

# Teaching First Graders to Comprehend Complex Texts Through Read-Alouds

Priscilla G. Witte

First graders, including emergent readers and those learning English, were better able to comprehend fictional texts of increasing complexity with this instructional approach. Modeling and high expectations are key elements.

The first graders had listened to the story *Honey...Honey...Lion!* (Brett, 2005), in which a bird taught a greedy badger a lesson because he had not kept his end of the bargain. Jaden (all names are pseudonyms) said, “I think that the central message is that if someone does something to you, you shouldn’t do it back to them. You should just say that it hurt your feelings.” Mason said, “I think the central message is that even if you’re starving and you want to eat it all, you should still share because others might want it too. The evidence is that the honey badger should have shared the honey. He had a consequence.” Mason pointed to the page in the book that showed the bird leading the badger to the lion’s den. Lin took the book and added, “I agree. I think the author was telling us that we can’t break promises or someone might do something back to us. Look what happened to the badger when he broke his promise.”

This scenario exemplifies how first graders engaged in higher level thinking skills when participating in the Complex Text Analysis (CTA) instructional approach, an approach that enabled all students in this diverse class to improve their ability to determine the central message of a story and provide evidence from the text to support their thinking.

## Background: Teaching Students to Comprehend Complex Text

I teach in a district that is seeking ways to help students achieve the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). One of the key requirements of the CCSS is that all students must be able to comprehend texts of steadily increasing complexity as they progress through school (National Governors Association

Center for Best Practices [NGA Center] & Council of Chief State School Officers [CCSSO], 2010). I wanted to encourage my first graders, who were beginning to learn to read themselves, to demonstrate reasoning skills and use evidence to show their thinking. My goal was to teach them to engage with high-quality literature that would broaden their worldviews and build their knowledge. I decided this could best be accomplished by focusing on CCSS Anchor Standards 2 and 10 for Reading. Anchor Standard 2 requires students to “determine central ideas or themes of a text and analyze their development; summarize the key supporting details” (p. 10). Standard 10 requires students to “read and comprehend complex literary and informational texts independently and proficiently” (p. 10). I decided to document both instruction and learning through an action research study that could be shared with colleagues if it was successful with my students.

## Underlying Theories

My investigation led me to think about what it meant to comprehend text and how I would know if students really were able to comprehend text at deeper levels. The construction-integration model of reading (Kintsch, 2004) and social constructivism (Rosenblatt, 1978; Tharp & Gallimore, 1988) together form a framework to portray the current beliefs that young readers make new connections and inferences when information from the text is integrated with their world knowledge and that the capacity to comprehend is increased when opportunities are

Priscilla Witte is a literacy teacher at Churchill Elementary School, Glen Ellyn, IL, USA; e-mail [pwitte@d41.org](mailto:pwitte@d41.org).

presented for social interaction. This social interaction, which is characterized by dialogue, questioning, and sharing ideas, must be scaffolded for young learners (Roehler & Cantlon, 1997; Wilkinson & Silliman, 2000). I combined these theories with research regarding other effective instructional programs (e.g., text talk: Beck & McKeown, 2001; theme identification: Williams et al., 2002) and with recommendations regarding comprehension instruction in the primary grades (Shanahan et al., 2010) to develop an instructional approach that incorporated the careful selection of high-quality literature to teach higher level reading strategies through the use of read-alouds and discussion.

### Text Complexity

First, I needed to clearly define complex text. One widely used system for determining text complexity, the Lexile framework (MetaMetrics, 2012), uses semantic difficulty of words in a lexical database and sentence length to match books to readers. Although Lexile scores are helpful in determining text complexity, qualitative components and reader-task components must be considered as well (Fisher, Frey, & Lapp, 2012; Hiebert, 2011; NGA Center & CCSSO, 2010). After extensive reading about text complexity, I developed a matrix of text complexity features that included Lexile level, story structure, illustrations, point of view, vocabulary, language, theme, and knowledge demands. I used this matrix to analyze the books that I typically read to my first graders, selecting only those with a central message, because determining central message was a key component of the CTA lessons. When sequencing those books from least complex to most complex, the point values ranged from 9 points for *Leo the Late Bloomer* (Kraus, 1971) to 24 points for *The Lorax* (Dr. Seuss, 1971). Table 1 provides an overview of the text features I used to determine the complexity of the texts and several exemplar texts with their corresponding point values.

