

---

## **Meeting the Needs of English Language Learners with Smarty Ants®**

Aubry Threlkeld, Doctoral Candidate,  
Harvard Graduate School of Education  
with Maria Gallardo-Kessler,  
M.A., University of Southern California



The Leader in Differentiated Instruction

## ■ Introduction

---

Changing immigration patterns as well as demographic shifts in the United States over the last years have dramatically altered the population in public schools. According to the National Center for Education Statistics, “the number of school-age children who spoke a language other than English at home rose from 4.7 to 11.2 million between 1980 and 2009, or from 10 to 21 percent of the population in this age range” (NCES, 2011).

This shift alone has resulted in a proliferation of services and settings for English Language Learners (ELLs) in schools, especially in states with high populations of ELLs. The number of school-age children who speak a language other than English at home and speak English with difficulty remains at around five percent. For these students, a short window of opportunity exists for early intervention during childhood to prevent later language and reading delays (Verhoeven, 2011). Over time, without remediation, less than 20 percent of children learning English in schools meet state standards for reading (Kindler, 2002). Although the term English language learner can technically refer to any person learning English at any stage in life, for the purposes of this literature review, it refers to K-12 students enrolled in U.S. schools. Garcia (2009) defines ELLs as:

Students 3-21 years old who are enrolled in elementary or secondary school but who do not speak, read, write, or understand English well enough to either: (1) reach a proficient level on state achievement tests, (2) be successful in a classroom in which English is the language of instruction, or (3) fully participate in society. (p. 1)

These students are sometimes also referred to as Limited English Proficient (LEP) students, although ELL is often preferred, as LEP emphasizes a deficiency in the students, as opposed to the overall process of learning. The process by which ELL students learn English is called second language acquisition, or second language learning. Most ELLs enter school already having acquired the majority, though not necessarily all, of the basic components of their native language or languages (Ballantyne, 2008). The phrase second language acquisition still applies even if the student is technically learning English as a third language or beyond.

Technology-based reading interventions are in a position to play a major role in remediating difficulties ELLs face when going into the classroom for the first time. Programs like Smarty Ants, designed to teach early reading skills to prekindergarten through second-grade students, present a unique opportunity to remediate early reading deficits through scaffolded and responsive instruction, with the option of that instruction being in the ELL's first language.

This paper explains how Smarty Ants addresses the unique needs of ELLs. It is organized around the findings and suggestions of eminent researchers in the field of second language acquisition (e.g., Butler-Pascoe & Wilber, 2003; Cummins, 2007; Diaz- Rico & Weed, 2010; Dukes, 2005; Van Scoter & Boss, 2002; Ybarra & Green, 2003; and Zehr, 2007), and focuses on learning, instruction and assessment.

## ■ The Development of Smarty Ants

---

Smarty Ants targets the needs of all struggling readers. Its research-based curriculum and pedagogy were created under the advisement of a core team of educators from Stanford University and the University of California, Berkeley:

- Dr. P. David Pearson, world-renowned reading researcher, professor, and dean emeritus of the University of California, Berkeley, Graduate School of Education.
- Dr. Robert Calfee, distinguished professor emeritus of the Stanford University School of Education, and dean emeritus of the University of California, Riverside, Graduate School of Education.

- Dr. Mia Callahan, graduate of Stanford University and the University of California, Berkeley, and seasoned reading teacher of 30+ years.

The Smarty Ants curriculum and pedagogy is based on the findings of landmark reading intervention studies (e.g., Foorman, Francis, Fletcher, Schatschneider, & Mehta, 1998; Vellutino, Scanlon, Sipay, Small, Pratt, Chen, et al., 1996; Vellutino, Scanlon, & Jaccard, 2003; Torgesen, Wagner, Rashotte, Rose, Lindamood, Conway, et al., 1999) and the most influential national research studies of the past five decades (e.g., Bond & Dykstra, 1967; Chall, 1967; Anderson, Hiebert, Scott, & Wilkinson, 1985; Adams, 1990; Snow, Burns, & Griffin, 1998; NICHD, 2000).

