perspectives and demonstrated their value. After reading *Follow the Dream* and seeing Columbus as the "hero" who discovered America, Hiroki said, "I learned that [Columbus] discovered the- he, like, helped the world, because they all thought that the world was flat, and they thought- they didn't know America." However, while reading *Encounter*, Hiroki discussed the concept of *invader*. His *evaluation* showed a critical reaction while reading *Encounter*, adopting the Native American perspective. "[*Encounter*] doesn't say anything about Christopher Columbus. It doesn't say the word anywhere. I think [Christopher Columbus] shouldn't [have kidnapped Native American people]. Not the land, just the [Native] American people." Here Hiroki expresses an objection to Christopher Columbus' landing in the Western hemisphere, positioning him as an invader. He also used *intertextuality* (Hartman, 1995) between these two versions of the Christopher Columbus story. Hiroki said: "They shouldn't come to America without [Native Americans'] permission." Intertextuality and inferential thinking have traditionally been considered cognitive aspects of reading, but these are also closely linked to sociocultural contexts of reading. L2 readers' comprehension reflects their value systems and identities, as we can see in Hiroki's negative evaluation of Christopher Columbus' landing. After reading the story, Hiroki thought his friends should read both versions of the story, in order to know Columbus more fully. He suggested that other readers go through the same dialogic process that he did, exploring both perspectives and relating this to their own experiences in order to build more complex accounts of Columbus.

Korean-American, Jaewon

Jaewon (7 years old) was a confident second grader who was born in the United States. Jaewon defined reading as "brain power," revealing a positive attitude. Jaewon interacted with Hiroki frequently and they often chose to work together. He learned Korean as his first language and spoke it fluently at home. Jaewon learned English as a second language when he entered preschool, and by the time of the study he was fluent in English also. His case illustrates how an EL's belief system can draw on family culture and influence the EL's literacy-learning experience. He regularly wrote dialogue journals at home in Korean. He enjoyed reading and writing in both English and Korean.

Jaewon used all 12 strategies, often in conjunction with each other. He chose among the various strategies depending on the task at hand. He often used social-contextual reading strategies, as when he drew on his cultural background while reading *Woodcutter and Tiger Brother*. In Korea, there is a strong belief that offspring should take care of their parents when they grow old. Jaewon supported Tiger's dutiful behavior toward his old mother, such as bringing animals for her to eat. He claimed that "The Korean version is better. It's my main language ... The sense of meaning is a little bit better."

Jaewon used the higher order thinking strategies of *summarizing*, *synthesizing*, *evaluation*, and *intertextuality*. While reading the two versions of the Christopher Columbus story, Jaewon marked an O [a Korean convention indicating a positive evaluation] and X [a negative evaluation] to assess the story: “This [*Encounter*] might be also O [positive] or X [negative] and this one [*Follow the dream*] would be O [positive] ‘cause this [*Encounter*] has landing information, and this [*Follow the dream*] just has traveling information, and it’s just different.” He continued, “Like moving, so if you combine these two books together, like this [showing me the two books overlapped], they would know that it’s Christopher.”

As a synthesizer and evaluator, Jaewon evaluated Columbus by combining perspectives from both books. He often created critical points of view based on his theory building, sociocultural values, and prior knowledge. He dialogued with texts and became a rewriter while reading stories (Freire, 1970), creating new viewpoints about the story. He represented the two authors’ intentions and purposes after reading the two versions of the Christopher Columbus story by stating, “These are different! Are they same? No!” He also provided various *inferences* during classroom reading periods. His emerging critical perspective provides a clear example of how cognitive aspects of reading are interrelated with sociocultural aspects. He used aspects of his own identity and cultural background knowledge as part of the bottom-up inferences he made about the meaning of the stories.

Mexican-American, Maria

Maria (8 years old) learned Spanish as her first language in Mexico and had lived in the United States for 10 months when I met her. Her English was still at a beginner level. Maria lived with her mother in a small apartment around the corner from the school. Maria’s mother learned English as a first language in the United States then moved to Mexico and lived for 27 years, working as an EFL teacher and an editor in Mexico. She took care of Maria by herself, as Maria’s father remained in Mexico.

Her mother said that Maria’s L1 knowledge supported her learning English as a second language, such as how to use grammatical structures. For example, Maria’s mother said, “It’s interesting. I was surprised ‘cause I expected it to be—to come choppy. Mom, water—and it wasn’t. It was, “Mom can I have a glass of water? Please.” Maria knew how to formulate clauses in Spanish, and she did not use English until she was prepared to speak in entire sentences. Maria displayed her preference for Spanish by speaking it at home, and used Spanish often while reading English stories. At the beginning of my observations, she wrote many school assignments in Spanish, but eventually she switched to writing in English. Ms. Green paid careful attention and did not push her to use English. She provided various resources such as bilingual flash cards. She waited until Maria chose to use English, on her own. When the change happened, Ms. Green was very excited and rushed to tell me.