### Research Design and Setting

Formative and design research methodology addresses practical problems in education and has been used to provide insights into complex, interacting

systems such as classrooms (Cobb, Confrey, DiSessa, Lehrer, & Schauble, 2003; Reinking & Bradley, 2008). I chose to use this methodology in my inquiry because it allowed me to design an instructional approach, evaluate how it was working, and revise it based on evidence of student learning. I used this instructional approach to teach one lesson per week for an entire school year.

The school in which I teach has a diverse population. Of the 23 students in my class, five spoke languages other than English at home, and five were considered students from low-income families. Three students received special education resource support. Four students received speech and language support, and three received social work services. One student had an identified

behavior disorder. Because all the students were learning to read, I will use the terms recommended in the position statement jointly adopted by the International Reading Association and the National Association for the Education of Young Children (1998). There were eight early readers whose instructional reading levels were between F and H on the Fountas and Pinnell (2010) Benchmark Assessments conducted in early September, six emergent readers who were able to read books at levels C–E, and seven explorational readers who were able to read at levels A or B. The five English learners included two emergent readers and three explorational readers.

### Lesson Procedures

I used one book each week to teach a lesson that took approximately 30–40 minutes, beginning with the least complex book and gradually increasing the complexity level in subsequent lessons. I clearly explained my thinking for the first six lessons each trimester and gradually released to students the responsibility of analyzing the text in subsequent lessons. I followed the same procedure in each trimester but used progressively more complex texts. During the first trimester, the text complexity ranged from 9–13 points; during the second trimester, it ranged from 14–19 points; and during the third trimester, it ranged from 19–26 points. I used the chart shown in Figure 1 to record the thinking for each lesson.

### PAUSE AND PONDER

- What approaches have you used to teach primary students to comprehend complex text? How do you know if students comprehend?
- What other standards could you incorporate into CTA lessons?
- How might this instructional approach be adapted for use with informational text?

**Table 1**  
**Text Complexity Matrix**

Feature	Lexile	Structure	Illustrations	Point of View	Vocabulary	Language	Theme	Knowledge Demands	Total
Description and Point Values	1. 0–199 2. 200–299 3. 300–399 4. 400–499 5. 500–599 6. 600–699 7. 700–799 8. 800–899	1. Single plot line 2. Multiple plot lines 3. Unconventional plot such as flashbacks	1. Very helpful for comprehension 2. Somewhat helpful 3. Minimally helpful	1. Third person 2. First person 3. Multiple points of view	1. Simple terms 2. Moderately complex vocabulary 3. Complex vocabulary	1. Literal, contemporary language 2. Less familiar language 3. Figurative or ambiguous language	1. Simple and literal 2. Metaphorical 3. Multiple levels of meaning	1. Life experiences similar to reader's own 2. Cultural background different from reader's own 3. Perspective different from reader's own	9
<b>Text</b>									
<i>Leo the Late Bloomer</i> (Kraus, 1971)	120L 1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	9
<i>Peter's Chair</i> (Keats, 1967)	390L 3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10
<i>The Recess Queen</i> (O'Neill, 2002)	450L 4	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	12
<i>It's Mine</i> (Lionni, 1985)	470L 4	1	1	1	2	2	2	1	14
<i>Honey... Honey... Lion!</i> (Brett, 2005)	710L 7	1	1	3	2	2	2	3	21
<i>The Lorax</i> (Dr. Seuss, 1971)	560L 5	3	1	3	3	3	3	3	24

**Figure 1**  
**Complex Text Analysis Chart**

Key Event	Character's Actions or Feelings	Evidence From the Text	Author's Message
<b>Central Message:</b>			

The following steps were used to teach the lessons and could be used by others who wish to implement the CTA instructional approach:

1. I told students that authors use clues in a story to give the reader a message about an important idea. The clues include events that happen and how characters react to those events. I told them that good readers are detectives who try to figure out why the author includes events in a story and what the author is really trying to tell the reader.
2. I read the story aloud. I explained that a graphic organizer (CTA chart; see Figure 1) would be used to help readers understand the central message of the story. I described how the CTA chart would help readers remember the important events and characters' actions, make it easier for readers to relate the events in the story to others,

and help readers determine the story's central message.

3. I explained that it was important to justify one's thinking and modeled how readers use evidence from the text to determine characters' actions, characters' feelings, and the message that the author is trying to convey about each event. The following example shows how I explained my thinking to fill in the information about the first key event in *I Am the King!* (Dieterlé, 2001). The items I wrote on the CTA chart for all four key events of this story can be found in Table 2.