## ■ Pre-conditions for Learning English

---

When ELLs enter the school system, many have had little exposure to English as the primary language of communication. Oftentimes, their only exposure is to English through television, the internet, or in brief conversations outside of the home (Verhoeven, 2011). Because early language abilities are largely determined by a child's oral language fluency, ELLs arrive at school at a distinct disadvantage.

Typically, when linguists speak of language acquisition, they are referring to first language acquisition. There is a long history of debate surrounding issues of first language acquisition, that is, how children come to speak in their mother tongue in such a seemingly effortless manner.

One early explanation for language acquisition was offered by behaviorists, most notably B.F. Skinner, who argued that linguistic behavior is molded solely by the environment, namely adult speakers whose speech children imitate (Skinner, 1957).

Behaviorists further believed that children are externally reinforced by adult speakers who correct them when they are “wrong” and reward them when they are “right” (Akmajian, Demers, Farmer, & Harnish, 1995). Clearly, this simplified theory could not explain the vast number of utterances that children produce that they, in fact, have never heard before. Furthermore, there is little empirical evidence to support the argument that correcting children's grammar plays any role in acquisition (Borer, 1998).

The behaviorist theory was most successfully challenged by Noam Chomsky's innateness hypothesis, which proposed that children are born with the biological predisposition for language acquisition (Chomsky, 1986). Chomsky points out that “the language each person acquires is a rich and complex construction hopelessly underdetermined by the fragmentary evidence available [to the child]. Nevertheless, individuals in a speech community have developed essentially the same language” (Pinker, 1994, p. 23). Chomsky's theory addressed the “input problem,” i.e., the evidence of a language available to a child underdetermines the acquired grammar for that language. Input alone cannot explain language acquisition, although it maintains a central role in the process of language acquisition. Ballantyne (2008) points out “research shows that first language acquisition continues into the elementary school years.

Children entering elementary school may not yet have acquired the complex grammatical structures of their first language” (p. 9).

A central question is whether second language acquisition follows the same pattern as first language acquisition. This question stems from the same issue that surrounds first language acquisition, i.e., how can a speaker of a second language come to produce utterances that he or she could not have possibly learned before? Numerous studies have considered the possibility that second language acquisition follows the same process that Chomsky proposed for first language acquisition (Cook, 1985; White, 1989), a proposal that is still debated. Ludo Verhoeven (2011) describes the processes of first language and second language acquisition as parallel, with the abilities of a

student in a second language to be highly dependent on the development of abilities in the first language. In fact, too much focus on the second language is considered by some to be detrimental to the development of early skills in language and literacy (Tabors, 1997; Dickinson & Tabors, 2002).

Despite the healthy debate among theorists and researchers concerning how children acquire a second language, there is general consensus that linguistic input for English language learners must be engaging for maximum language learning to occur (Gersten, 2003; Goldenberg, 2008). Smarty Ants provides engaging and highly interactive English language input for students at all levels of English language learning.

## ■ Technology

---

According to Dukes (2005), best practice is defined as “a technique or methodology that, through experience and research, has proven to reliably lead to a desired result” (p. 3). Although research on the effectiveness of technology for English language learners is in its infancy, there is a mounting body of research outlining some of the best practices in utilizing technology for teaching English language skills and reading skills to all students, in particular English language learners (Butler-Pascoe & Wiburg, 2003; Cummins, 2007; Dukes, 2005; Van Scoter & Boss, 2002; Ybarra & Green, 2003; Zehr, 2007). This section outlines specific best practices for integrating technology and teaching English language learners, and examines how Smarty Ants incorporates these best practices.


### Develop and Practice the Key Components of Reading

It is fairly well understood and accepted that learning to read in a second language requires skill development in many of the same domains involved in learning to read in a first language, including phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, and comprehension (Díaz-Rico & Weed, 2010). The use of a computer program that is tailored to the specific learning needs of the student is an unobtrusive, nonjudgmental, and potentially high-impact way of providing instruction to these students. The following subsections explain how Smarty Ants targets these fundamental skills for English language learners.