Maria used nine reading strategies (all but *intertextuality*, *inferences*, and *rhetoric*), especially the social-contextual reading strategies. She drew on her personal opinions, culture, and experiences as she read. She developed impressive insights when reading culturally relevant stories and showed empathy as well, mostly using social-contextual reading strategies such as *connection to self* and *socioaffective strategies*. These two strategies are similar, but the former involves making a connection to the story (e.g., remembering a similar event) while the latter creates momentum, creating a lived-through experience (Rosenblatt, 1978). Her prior knowledge motivated Maria to read *Family Pictures* and *I Hate English*. She identified closely with the protagonists, mostly using the *connecting to oneself* and *socioaffective strategies*. For example, she once spontaneously spoke and sang in Spanish while reading *Family Pictures*, describing a piñata:

They put you a little thing and they turn you around three times and they sing a little song, that’s kind of, ‘*Dale, dale, dale, pégale asina, porque si no le das pierdes el camino.*’ It’s like hit it, hit it. It’s kind of hard to translate it.

Singing a song for the piñata, Maria showed strong connection to these stories. She also said that the story strengthened her affection for her father back in Mexico. This example shows how cultural aspects could improve Maria’s engagement and L2 reading comprehension.

Maria often used *socioaffective strategies* to comprehend stories. She strongly identified with Mei Mei, the main character of *I Hate English*: “She [Mei Mei] wants to speak Chinese, and they want her

to speak English, so she [Mei Mei] came here and doesn't want to speak English, only wants to speak Chinese." Maria empathized with Mei Mei's resistance to English and compared it to her own situation. Echoing the book, at one point she said "I am losing my Spanish," demonstrating worry about language loss. Maria wanted to practice Spanish in order to maintain her ability to communicate with her father, who did not speak English. But Maria also recognized the power of English proficiency in her social world, and this created anxiety.

Maria used the *evaluation strategy* after reading "The Wall," which was a culturally distant story for her. Her evaluation was closely linked to her social values and morals. She drew "two lessons. Never to say things that you don't know. If you're good at or if you're not good at. And never tease someone. Never hurt somebody's feelings." She connected her cognitive understanding of the story to her value system, as she evaluated what is appropriate behavior in a context like this.

Swedish-American, Evert

Evert (9 years old) and his family came to the United States from Sweden one week before the study began. Evert lived with his father, mother, and a younger sister. Evert's father was pursuing a Ph.D. The family planned to stay in the United States for 2 years. A third grader in Sweden, he came to this second-grade classroom as a pull-out student, because the teachers were ESOL certified. Fluent in Swedish, he was an English beginner. Drawing on his fluency in Swedish, including advanced reading and writing skills, Evert's L2 English development was extraordinary.

At the beginning, Ms. Green partnered him with another Swedish boy whose name was Simon. After a while, she noted that Simon was falling behind in his work. That was about 4 months after Evert arrived. However, about this time Evert was able to read a first-grade reading book in English with only minimal help, and Simon went back to working by himself. Evert had studied some English as a foreign language in Sweden before coming to the United States, and his mother was a teacher and worked with him on English every day after school. The family mostly spoke Swedish, but they regularly read books in both languages.

Evert used nine of the 12 reading strategies (all but inferences, visualization, and synthesizing). He was able to conduct verbal protocols just four months after his arrival, with minor assistance from his mother. Evert often used *connection to self*, *socioaffective strategies*, *rhetorical strategies*, and *comprehension monitoring* while reading stories. The frequently used were *connection to self* (Carrell, 1988) and *rhetorical strategies*, which transferred well from his L1 literacy skills, representing what Koda and Reddy (2008) describe as *cross-linguistic transfer*. Evert used these strategies often and was very engaged in reading. He explained how to use his L1 literacy skills: "So maybe understanding or like, for example, you know how to sit and then to read or you know how book start, and then the main event and then the ending." While reading L2 stories he used genre analysis, character analysis, and style, and he also made inferences about the author's intentions and purpose, all skills he transferred from his L1 literacy.

At one point, while reading at home, Evert asked his mother what the English word *memory* meant in Swedish, because it was a new word for him. I coded this under *rhetorical strategies*, which also includes transferring L1 word knowledge to understand a L2 word (Koda & Reddy, 2008). After reading *Wilfred Gordon and Partridge*, Evert defined the new word "memory" as "You remember things. Something you have done. Something very sad or something happy." Evert did not understand *memory* in English, although he knew the concept in Swedish. But after he asked his mother to explain the word, he was able to transfer the knowledge from his L1. Literacy challenges like this stimulated the ELs not only to try to infer meanings from context, but also to ask others for help.

Like Maria, Evert used *connection to self* in reading about the character Mei Mei. He identified with Mei Mei's feelings, her struggles, and her frustration: "Yeah. I know how she feels. I felt the same thing as her when I came to a new country." While he read the story he created rich dialogue between himself and the character. Evert appeared to adopt Mei Mei's feelings and struggles as his own, and this made him feel better. At one point he said, "I want my friend to read this story. They will understand me better." He understood the need for peer compassion, and felt sharing this story would generate understanding and build community.