As I remember the story, the first main event is when Little Louis gets a crown from his mother. So, I am going to write that in the first box under the category Key Event. And I think that Louis was proud to get the crown, so I am writing, "Little Louis was proud," in the next box, under Character's

**Table 2**  
**Completed Complex Text Analysis Chart for *I Am the King!* (Dieterlé, 2001)**

Key Event	Character's Actions or Feelings	Evidence From the Text	Author's Message
Little Louis's mom gave him a crown.	Little Louis was proud.	He has his nose in the air. He looks proud in the picture.	Kings sometimes feel like they are better than other people.
He decided to change the laws of the country.	Louis did not want to go to school.	The speech bubble says that the king will not go to school.	Sometimes kings do not want to do things that they should do.
He tried to take things that weren't his.	He is mean, and he is shouting.	The speech bubble says that the king must have this bike and baseball cap.	Some kings are greedy and might try to steal from others.
His parents got mad at him.	Louis was mad when his parents sent him to his room.	He has a mad look on his face in the picture.	People might stop mean kings from ruling.
<b>Central Message:</b> Kings should do the right thing and treat people fairly, or others may not let them be king anymore.			

Actions or Feelings. I think this because the picture that goes along with the text “Little Louis proudly went to check on his subjects” shows Louis with his nose in the air—something that I know shows he thinks he is important. So, in the third box, under Evidence From the Text, I am writing, “He has his nose in the air. He looks proud in the picture.” Now I have to think about what the author is trying to tell me—the reader—about this key event of the story. Louis seems proud to be wearing a crown and be called a king. I know that walking with one’s nose in the air is a sign that the person thinks he or she is very important, so I am thinking that the author is saying that sometimes kings feel they are very important—maybe even more important or better than other people. So, under the category Author’s Message, I am writing, “Kings sometimes feel like they are better than other people.”

A similar procedure was followed for each additional key event.

4. After all key events and the characters’ reactions to the events were analyzed, I explained that the author may use clues from several different events to explain a central message of the story. I explained how to examine all the events together to determine that overarching message. The following example shows how I explained how I used the information from the CTA chart for *I Am the King!* (Dieterlé, 2001) to determine the book’s central message:

Now we have four events, each representing a message that the author wanted to tell us. Let’s look at all of them and see if we can put the messages together into one idea. We’ll call that the central message. I know that kings sometimes feel as if they might be better than other people, and they might do things they shouldn’t do, like stealing from others. If this happens, others might stop them from being king. Let’s combine all these ideas into one. In the Central Message box, I am going to write, “Kings should do the right thing and treat people fairly, or others may not let them be king anymore.”

5. I modeled the same process with the first six texts on the list to ensure that students understood the strategy.
6. After I modeled the process with those first six texts, the responsibility for analyzing the text was gradually transferred to the students in whole-group lessons. I guided the discussion but decreased the amount of teacher talk so the amount of student talk increased. I read the story a second time if most students did not remember the key events.

Although the CTA approach has components similar to those in other effective read-aloud protocols such as text talk (Beck & McKeown, 2001) and the theme-identification program (Williams et al., 2002), it is unique. The CTA approach purposely uses texts of incrementally increasing complexity. This is not a planned component of other protocols, where intellectually stimulating texts or texts that focus on specific themes may be the most important criterion. The same chart and related questions are used in every CTA lesson because they support the students’ ability to analyze key events in order to determine the central message. Other read-aloud protocols use a different set of questions for each lesson to focus on the key aspects of the selected books, or they may use a similar set of questions but do not consistently use a graphic organizer to document the responses to these questions.

### **Changes to the CTA Process**

One of the benefits of using the formative and design research methodology is the ability to revise the instruction during the study. I revised some discussion routines during the first trimester to encourage better listening, as I will discuss in the Fostering Social Interaction and Independence section. After reviewing the results of the first trimester rubrics, I also changed the format of the CTA chart but found that it only confused the students, so after a few lessons, I changed back to the original chart.

Finally, during the second trimester, I asked students to practice the CTA strategy during small-group guided reading lessons when they read instructional-level books that included strong central messages. The additional practice in a small-group setting was beneficial because I was better able to explain key elements of the chart to students who had difficulty focusing in the large-group setting. I gradually released the responsibility to students and found that, because the texts that students read during these lessons were less complex than the texts read aloud, they were easier for students to analyze.

