



AN EXAMINATION OF YOUNG ADOLESCENT STUDENTS' RECALL OF INFORMATIONAL TEXT USING SCAFFOLDED PROMPTS

Antony Smith
University of Washington, Bothell
Anne Reece
University of Washington

BACKGROUND

- Adolescents' and English Language Learners' reading challenges

(August & Shanahan, 2006; Garcia, 2003; Kamil, 2003; Lesaux & Geva, 2006)

- Oral retelling and issues of informational text

(Brown & Cambourne, 1987; Carlisle, 1999; Fuchs, Fuchs, & Maxwell, 1988; Kalmbach, 1986; Smith & Keister, 1996)

- Metacognitive strategies and main idea comprehension

(Brown et al., 1983; Gambrell, Koskinen, & Kapinus, 1991; Schellings & Van Hout-Wolters, 1995; Stoicovy, 2004)

RETELLING STUDY I

Questions

1. What is the nature of adolescent English Language Learning (ELL) and English-only (EO) speaking students' oral main ideas recalls on narrative and informational text?
2. What do oral main ideas recalls tell us about the reading comprehension of these different groups of students?
 - Grade 6 students (N= 53)
 - Sample grouped by linguistic experience
 - ELL students (N = 25)
 - English-only students (N = 28)
 - English-only instruction
 - Sample group is heterogeneous in nature

RETELLING I: MEASURES & PROCEDURES

- Oral Reading
 - 6th grade level text, one fiction, one informational text
- Main Ideas Recall
 - Main idea units, coherence, idea units, total words, content words
- Cued Recall
 - 5 passage comprehension questions (literal and inferential)
- Other Reading Measures
 - ITBS reading comprehension (NCE), Woodcock Johnson word list, passage WCPM, passage accuracy

RETELLING I: FINDINGS

- Passage comprehension: Significant differences found between ELL and English-only students on informational passage
- Recall correlations: Significant correlations on informational for ELL students but not for native English students

RETELLING STUDY II (IN PROGRESS)

1. What do young adolescent students' recalls tell us about their comprehension of informational texts?
2. What are the differences in comprehension between NS and ELL groups of students, and what is the efficacy of the recall protocols in identifying these differences?

MEASURES & PROCEDURES

- Oral reading of three 6th grade level texts
- Qualitative Reading Inventory (QRI):
 - Word list
 - Prior knowledge
 - Accuracy
 - Rate
 - *Retelling (prompts added to standard)
 - Comprehension questions
 - Explicit
 - Implicit

PROMPT 1: SCAFFOLDED

Scaffolded Recall included a standard recount of details as called for in the QRI, the identification of the main idea, and a personal connection to the information (Harvey & Goudvis, 2000).

PROMPT 2: CUMULATIVE

Cumulative Recall, based on approaches to comprehension that use stopping-places during the reading of text and the asking of open questions (Kame'enui & Simmons, 2001), included stopping at the end of each paragraph and responding to, “What are you thinking?”

PROMPT 3: GRADUATED

Graduated Recall, based on Bransford, Brown and Cocking's (2000) concept of graduated transfer, included building on a standard recount by having the researcher paraphrase the last important idea mentioned and ask the student to tell more information (Tuncer & Altunay, 2006).

PASSAGES: DESCRIPTIVES

Word List – Mean - 87%

Variables	Passages		
	PELE	NILE	TEMP
Prior Knowledge (%)	0.59	0.52	0.40
Accuracy (%)	0.97	0.95	0.96
WCPM	164.07	128.47	154.47
Recall	3.80	2.53	2.20
• Total Words	230.40	163.40	157.47
• Idea Units	21.53	10.13	8.07
• Content Words	30.73	21.00	18.53
Comprehension (%)	0.81	0.62	0.40

CORRELATIONS WITH COMPREHENSION

Variables	PROMPT		
	SCAFFOLDED	CUMULATIVE	GRADUATED
Word List	.255	.375	.599*
Prior Knowledge	.825**	.670**	.532*
Accuracy	.377	.420	.252
WCPM	.078	.280	.631*
Recall	.572*	.603*	.750**
• Total Words	.065	.722**	.654**
• Idea Units	.611*	.697**	.728**
• Content Words	.623*	.807**	.748**

* significant at .05 level

** significant at .01 level

Antony Smith, UW Bothell and Anne Reece, UW Seattle
ansmith@uwb.edu

CORRELATIONS WITH RECALL

Variables	PROMPT		
	SCAFFOLDED	CUMULATIVE	GRADUATED
Word List	-.310	-.037	.311
Prior Knowledge	.534*	.561*	.268
Accuracy	-.217	.036	.109
WCPM	-.163	.020	.784**
Recall			
• Total Words	.222	.653**	.637*
• Idea Units	.731*	.607*	.839**
• Content Words	.218	.556*	.734**
Comprehension	.572*	.603*	.750**

* significant at .05 level

** significant at .01 level

POINTS FOR DISCUSSION

- What might these recalls reveal about adolescent comprehension of informational text?
- What is different about these recall tasks that causes these different relationships among variables?
- Looking ahead, what might be implementation issues of these three prompts? Implications for assessment and instruction?

NEXT STEPS

- Larger sample
- Larger number of ELL students
- Connections to classroom assessment and instruction