Discussion

These ELs used all 12 reading strategies, in ways that involved cognitive, social, and cultural processes (Gonzalez et al., 2005; Koda, 2005; Perez, 1998; Rumelhart, 1980). One striking finding is how social-contextual reading strategies such as *connection to oneself*, *connection to the world*, *visualization*, *rhetorical strategies*, and *socioaffective strategies* drew deeply on the ELs' cultural heritage, L1, morals, and beliefs. Students adopted these strategies by observing and talking with teachers, family and peers. Classrooms provide a space for ELs to interact with peers and the teacher (Franquíz, 2003) and to practice their second language, connecting it to their L1 language and culture. The dialogic strategies used by the ELs to construct meaning were deeply rooted in their social and cultural beliefs (Kim, 2009; Weaver, 2002) and were influenced by the classroom and broader social context (Jang & Jimenez, 2011).

Another notable finding describes the intersection between proficiency and culturally relevant texts. Park (2015) describes how proficient and less proficient readers utilize almost the same strategies, but that proficient readers use strategies more frequently. Similarly, Ahmadian, Poulki, and Farahani (2016) describe how high scoring IELTS candidates use cognitive and metacognitive strategies more frequently than lower scoring ones. I also found this to be the case, as the less proficient readers used less diverse strategies, less often. However, by looking at both culturally relevant and culturally distant texts, I was able to see an intersecting pattern that may help us serve ELs more effectively. I found that the less proficient ELs favored culturally relevant texts, while intermediate and fluent ELs readily engaged with different types of texts. The beginners Maria and Evert felt safe and empowered while reading culturally relevant texts. Table A1 shows that Maria and Evert used socio-contextual reading strategies like *connection to self* and *socioaffective reading strategies* preferentially when reading culturally distant stories. As Jang & Jimenez (2011) note, the fit between EL's cultural backgrounds and the text may motivate them to engage in reading. Maria, for instance, began singing a Spanish song while reading *Family Pictures* and explained the piñata to me. Evert explained the story of *Pettson and Findus* while describing his culture. Maria and Evert, as experts on their own culture, revealed their social and cultural competence while reading culturally relevant stories. Maria and Evert did sometimes connect to culturally distant stories such as *Wilfred Gordon and Partridge* and *The Wall*, using higher order strategies like *connection to text*, *identifying main ideas and importance*, *comprehension monitoring*, and *evaluation*, despite the fact that they often struggled to comprehend the content of stories or new words. But with these stories they more often needed help from adults.

In contrast, the more advanced ELs emphasized other strategies in their reading, favoring higher order thinking reading strategies such as *connection to the text*, *inference*, *questioning*, *synthesizing*, and *evaluation* (focusing on text content). As shown by their sophisticated understandings and evaluations of the divergent stories about Christopher Columbus, they were able to engage in dialogic thinking while reading culturally distant texts. They did not do noticeably better with culturally relevant stories, although they read these stories just as competently. All students used various reading strategies, as shown in Table A1. More proficient learners used different kinds of strategies than less proficient learners. The ELs often connected their L1 language and literacy and to their own experiences (Kim, 2009; Koda & Reddy, 2008). These four ELs' reading processes demonstrated two levels of L2 reading processes: "transactional" (Rosenblatt, 1978) for beginner ELs, and "dialogic-critical" (Bakhtin, 1986, Freire, 1970) for intermediate and fluent ELs.

Transactional L2 reading in social space

The learners in my study made *connections to self* and used *socioaffective strategies*. Maria and Evert made strong connections to their cultural knowledge and cultural experiences in order to make sense of the text by expressing empathy with it. As Rosenblatt (1978) suggests with her account of transactional reading as "living through experiences," *connection to self* is a strategy that draws on sociocultural aspects. Culturally relevant texts provided a safer and more comfortable environment

for the beginners (Kim, 2009; Gay, 2000). Maria's case illustrated her engagement while reading *Family Pictures*, which portrayed her home culture. Maria fondly recalled her father, who lives in Mexico, after reading the birthday chapter in *Family Pictures: Cuadros de mi Familia*. Her spontaneous singing demonstrated her engagement with the story and her ownership of learning (Cummins, 1992). Evert had similar experiences while reading *Pettson and Findus*. Culturally relevant texts motivated the ELs to engage in reading. Cultural aspects of L2 literacy practice led to motivation and empowerment (Fránquiz, 2003). Like Maria, Evert identified with Mei Mei's feelings while reading *I Hate English*. Maria and Evert engaged with this story by connecting it to their lived-through experiences (Rosenblatt, 1978). While reading a culturally relevant book, Maria more often used *connection to self* (Maria used it 17 times and Evert 16), compared to Hiroki and Jaewon, with 9 and 6 respectively (see Table A1). Reader-response theory describes how readers use personal knowledge, insight, and imagination to experience the text, as they make sense of the story based on their own knowledge and actively bring their experience to the text (Park, 2012).

Maria and Evert developed transactional momentum (Rosenblatt, 1978) between themselves and Mei Mei, connecting their own experiences. They extended their relationship to their friends, asking friends to read this story about their experience as English language learners in order to create empathy (Rosenblatt, 1978). Cultural background and experiences are critical resources as ELs adjust, learn English and begin to engage in transactional reading and eventually expand to critical reading. Linking new cultural experiences to their culture is important. By asking their classmates to read *I Hate English*, they demonstrated their desire for learning communities that show empathy and respect (Jang & Jimenez, 2011).