### **Assessing the CTA Process**

I created a rubric modeled after those commonly used in my district to track progress in students’ ability to analyze the texts. The CTA chart rubric is shown in Table 3.

**Table 3**  
**Complex Text Analysis Rubric**

	<b>Not Meeting Standards: 1 point</b>	<b>Progressing Toward Standards: 2 points</b>	<b>Meets Standards: 3 points</b>	<b>Advanced Achievement: 4 points</b>
Identifies Key Events	Does not identify key events	Identifies some events, but they may not be key events	Identifies more than one key event	Identifies all the key events
Identifies Character's Actions or Feelings	Does not identify character's actions or feelings	Identifies some of the character's actions or feelings but may not be accurate	Accurately identifies more than one character's actions or feelings	Accurately identifies all the applicable character's actions or feelings
Provides Evidence From the Text	Does not provide evidence from the text	Provides some evidence from the text but may not be accurate	Provides accurate evidence from the text	Provides detailed and accurate evidence from the text to justify all responses
Identifies the Author's Message	Does not identify the author's message	Identifies some parts of the author's message	Identifies the author's message	Accurately identifies the author's message with details
Identifies Central Message	Does not identify central message	Partially identifies the central message	Identifies the central message	Accurately identifies the central message with details
<b>Points Earned</b>				

I conducted a baseline assessment during the first week of school to determine how well students were able to analyze the text prior to conducting any CTA lessons. I read aloud *Leo the Late Bloomer* (Kraus, 1971) and asked each student individually about their thinking associated with each area of the CTA chart while I wrote their responses. The assessment was repeated at the end of each trimester using a more complex text. I read these texts aloud one time to the class, but there was no discussion following the reading. Students were given the option of writing their responses or dictating them to me in trimesters 2 and 3.

**One Student's Progress**

I have selected Kayla to show the typical pattern or progress made by students as they moved through the year. Table 4 contains the responses given by Kayla, an emergent reader, during the baseline assessment. She received 8 out of a possible 20 points on that assessment. She did not meet or exceed expectations for any component of the rubric.

Table 5 shows the responses Kayla provided on the final assessment, conducted at the end of the school year. I read *The Lorax* (Dr. Seuss, 1971), and students completed the CTA chart independently.

**Table 4**  
**Example Baseline Complex Text Analysis Chart for *Leo the Late Bloomer* (Kraus, 1971)**

<b>Key Event</b>	<b>Character's Actions or Feelings</b>	<b>Evidence From the Text</b>	<b>Author's Message</b>
the lion bloomed (2 points)	happy (2 points)	he is writing (2 points)	to be happy (1 point)
<b>Central Message:</b> teaching us to be happy (1 point)			

**Table 5**  
**Example End-of-Year Complex Text Analysis Chart for *The Lorax* (Dr. Seuss, 1971)**

Key Event	Character's Actions or Feelings	Evidence From the Text	Author's Message
I think the first [first] key event is that if someone told you to do something like stop you should stop.	I think that the character's action or feelings is that you should not pollute [pollute] the air or cut down lots of trees. Because it is not good for animals or us to have no trees because the trees give oxygen [oxygen] and food and also energy.	I think that the evidence from the text is that if someone tells you to stop chopping down trees and do what [what] you are told to do.	I think the author's [author's] message [message] is if someone told you to stop you should [should] stop.
The second key event is that things did not go well. All of the trees were gone the Lorax lifted his pouch [pouch] of his bottom and flew [flew] away through [through] a hole.	The Lorax felt sad that all the trees were [were] gone.	In the picture [picture] they were polluting [polluting] the air.	The author's [author's] message that you should not cut down trees.
He dropped [dropped] the seed and the boy caught [caught] it.	The Once-ler felt happy.	Because he shared. The boy reached [reached] out and wanted it.	I think that the author's message is that if you saved the tree seed the very last truffula tree seed of all.
(3 points)	(3 points)	(3 points)	(2 points)
<b>Central Message:</b> I think the central [central] message is that if someone told you to stop you should [should] stop. Stop polluting [polluting]. (3 points)			

Kayla wrote all the responses independently and did not ask for help. Conventional spellings are shown in brackets for clarity. She received 14 out of a possible 20 points on the final assessment, an improvement from her score of 8 on the baseline assessment. More importantly, Kayla met or exceeded the standard for all components but one of the rubric.