#### Phonemic Awareness and Phonics

Phonemic awareness, the ability to isolate sounds, represents the “metalinguistic understanding that spoken words can be decomposed into phonological primitives, which in turn can be represented by alphabetic characters” (Pugh, Sandak, Frost, Moore, & Mencl, 2006, p. 65).

Phonemic awareness is typically learned in a classroom environment (Snow, Burns, & Griffin, 1998). Smarty Ants presents the opportunity for ELLs to become phonemically aware in English at home, exposing them early to this skill that is so critical to later reading development. Typically, the sounds of letters, as well as letter combinations like digraphs, diphthongs and blends, also are taught in school in the form of phonics instruction.



**Figure 1** – Word bubbles illustrating the process of sounding out and blending phonemes to create words

In the Smarty Ants game Four Square, the child playing the game is given the opportunity to identify letters. Then, each letter's relationship to a word illustrated in the preceding screen will be shown with each phoneme segmented both aurally and visually for the child to see. The visual segmentation occurs through the use of a word bubble that expands as the phoneme segments are then blended and pronounced as part of a word.

This technique corresponds to a popular instructional strategy called sound boxes. Sound boxes, just like many other strategies of manipulating phonemes in words, emphasize the individual phonemes as well as the putting of sounds together, or blending. Preliminary research has shown that the systematic use of sound boxes has positive effects on developing phonemic awareness (McCarthy, 2008; Yeh & Connell, 2008).

Another way that phonemic awareness is explicitly taught in Smarty Ants is through the use of rhymes, a technique supported by teachers of ELLs (Díaz- Rico & Weed, 2010). Because traditional rhyming games require an understanding of how to manipulate sounds in words, they can be effective in teaching simple manipulation of phonemes. Research suggests that, due to the complex nature of developing a tiered curriculum for phonemic awareness (McGee & Ukrainetz, 2009), computer-based programs may be one of the best ways of developing mastery in this area.

## **Vocabulary**

Words are not taught in isolation from their contexts or meanings and must be used in context for ELLs to develop rich vocabularies. According to Lynn Díaz-Rico and Kathryn Weed (2010), "Native English speakers typically know at least 5,000-7,000 English words before kindergarten – a huge vocabulary as anyone who has struggled to learn a second language knows." In order for ELLs to keep pace with their English-speaking peers, they need to learn at least that many words before kindergarten begins.

The explicit teaching of vocabulary must begin early. Important studies, such as those conducted by Hart and Risley (1995), clearly outline how early deficits in word knowledge become compounded overtime, leaving children far behind their higher-achieving peers. Part of developing a robust vocabulary includes learning the most common words at an early age while also learning uncommon or academic words (Beck, McKeown, & Kucan, 2002).

Smarty Ants teaches word recognition initially through phonemic awareness activities, and later moves into learning words through word games incorporating sound/symbol correspondences (phonics) and practice reading the words in longer stories. As students master the words by identifying them correctly at least three times, they accumulate the words in the reward room. Here students can see which words they have mastered as well as those they are still working on. When the words are clicked on, they are segmented and pronounced.

This dynamic word wall style presentation corresponds to well-known practices for enriching vocabulary instruction because it often organizes the words into families, morphological categories, and/or phonetic categories depending on the level of the student (Beck & McKeown, 2007).

## **Comprehension**

Developing a deep understanding of what is read comes about through a complex set of cognitive processes and through fluency with a variety of reading-related cognitive tasks. Beginning instruction in reading comprehension should include skill development in recalling, sequencing, predicting, and summarizing information (Snow, Burns, & Griffin, 1998).


In Smarty Ants, the Story Quiz Show, which is accessible after completing a variety of games on the activity board, is the main site of reading comprehension activities. A variety of questions asked in a game show-like format allow the child to demonstrate mastery of a library of stories that are read prior to the game show beginning.

Metacognitive thinking strategies are modeled throughout by the host of the show and the ant friends that the child invites to play along and react to the story (Harvey & Goudvis, 2007). Moreover, the stories that are read to the child normally have vivid illustrations that depict the story. The presence of these illustrations also increases the comprehensibility of the text.