As intermediate and fluent learners, Jaewon and Hiroki were also read stories and connect them to culturally relevant value systems. Hiroki was able to create mental images while reading *Passage to Freedom*. ELs were able to relate the stories to culturally familiar material. This sometimes allowed them to identify with the stories, using *connecting to self*. Hiroki and Jaewon used strategies that simultaneously had cognitive and sociocultural dimensions. Rosenblatt (1986) emphasizes the importance of seeing any reading event in its personal, social, cultural aspects, but she also extends her reading pedagogy to critical interpretation and evaluation (2003). Reading can be viewed as a political matter because it examines experience across social dimensions (Cai, 2008).

Critical L2 reading in social space

Hiroki and Jaewon drew upon extensive background knowledge to clarify the contents of the stories, adeptly using schema strategies (Rumelhart, 1980), a more sophisticated cognitive approach than Maria and Evert were able to manage. They compared and contrasted preexisting knowledge while acquiring new information, making critical judgments and evaluations. They used these cognitive strategies to construct meaning in social context, using inferential thinking and evaluation to create meaning between themselves and the text and sometimes between themselves and peers. These cultural experiences also stimulated their thinking skills and led to critical thinking (Freire, 1970). Critical reading in L2 acknowledges and incorporates one's social and political views in reading. This goes beyond a personal aesthetic reading response, including expansion as new voices are incorporated into the conversation.

Critical reading in L2 first involves conversation between the reader and the author. Then it involves an openness to multiple viewpoints found in the text and the social surround, with multiple voices populating an ongoing conversation (Bakhtin, 1985). Such conversation involves a reader's personal experience and insights, but it is also sociocultural and contextual, encompassing social, historical, and political dimensions that make critical reading possible.

While reading *Follow the Dream*, Hiroki thought dialogically about two concrete facts: from the European perspective, Christopher Columbus discovered America; but from the Native American perspective he was an invader who came without permission. Hiroki and Jaewon considered *Follow the Dream* a very informative history and *Encounter* a well-written story, but they were puzzled by

the two different perspectives on the same historical figure. Jaewon resolved this confusion by concluding that the two versions of Christopher Columbus stemmed from the authors' divergent intentions. Hiroki identified more with *Follow the Dream*, emphasizing Columbus's discovery. While reading *Encounter*, however, he observed, "They shouldn't come without [Native American's] permission," and thus he displayed a critical stance and established some distance from his earlier embrace of Columbus. While Jaewon and Hiroki used *inferential thinking*, a cognitive strategy, they also drew on their cultural knowledge (using *connections to self*) and information from other texts (*intertextuality*) to make critical judgments. Their insights depended on interconnections between cognitive and sociocultural strategies.

Hiroki and Jaewon said that their friends needed to read both books, so that they could engage in dialogue with the two perspectives. Jaewon and Hiroki became "rewriters" (Freire, 2000; Park, 2012) after reading the two versions. Their new account of Christopher Columbus presented him as both hero and invader. In this way the advanced ELs used dialogic-critical thinking skills to connect to culturally distant texts. A relatively high level of English proficiency may be required to develop dialogic thinking (Bakhtin, 1986), even though it is not necessary for responsive reading. Just as Evert urged his friends to read *I Hate English*, Hiroki and Jaewon recommended that their friends read the two depictions of Christopher Columbus. They all sensed the importance of creating positive community, an important resource in classrooms.

Implications and conclusion

The study describes how it can be productive to combine cognitive and sociocultural approaches: the ELs' used reading strategies that represent cognitive aspects of L2 literacy, but they did so by weaving in content that was closely linked to their sociocultural contexts. The integration of cognitive and sociocultural approaches is essential to advance reading instruction for L2 learners (Davidson, 2010). Instead of one sided approaches, we need to combine these approaches in order to understand reading processes and support reading comprehension. The study also reiterates an important point about cultural approaches to reading instruction. Readers are cultural beings, inevitably shaped by and drawing on cultural beliefs and values. By allowing connections to culturally relevant aspects, readers improve their confidence and read more effectively. I have shown that the implications of this vary for more and less advanced readers. Culturally relevant texts are more important for beginning readers. All readers are socioculturally positioned, and all readers use sociocultural strategies, but the funds of knowledge and motivation made possible by culturally relevant stories are more important for beginners.

This study also describes 12 reading strategies that ELs use for L2 literacy, divided into two categories: higher order thinking strategies and social-contextual reading strategies. Some of these reading strategies are familiar, but others are less commonly described. The addition of social-contextual strategies also provides a way of understanding how to embed EL reading within larger contexts that impact the lives of immigrant learners. Understanding and applying these various reading strategies effectively is crucial as educators work to support L2 readers.

Effective instruction in these reading strategies can facilitate ELs' reading comprehension (Kim, 2009). Selecting proper reading strategies and forming connections with extratextual material, such as materials to relating to oneself, other texts, and other people, are pivotal. Cognitive strategies such as inferential thinking, intertextuality, monitoring comprehension, and evaluation are deeply linked to sociocultural reading strategies such as *connection to self* and *socioaffective strategies*. For example, making inferences from background knowledge can develop into a critical analysis of a text when ELs engage cultural background knowledge. In this way a cognitive approach can support a socio-cultural approach, and vice versa.