### Outcomes of the CTA Process

I analyzed the data and found that the class and each subgroup (i.e., the explorational, emergent, and early readers) made significant gains in their ability to complete the CTA chart independently. I also analyzed the scores of the EL students. To establish reliability in scoring, a colleague who teaches first grade in my school scored 25% of the CTA chart rubrics for each testing period. After an initial discussion regarding differences, the goal to obtain a 90% agreement was exceeded.

**Rubric Scores.** When comparing total rubric scores on the baseline assessment with scores on the year-end assessment, the class made significant progress in their ability to analyze the texts. At the beginning of the year, the whole-class mean score was 7.71 out of a possible 20 points ( $SD = 0.78$ ). At the end of the year, the whole-class mean score was 15.52 points out of a possible 20 points ( $SD = 1.83$ ). At the end of the year, 20 out of 21 students (95%) met or exceeded the standard in identifying key events, 19 students (90%) met or exceeded the standard in identifying the character's actions or feelings, 14 students (67%) were able to provide evidence from the text, and 19 students (90%) met or exceeded the standard in identifying the author's message related to the key events. In terms of being able to identify the central message, the baseline scores were lower than scores in any other area; none of the students met the standard. However, at the end of the year, 18 students (86%) met or exceeded the standard and 2 students were progressing toward the standard.

The final scores for the ability to provide evidence from the text were the lowest of any area. I surmised that because the books were read aloud, students may not have gone back to the text to find specific evidence. Even if they had referred to the text, most of it was too difficult for them to read independently. I assumed that students were relying on their memories of the text and the pictures for evidence and that this might be a factor in the lower scores for this category.

In analyzing the results by trimester, the early readers, or those who were able to read texts at higher levels independently at the beginning of the year, made significant gains in most areas after the first trimester; the emergent and explorational readers did not make significant progress until the second or third trimester. The latter pattern was true for ELs as well.

### **Fostering Social Interaction and Independence.**

During the first CTA lessons, I initiated questions and the students responded to them. Students did not listen well to their peers' comments and sometimes repeated what the previous speaker said without realizing it. Sometimes students interrupted others, or several would speak at the same time. One change that I made to the CTA lessons was the incorporation of a talking stick, explaining that whoever was holding the stick could speak. This fostered better listening and discussion because students would listen carefully to the person with the talking stick, then respond by building on the comments of their peers.

In prior years, I tended to differentiate my questions to match the reading ability of the individual. During this study, however, I began asking higher level questions of all the students rather than focusing on just the higher readers. The results clearly indicated that all of the students, regardless of reading level, grew in their ability to infer why characters performed certain actions and what the author was teaching the reader. K.A.D. Stahl (2012) found that challenging texts can be made accessible to students by using shared reading, think alouds, and high-level discussions, and this study confirms Stahl's conclusions.

As the students gained knowledge and proficiency in the ability to analyze texts that were incrementally more complex, I used fewer direct explanations and more reminders about the goals of the lessons. I praised students when they displayed good ideas and helped them make connections to other lessons in which they had displayed good

thinking. I became more of a facilitator of discussions than a teacher providing explicit instruction.

Throughout the study, the dialogic process sustained interpretations of text and high-level reasoning (Murphy, Wilkinson, Soter, Hennessey, & Alexander, 2009). The instances of students commenting on peers' ideas increased in the third trimester; in addition, students became aware of the importance of justifying their thinking with evidence from the text because they knew that others might challenge their thinking if they were not able to support it. Jadallah et al. (2011) found that prompting students to support their arguments and praising them when they did it spread among the rest of the children so that the support occurred with increasing frequency. Similarly, in this study, when I praised a student for citing textual evidence, other students also made an effort to provide evidence to support their own thinking.

## **Additional Benefits of the CTA Approach**

In addition to improved achievement on assessments, the students gained vocabulary knowledge and were better able to write their own stories.

### **Increased Vocabulary Knowledge**

During the year, the first graders learned new words when they listened to books containing rich vocabulary. Reading aloud is a productive means of giving students opportunities to go beyond their existing oral vocabularies and introducing them to new concepts and deeper word knowledge (Blachowicz, Fisher, Ogle, & Watts-Taffe, 2006). Research has shown that students need multiple exposures to read and use words in order to remember them and that they need to practice using the words in authentic contexts rather than memorizing dictionary definitions (S.A. Stahl & Fairbanks, 1986). During CTA lessons, students received these multiple exposures to key vocabulary. I read the books aloud, sometimes more than once, and explained many words that were unfamiliar to students. The students then used the words when they discussed the texts; they developed an interest in learning new words, many of which were related to the focus on character traits.