## Increase Comprehensibility

Dukes (2005) notes that “increasing comprehensibility in the classroom means using whatever appropriate means necessary to ensure that students understand the material presented to them” (p. 3). This does not necessarily mean oversimplifying the language for English language learners; rather, it suggests using outside sources to get the meaning across to them. Garcia (2009) specifies that teachers should provide context to help students understand the content:

“In order to make the content more comprehensible, teachers can use a variety of scaffolding techniques, such as ... using a number of visual supports, such as objects, pictures, video images...” (p. 16). Smarty Ants has a number of visual supports built into its program, including vivid pictures to illustrate lessons and colorful depictions of words and stories built by the children throughout their literacy journey.



**Figure 2** – *Story Game Show, where questions about the stories model strategies and develop skills that enhance comprehension*



**Figure 3** – *An example of a visual support provided when the user is asked to produce the word “pens”*

At the same time, Smarty Ants still challenges students and uses positive reinforcement as it pushes them to continue to move up through all 69 lessons and 11 levels that it provides. Both Stephen Krashen and Vygotsky noted the ability and need of students to push beyond their level of competence; that is, students need comprehensible input that still challenges their abilities (Hobgood, 2005). Smarty Ants has addressed this need. Students strive to push ahead and move up in each level of the program, their motivation fueled by the large variety of activities that provide them with abundant comprehensible input.

## Provide Individualized Practice to Accommodate a Variety of Learning Styles and Levels

Assessment in Smarty Ants follows many of the recommendations made by leading theorists on early literacy for ELLs (Díaz-Rico & Weed, 2010). First, Smarty Ants does not assume that students know anything about sound-letter correspondence or English orthography as they begin their work.

Through an interactive assessment, users demonstrate their skills in a variety of domains of reading and are then

placed in the appropriately leveled lesson to begin the program. The assessment takes place in the Smarty Ants swimming pool, where the child is asked to “dive” on letters or words that are floating in the pool below. Children are provided with encouraging feedback throughout the assessment and, based on their responses to questions, are placed in a level appropriate to their ideal learning zone [see Figure 4].

The user is then placed into an interactive environment where he or she can choose from a variety of games, each targeting the identified skill. This element of choice helps students remain motivated while moving through the program, since no one form of practicing a specific skill is required [see Figure 5].



**Figure 4** – A The Assessment Pool is the pre-assessment that places children in an appropriately leveled learning environment.



**Figure 5** – The Activity Board allows the user to select from a variety of activities based on personal interests

## Provide Multisensory Support

Using more than one sense to learn basic reading skills in English allows for students who may need additional input to gain access to sounds, words, and texts which may be unfamiliar (Birsh, 2005; Díaz-Rico & Weed, 2010). The immersive environment of Smarty Ants brings life to the process of learning to read. Throughout the program, directions for all activities are given

Orally, and examples enacted by the Flea character provide auditory and visual support. All of the sounds, words, and texts learned are seen and heard multiple times. Touch is incorporated through the use of a computer mouse

or its equivalent with activities such as painting letters to learn letter formation.

## Create a Motivating and Positive Working Environment

Butler-Pascoe and Wilburg (2003) point out that “technology can aid teachers in creating a supportive, nonthreatening learning environment in which second language learners feel secure enough to practice the target language and to make and correct their own errors without embarrassment or anxiety” (p. 86). From the moment students get into the Smarty Ants world to be assessed, it is clear that it is a fun, engaging, and interactive world for students to join. The positive reinforcement that students receive is immediate, in the form of encouragement and feedback from the Coach, the user’s Dog, and Flea, who support and accompany the student on his or her learning journey.

This kind of motivating and positive working environment is crucial for all students, but especially for students such as English language learners, who feel more vulnerable and apprehensive about being assessed. There is never any negative feedback provided in Smarty Ants. For example, if Coach says “Click on the letter p,” and the student instead clicks on a different letter, such as the letter v, instead of being told that he or she is “wrong,” Coach affirms that the student chose the letter v, then asks again for the letter p. If the child is unable to find the correct letter independently, scaffolding is provided so that success is guaranteed.