These 12 reading strategies can productively be embedded into daily teaching (Kim, 2009). Because of the flexibility and heterogeneity of the strategies, educators can create different course goals and materials for different ELs. I recommend that teachers use a think-aloud method to teach the reading strategies to

ELs. Modeling is crucial. The teacher thinks aloud as s/he reads each sentence, drawing on various reading strategies. The teacher shows how to understand each sentence using one or more strategies and invites ELs' response to the text. For instance, to practice "identifying main ideas in a text," the teacher could ask questions like "What parts of the story are most important?" "What did you learn from the story?" "What key words form the story?" Students could offer answers such as "this is an important word/sentence/paragraph because ..." and "I learned something new ..."

The strategies can maximize what the reader gains from reading instruction, and they can help students and educators value the social and cultural aspects of their L2 literacy practice. These strategies embrace ELs' ethnic and cultural heritage, cultural knowledge and values (Carrell, 1988), L1 literacy, and real-life experiences (Davis & Bistodeau, 1993). Using these strategies may promote a genuine dialogue with students (Park & Kim, 2016), leading them to embrace their own voices and helping them share their cultural and historical knowledge and experiences (Fránquiz, 2003) and become rewriters (Bakhtin, 1986; Park & Kim, 2016). Teaching L2 reading in this way can create a critical perception of *the word* and the transformation of *the world* through practical action and reflection (Freire, 2000).

Selecting texts that provide different viewpoints should be done carefully for each EL, depending on his/her cultural background, reading level, L1 literacy skills, and language proficiency (Bishop, 1993). Culturally distant materials challenge beginning ELs, while more advanced readers are able to comprehend culturally distant stories more critically. Beginners can identify with even culturally distant stories, and they are sometimes able to comprehend them by getting support from others, connecting to oneself, or evaluating the stories using their own social values. Teachers should combine cognitive and sociocultural approaches by encouraging ELs to use a mixture of reading strategies, providing a range of texts, and fostering a community of readers.

References

- Au, K. H. (1993). *Literacy instruction in multicultural settings*. Vermont, CA: Wadsworth.
- August, D., & Shanahan, T. (2006). *Executive summary: Developing reading and writing in second-language learners: Lessons from the report of the national literacy panel on language-minority children and youth*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ahmadian, M., Poulaki, S., & Farahani, E. (2016). Reading strategies used by high scoring and low scoring IELTS candidates: A think-aloud study. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 6, 408–416. doi:10.17507/tpls.0602.25
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays* (V. W. McGee, Trans.). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Bishop, R. S. (1993). Multicultural literature for children: Making informed choices. In V. J. Hanis (Ed.), *Teaching multicultural literature in Grades K–8* (pp. 37–53). Norwood, MA: Christopher Gordon.
- Cai, M. (2008). Transactional theory and the study of multicultural literature. *Language Arts*, 85(3), 212–119.
- Carrell, P. L. (1988). SLA and classroom instruction: Reading. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 9, 223–242. doi:10.1017/S02671905000091X
- Chamot, A. U., & El-Dinary, P. B. (1999). Children's learning strategies in immersion classrooms. *Modern Language Journal*, 83, 319–341. doi:10.1111/0026-7902.00025
- Cruz, A. (1984). *The wall*. New York, NY: Macmillan McGraw-Hill.
- Cummins, J. (1992). Language proficiency, bilingualism, and academic achievement. In P. A. Richard-Amato & M. A. Snow (Eds.), *The multicultural classroom* (pp. 16–26). New York, NY: Longman.
- Davidson, K. (2010). The integration of cognitive and sociocultural theories of literacy development: Why? How? *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 50, 246–256.
- Davis, J. N., & Bistodeau, L. (1993). How do L1 and L2 reading differ? Evidence from think aloud protocols. *Modern Language Journal*, 77, 459–472. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4781.1993.tb01993.x
- Ebe, A. E. (2011). Culturally relevant texts and reading assessment for English language learners. *Reading Horizons*, 50, 193–206.
- Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Eksner, H. J., & Orellana, M. F. (2012). Shifting in the zone: Latina/no child language brokers and the co-construction of knowledge. *Ethos: Journal of the Society for Psychological Anthropology*, 40(2), 196–220.
- Erbert, S., & Nordqvist, S., (2001) *Pettson and Findus*. Riverside, CA: Xenos.