Students often suggested that we add words from CTA lessons to the Powerful Words chart that we created early in the year as a place to write and remember interesting words that the students encountered. For example, *ordinary* and *extraordinary*

were added after reading *An Extraordinary Egg* (Lionni, 1994). Other words, such as *exaggerate*, *triumphant*, *dilemma*, *resisted*, *magnificent*, *reluctantly*, and *excluded*, were also added during the year.

### **Improvement in the Ability to Write Fictional Stories**

In addition to improving their vocabulary knowledge, the students were better able to write their own stories as a result of the CTA instructional approach. In previous years, I had difficulty teaching first-grade students to write coherently with good leads, plot development, and endings. However, it appears that CTA instruction helped focus students on the key elements of good literature, as the stories that students chose to write had interesting, well-developed characters and logical plots. Emma wrote a story about a kitten that broke special toys twice and said the central message was “Don’t break stuff on purpose because it’s not being responsible.” Sophia wrote about a girl who got everything she wanted at the fair but then lost her Nana and said the central message was to “care more about your family.” Isabella wrote about a girl who finally got new shoes and said the central message was to not give up.

### **Concluding Thoughts**

The district in which I work values practitioner research and encourages data-driven instruction. Documenting both instruction and student learning allowed me to monitor progress and determine whether it was having a positive impact on students’ ability to analyze text of increasing complexity. Furthermore, after sharing the results of my action research, several second- and third-grade teachers in my district have implemented the CTA approach with similar success.

There is a strong emphasis on increasing rigor in education today, and there is a fear that some students will become frustrated and their motivation will suffer. However, Fisher, Frey, and Lapp (2012) suggest that one of the past mistakes in the efforts to improve reading has been the removal of struggle. Teaching lessons that are easy for students will not help them gain the skills to delve into worthy texts and understand what the author is telling the reader. The CTA approach supported students in developing the ability to comprehend deeply in ways that students in my classes during the past 10 years had been unable to accomplish. The key may be to ensure that students are given sufficient support

before asking them to complete difficult tasks independently. The results of the present study indicated that students were motivated by the knowledge that they were able to accomplish a difficult task.

### **TAKE ACTION!**

Teachers who wish to implement the CTA approach should consider the following suggestions:

1. Select texts purposefully.
  - Select high-quality texts with clear central messages that match students’ interests.
  - Use multiple factors to determine the complexity of each text, and use that information to order the texts from less to more complex.
2. Prepare for each lesson.
  - Complete a CTA chart prior to each lesson to guide your instruction.
  - Select key vocabulary words or character traits to be taught.
  - Prepare SMART Board or document camera to project text and blank CTA chart.
3. Scaffold instruction.
  - Model thinking before expecting students to analyze text independently.
  - Teach students to engage in structured dialogue to focus on speaking and listening skills.
  - Gradually release to students the responsibility of analyzing the text.
4. Maintain high expectations for all students.
  - Ask all students to answer questions requiring higher level thinking.
  - Provide additional support such as the following for ELs and low readers:
    - Build on students’ existing knowledge and life experiences.
    - Suggest sentence stems to provide support in the formulation of ideas (e.g., “I think the central message is... because...”).
5. Assess and reflect.
  - Use student data to determine gains related to the different components of the CTA chart.
  - Change aspects of lessons based on data.