- Ericsson, K. A., & Simon, H. A. (1993). *Protocol analysis: Verbal reports as data*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. (Original work published 1984)
- Eskey, D. (2005). Reading in a second language. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research on second language teaching and learning* (pp. 93–100). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Fitzgerald, J. (2003). Multilingual theory. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 38, 118–122.
- Fox, M. (1984). *Wilfrid Gordon McDonald Partridge*. La Jolla, CA: Kane/Miller.
- Fránquiz, M. E. (2003). It's about youth: Chicano high school students revising their academic identity. In M. L. Reyes & J. J. Halcon (Eds.), *The best for our children: Critical perspectives on literacy for Latino students* (pp. 168–185). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Freire, P. (1970). Cultural action and conscientization. *Harvard Educational Review*, 40, 452–477. doi:10.17763/haer.40.3.h76250x720j43175
- Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum International.
- Garza, C. (1990). *Family pictures: Cuadros de familia*. San Francisco, CA: Children's Book Press.
- Gay, J. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Gonzalez, N., Moll, L. C., & Amanti, C. (2005). *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households and classrooms*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Goodman, K. (1987). *Language and thinking in school: A whole-language curriculum*. New York, NY: R. C. Owen.
- Grabe, W. (2009). *Reading in a second language: Moving from theory to practice*. New York, NY: Cambridge Press.
- Hartman, D. K. (1995). Eight readers reading: The intertextual links of proficient readers reading multiple passages. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 30, 520–561. doi:10.2307/747631
- Haynes, M., & Baker, I. (1993). American and Chinese readers learning from lexical familiarization in English texts. In T. Huckin, M. Haynes, & J. Coady (Eds.), *Second language reading and vocabulary acquisition* (pp. 130–152). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Hinkel, E. (2006). Current perspectives on teaching the four skills. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40, 109–131. doi:10.2307/40264513
- Hirsch, E. D. (2006). *The knowledge deficit: Closing the shocking education gap for American children*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Jang, E.-Y., & Jimenez, R. T. (2011). A sociocultural perspective on second language learner strategies: Focus on the impact of social context. *Theory Into Practice*, 50, 141–148. doi:10.1080/00405841.2011.558443
- Keene, E. O., & Zimmermann, S. (1997). *Mosaic of thought: Teaching comprehension in a reader's workshop*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Kim, D. (2009). Working with texts to develop ESOL reading strategies. In L. Savova (Ed.), *Effective use of textbooks* (pp. 109–117). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Koda, K. (2005). Development of L2 intraword orthographic sensitivity and decoding skills. *Modern Language Journal*, 83, 51–64. doi:10.1111/0026-7902.00005
- Koda, K., & Reddy, P. (2008). Cross-linguistic transfer in second language reading. *Language Teaching*, 4, 497–508. doi:10.1017/S0261444808005211
- Levine, E. (1989). *I hate English*. New York, NY: Scholastic.
- Lewis, C. (2000). Critical issues: Limits of identification: The personal, pleasurable, and critical in reader response. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 32, 253–266. doi:10.1080/10862960009548076
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. London, UK: Sage.
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Mochizuki, K. (1997). *Passage to freedom: The sugihara story*. New York, NY: Lee & Low Books, Inc.
- Moll, L., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (2001). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory Into Practice*, 31(2), 132–141. doi:10.1080/00405849209543534
- National Center for Educational Statistics (2014). *The condition of education: English language learners*. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_cgf.asp
- Nunan, D. (2003). *Practical English language teaching*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Olshavsky, J. E. (1975). *An exploratory analysis of the reading process*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University.
- Park, H.-R., & Kim, D. (2016). English language learners' strategies for reading computer-based texts at home and in school. *CALICO Journal*, 33, 380–40. doi:10.1558/cj.v33i3.26552
- Park, J. Y. (2012). Re-imaging reader-response in middle and secondary schools: Early adolescent girls' critical and communal reader responses to the young adult novel speak. *Children's Literature in Education*, 43, 191–212. doi:10.1007/s10583-012-9164-5
- Park, J. (2015). Insights into Korean EFL students' reading motivation, proficiency, and strategy use. *English Teaching*, 70(1), 57–74. doi:10.15858/engtea.70.1.201503.57
- Perez, B. (1998). *Sociocultural contexts of language and literacy*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Reyes, M. D. (2003). Biliteracy in the primary grade. In M. L. Reyes & J. J. Halcon (Eds.), *The best for our children: Critical perspectives on literacy for Latino students* (pp. 168–185). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Rhee, N. (1988). *Woodcutter and tiger brother*. Seoul, South Korea: Design House.

- Rosenblatt, L. M. (1978). *The reader, the text, the poem: The transactional theory of the literary work*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Rosenblatt, L. M. (1986). The aesthetic transaction. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 20(4), 122–128. doi:10.2307/3332615
- Rosenblatt, L. M. (1995). Continuing the conversation: A clarification. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 29, 349–354.
- Rosenblatt, L. M. (2003). Literary theory. In D. Lapp, J. R. Squire, & J. M. Jensen (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching the English Language Arts* (2nd ed., pp. 67–73). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Rumelhart, D. E. (1980). Schemata: The building blocks of cognition. In R. J. Spiro, B. C. Bruce, & W. E. Brewer (Eds.), *Theoretical issues in reading comprehension* (pp. 33–58). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Salinas, C., Fránquiz, M., & Guberman, S. (2006). Introducing historical thinking to second language learners: Exploring what students know and what they want to know. *The Social Studies*, 97, 203–207. doi:10.3200/TSSS.97.5.203-207
- Scotto-Boyan, L. (2002). *An analysis of the reading strategies employed by fourth-grade students while thinking aloud in a group context*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Fordham University, Tarrytown, NY.
- Sis, P. (1991). *Follow the dream: The story of Christopher Columbus*. New York, NY: Knopf, Borzoi Books.
- Weaver, C. (2002). *Reading process and practice*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Yolen, J. (1996). *Encounter*. Orlando, FL: Voyager Books.

Appendix

The Verbal Protocol Sessions and Prompts

I use both retrospective protocols (gathering information using prompts after reading) and concurrent protocols (gathering information while performing the task) in a comfortable, safe, and friendly atmosphere. After performing the verbal-protocol sessions myself, participants followed my modeling. In a typical session, I recorded the ELs' immediate responses while reading (Davis & Bistodeau, 1993) and their responses to the prompts after each story. The procedure was the same for each session. Activities followed:

- (1) *Modeling think aloud while reading a short story* such as “What I am thinking about?”
- (2) *Practicing think aloud* such as “What were you thinking about?”
- (3) *Informing stage about the procedure*.
- (4) *Reading a short storybook or a chapter from a longer storybook written in English*.
- (5) *Verbal reports*. Participants read a short story and verbalized about the story and their thoughts, to expose their thinking process immediately after completion of the task.
- (6) *Processing*. All of the procedures were tape recorded and transcribed.

Verbal Protocol Prompts

These are sample questions for the verbal protocols.

Meaning Construction

- (1) What are you thinking as you are reading this?
- (2) Can you retell the story?
- (3) What makes you have that meaning?
- (4) Why do you think that way?
- (5) Why not another way?
- (6) What words are most important for this story?
- (7) What do you mean by this?

Dialogue and Interaction Between the Story and the Reader

- (1) How do you feel after reading this story?
- (2) Why do you feel this way? Which words or sentences in the story give you this feeling?
- (3) Could you describe the setting of this story?
- (4) Do you like this story? If so, could you tell me the reason?
- (5) Does this story remind you of any event in your experience? Tell me about that.
- (6) Does this story remind you of any stories you have read before? Tell me the other stories.
- (7) What do you think about the author?
- (8) Why do you think the author wrote this story?
- (9) What parts of the story are most significant for you?
- (10) Why do you think that part is so important for the story or for you?
- (11) What do you think of the main characters' behavior?

Table A1. English Learners' Use of Reading Strategies.

Order	Strategies	Description	Examples	ELL	Frequency	Culturally relevant	Non-culturally relevant	Total for all students
Higher Order Thinking Strategies	<i>Connection to the text</i>	In <i>connection to the text</i> , the readers make links from text to text while reading, building a mosaic of intersecting texts.	Jaewon: Like moving, so if you combine these two books together, like this, they would know that it's Christopher. (Protocol 4)	<i>Hiroki</i>	14	4	10	32
				<i>Jaewon</i>	15	5	10	
				<i>Maria</i>	0	0	0	
				<i>Evert</i>	3	2	1	
	<i>Inferential thinking</i>	<i>Inferential thinking</i> occurs when readers use their prior knowledge and textual information to draw conclusions, make critical judgments, and form unique interpretations from the text (Keene & Zimmermann, 1997).	Hiroki: I think, the king and queen of Spain that think he was going to make it. (Protocol 8)	<i>Hiroki</i>	15	5	10	30
				<i>Jaewon</i>	15	5	10	
				<i>Maria</i>	0	0	0	
				<i>Evert</i>	0	0	0	
	<i>Identifying main ideas and significance</i>	<i>Identifying main ideas and importance</i> helps readers grasp essential ideas, important information, and key aspects while reading, at the word, sentence, and text level.	Hiroki: I thought that he was pretty brave to go see—to go around the world. To the other side of—This book is more informative and this more data or—this is part of a different story about this event. (Protocol 5)	<i>Hiroki</i>	13	6	7	37
				<i>Jaewon</i>	13	6	7	
				<i>Maria</i>	5	3	2	
				<i>Evert</i>	6	4	2	
<i>Comprehension monitoring</i>	The <i>comprehension monitoring</i> strategy enables readers to determine the author's intention and purpose and monitor their own comprehension. Readers' evaluation of new information triggers recognition and comprehension.	Hiroki: I learned that [Columbus] discovered the—he like helped the world, because they all thought that the world was flat and they thought—they didn't know America. (Protocol 8)	<i>Hiroki</i>	13	7	8	43	
			<i>Jaewon</i>	13	8	7		
			<i>Maria</i>	9	6	3		
			<i>Evert</i>	8	6	2		

(Continued)

Table A1. (Continued).