## REFERENCES

- Beck, I.L., & McKeown, M.G. (2001). Text talk: Capturing the benefits of read-aloud experiences for young children. *The Reading Teacher*, 55(1), 10–20.
- Blachowicz, C.L.Z., Fisher, P.J.L., Ogle, D., & Watts-Taffe, S. (2006). Vocabulary: Questions from the classroom. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 41(4), 524–539.
- Cobb, P., Confrey, J., DiSessa, A., Lehrer, R., & Schauble, L. (2003). Design experiments in educational research. *Educational Researcher*, 32(1), 9–13.
- Fisher, D., Frey, N., & Lapp, D. (2012). *Text complexity: Raising rigor in reading*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Fountas, J.C., & Pinnell, G.S. (2010). *Benchmark assessment system 1: Assessment guide* (2nd ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Hiebert, E.H. (2011). *Using multiple sources of information in establishing text complexity* (Reading Research Report No. 11.03). San Francisco, CA: TextProject.
- International Reading Association & National Association for the Education of Young Children. (1998). *Learning to read and write: Developmentally appropriate practices for young children* [Position statement]. Newark, DE: International Reading Association; Urbana, IL: National Association for the Education of Young Children.
- Jadallah, M., Anderson, R.C., Nguyen-Jahiel, K., Miller, B.W., Kim, I., Kuo, L., ... Wu, X., (2011). Influence of a teacher's scaffolding moves during child-led small-group discussions. *American Educational Research Journal*, 48(1), 194–230.
- Kintsch, W. (2004). The construction-integration model of text comprehension and its implications for instruction. In R.B. Ruddell & N.J. Unrau (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (5th ed., pp. 1270–1328). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- MetaMetrics. (2012). *What is a Lexile measure?* Retrieved from [lexile.com/about-lexile/lexile-overview/](http://lexile.com/about-lexile/lexile-overview/)
- Murphy, P.K., Wilkinson, I.G., Soter, A.O., Hennessey, M.N., & Alexander, J.F. (2009). Examining the effects of classroom discussion on students' comprehension of text: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 101(3), 740–764. doi:10.1037/a0015576
- National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers. (2010). *Common Core State Standards for English language arts and literacy in history/social studies, science, and technical subjects*. Washington, DC: Authors.
- Reinking, D., & Bradley, B.A. (2008). *On formative and design experiments: Approaches to language and literacy research*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Roehler, L.R., & Cantlon, D.J. (1997). Scaffolding: A powerful tool in social constructivist classrooms. In K. Hogan & M. Pressley (Eds.), *Scaffolding student learning: Instructional approaches and issues* (pp. 6–42). Cambridge, MA: Brookline.
- Rosenblatt, L.M. (1978). *The reader, the text, the poem: The transactional theory of the literary work*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Shanahan, T., Callison, K., Carriere, C., Duke, N.K., Pearson, P., Schatschneider, C., & Torgessen, J. (2010). *Improving reading comprehension in kindergarten through 3rd grade: IES practice guide* (NCEE 2010-4038). Princeton, NJ: What Works Clearinghouse.
- Stahl, K.A.D. (2012). Complex text or frustration-level text: Using shared reading to bridge the difference. *The Reading Teacher*, 66(1), 47–51. doi: 10.1002/TRTR.01102
- Stahl, S.A., & Fairbanks, M.M. (1986). The effect of vocabulary instruction: A model-based meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 56(1), 72–110.
- Tharp, R.G., & Gallimore, R. (1988). *Rousing minds to life: Teaching, learning, and schooling in social context*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Wilkinson, L.C., & Silliman, E.R. (2000). Classroom language and literacy learning. In M.L. Kamil, P.B. Mosenthal, P.D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 3, pp. 337–360). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Williams, J.P., Lauer, K.D., Hall, K.M., Lord, K.M., Gugga, S.S., Bak, S.J., ... DeCani, J.S. (2002). Teaching elementary school students to identify story themes. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 94(2), 235–248.

## LITERATURE CITED

- Brett, J. (2005). *Honey...honey...lion!* New York, NY: Putnam.
- Dieterlé, N. (2001). *I am the king!* New York, NY: Orchard.
- Dr. Seuss. (Geisel, T.S.). (1971). *The Lorax*. New York, NY: Random House.
- Keats, E. (1967). *Peter's chair*. New York, NY: Puffin.
- Kraus, R. (1971). *Leo the late bloomer*. New York, NY: Windmill.
- Lionni, L. (1985). *It's mine*. New York, NY: Dragonfly.
- Lionni, L. (1994). *An extraordinary egg*. New York, NY: Dragonfly.
- O'Neill, A. (2002). *The recess queen*. New York, NY: Scholastic.

## MORE TO EXPLORE

- Visit TextProject's website ([textproject.org](http://textproject.org)) for information regarding text complexity and the CCSS.
- Read a recent article about an instructional approach used to teach students to empathize with characters and understand opposing viewpoints: McTigue, E., Douglass, A., Wright, K., Hodges, T., & Franks, A. (2015). Beyond the story map: Inferential comprehension via character perspective. *The Reading Teacher*, 69(1), 91–101. doi:10.1002/trtr.1377