Order	Strategies	Description	Examples	ELL	Frequency	Culturally relevant	Non-culturally relevant	Total for all students
	<i>Questioning</i>	Through <i>questioning</i> , readers question the significance or veracity of information. By questioning what they read and seeking answers in the text, they not only monitor comprehension, but construct meaning and enhance understanding.	Hiroki: Different. [<i>Encounter</i>] doesn't say anything about— Christopher Columbus. It doesn't say the word anywhere. I think [Christopher Columbus] shouldn't. Not the land, just the [Native] American people. (Protocol 5) They shouldn't come to America without [Native Americans'] permission. (Protocol 5)	<i>Hiroki</i> <i>Jaewon</i> <i>Maria</i> <i>Evert</i>	7 7 5 7	4 3 4 5	3 4 1 2	26
	<i>Summarizing and synthesizing</i>	Summarizing is a process of overview within a cohesive and coherent short version of the story; synthesizing is the integration of summarizing with evaluation of the text.	Evert: It's about Mei Mei from Hong Kong and she moved to New York and she can't speak any English. She doesn't want to speak English and she dreamed about Hong Kong and then she talked with Nancy. Nancy is a teacher and that's all. At the end Mei Mei and Nancy became friends. Mei Mei speaks English. That's all. (Protocol 6)	<i>Hiroki</i> <i>Jaewon</i> <i>Maria</i> <i>Evert</i>	9 10 3 1	3 4 2 0	6 6 1 0	23
	<i>Evaluation</i>	Using <i>evaluation</i> , readers evaluate their understanding of new information. Readers also evaluate the text based on their sociocultural perspectives and social values and demonstrate their opinions. Readers make judgments about what they read.	Jaewon: This might be also O or X and this one would be O cause this has landing information, and this just has traveling information, and it's just different. And he continued, Like moving, so if you combine these two books together, like this, they would know that it's Christopher. (Protocol 7)	<i>Hiroki</i> <i>Jaewon</i> <i>Maria</i> <i>Evert</i>	15 14 3 0	4 4 2 0	11 10 1 0	32

(Continued)

Table A1. (Continued).

Order	Strategies	Description	Examples	ELL	Frequency	Culturally relevant	Non-culturally relevant	Total for all students
Social-contextual Reading Strategies	<i>Connection to oneself</i>	It involves connecting to one's prior experiences and cultural and background knowledge to comprehend and evaluate new information and relate it to one's own stories.	Maria: They put you a little thing and they turn you around three times and they sing a little song, that's kind of, 'Dale, dale, dale, pégale asina, porque si no le das pierdes el camino.' It's like hit it, hit it. It's kind of hard to translate it. (Protocol 3)	<i>Hiroki</i>	12	9	3	65
				<i>Jaewon</i>	11	6	3	
				<i>Maria</i>	22	17	5	
				<i>Evert</i>	20	16	4	
	<i>Connection to the world</i>	Using <i>connection to the world</i> , the readers' comprehension of stories is significantly interconnected with their understanding of the world.	Maria: Because it's from another place. Hong-Kong is another place from New York so, she wants to speak Chinese and they want her to speak English, so she came here and doesn't want to speak English, only wants to speak Chinese. (Protocol 11)	<i>Hiroki</i>	4	2	2	14
				<i>Jaewon</i>	5	3	2	
				<i>Maria</i>	3	3	0	
				<i>Evert</i>	2	2	0	
	<i>Visualization</i>	In <i>visualization</i> , readers create mental images while reading to enhance their meaning making. <i>Rhetorical strategies</i> help readers use their L1 literacy skills, including plot identification, character analysis, and genre analysis, as well as recognizing the author's attitude, purpose, and setting (Author, 2005).	Hiroki: I only imagined one— The person twisting and tossing in his bed— I like to imagine cause then I'll have another picture that is not in the book. (Protocol 9)	<i>Hiroki</i>	4	2	2	11
				<i>Jaewon</i>	5	3	2	
				<i>Maria</i>	2	2	0	
				<i>Evert</i>	0	0	0	
	<i>Rhetorical strategies</i>	Readers who are English Learners used rhetorical strategies from L2 skills to comprehend stories: character analysis, genre analysis, author's attitude, purpose, and setting.	Evert: So maybe understanding or like for example, you know how to sit and then to read or you know how book start, and then the main event and then the ending—it is same kind of books which I read in Swedish and English? Style or. (Protocol 6)	<i>Hiroki</i>	0	0	0	11
				<i>Jaewon</i>	3	2	1	
				<i>Maria</i>	0	0	0	
				<i>Evert</i>	8	5	3	

(Continued)

Table A1. (Continued).

Order	Strategies	Description	Examples	ELL	Frequency	Culturally relevant	Non-culturally relevant	Total for all students
	<i>Socioaffective strategies</i>	Socioaffective strategies refer to reader's lived-through experience (Rosenblatt, 1978) and the creation of a transactional momentum while reading stories.	Evert: Yeah. I know how she feels. I felt the same thing as her when I came to a new country. (Protocol 6) Maria: No. Mei Mei doesn't speak English because she wants to speak Chinese. But everybody is bugging her because they want her to speak English. And she wishes she was in Hong Kong. (Protocol 10)	<i>Hiroki</i> <i>Jaewon</i> <i>Maria</i> <i>Evert</i>	17 16 15 13	11 10 12 11	6 6 3 2	61

Note. Table A1 used only ten of the 12 protocols from the study: Protocols 2 (Jaewon reading *Woodcutter and Tiger Brother*), 3 (Maria reading *Family Pictures*), 4 (Jaewon reading *Encounter*), 5 (Hiroki reading *Encounter*), 6 (Evert reading *I Hate English*), 7 (Jaewon reading *Follow the Dream*), 8 (Hiroki reading *Follow the Dream*), 9 (Hiroki reading *Passage to Freedom: The sugihara story*), 11 (Maria reading *I Hate English*), and 12 (Evert reading *Pettson and Findus*). 2. The participants' responses were smoothed to enhance readability.