The student is not only corrected in a positive way, but he or she also learns something in the process, without ever being made to feel ashamed of answering incorrectly. This is especially important for ELLs who often already feel different from their native English speaking peers. As further encouragement, when students successfully complete any game while playing Smarty Ants, the next time they log on they receive a copy of *The Daily Woof* [see Figure 6], which chronicles their accomplishments and reads them aloud to the user.



**Figure 6** – *The Daily Woof* is one way to bridge home and school communication and keep concerned parents and teachers informed about reading progress

The Daily Woof can also be sent to the e-mail address of the registered parent or teacher so that they remain informed as to the progress of their child and can support him or her in any way possible. The involvement of family members in promoting early literacy or family literacy has long been a successful way of encouraging long-term gains in literacy (Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 1995; Lareau, 1989; Marvin & Wright, 1997).

The Daily Woof connects the family, the school, and the child in a network of support. This e-mail communication between family and instructors during the child's early learning potentially opens up discussions about the child's specific learning successes, especially if the parents have some understanding of spoken English.

## ■ Conclusion

---

As the English language learner population grows, it will soon encompass the majority of students in American public schools. Now is the time when researchers and software developers should be working in tandem to design effective, low-cost interventions that can support the life-long literacy achievement of ELLs. Smarty Ants successfully targets ELLs because it teaches early literacy skills, starts where children are, involves members of the family in the learning process, motivates children to learn, addresses different learning styles, and engages students using more than one sense.

## ■ References

---

- Adams, M. J. (1990). *Beginning to read: Thinking and learning about print*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Akmajian, A., Demers, R. A., Farmer, A. K., & Harnish, R. M. (1995). *Linguistics: An introduction to language and communication* (4th ed.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Anderson, R. C., Hiebert, E.H., Scott, J.A. & Wilkinson, I.G. (1985). *Becoming a nation of readers*. Washington, DC: US Department of Education, The National Institute of Education.
- August, D., & Shanahan, T. (Eds.). (2006). *Developing literacy in second-language learners: Report of the National Literacy Panel on language-minority children and youth* (Executive summary). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Ballantyne, K. G. (2008). Learning a second language while you are still working on the first. *AccELLerate!*, 1(1), 9–11.
- Beck, I. L., & McKeown, M.G. (2007). Different ways for different goals, but keep your eyes on the higher verbal goals. In Wagner, R. K., Muse, A. E., & Tannenbaum K. R. (Eds). *Vocabulary acquisition: Implications for reading comprehension*. New York: Guilford Press (pp. 182-204).
- Beck, I. L., McKeown, M.G., & Kucan, L. (2002). *Bringing words to life: Robust vocabulary instruction*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Birsh, J. (2005). *Multisensory teaching of basic English skills*. Baltimore, MD: Brookes Publishing.
- Bond, G. L., & Dykstra, R. (1967). The cooperative research program in first-grade reading instruction. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 2, 10–141.
- Borer, H. (1998). *Topics in language acquisition*. University of Southern California: Dept. of Linguistics Lecture Series.
- Butler-Pascoe, M. E., & Wiburg, K. M. (2003). *Technology and teaching English language learners*. Boston: Pearson Education.
- Chall, J. S. (1967). *Learning to read: The great debate*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Chomsky, N. (1986). *Knowledge of language: Its nature, origin, and use*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Cook, V. J. (1985). Chomsky's universal grammar and second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 6(1), 2–18.

## ■ References (continued)

---

- Cummins, J., Brown, K., & Sayers, D. (2007). *Literacy, technology, and diversity: Teaching for success in changing times*. Boston: Pearson Education.
- Cunningham, P. (2005) *Phonics that work*. Baltimore: Pearson.
- Díaz-Rico, L. T. & Weed, K. Z. (2010). *The Cross-cultural, language, and academic development handbook: A complete K-12 reference guide*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Dickinson, D. & Tabors, P. (2002). Fostering language and literacy in classrooms and homes. *Young Children*, 57(2), 10-18.
- Dukes, C. (2005). Best practices for integrating technology into English language instruction. *SEIR-TEC News Wire*, 7(1), 3-6. Retrieved September 21, 2011, from <http://www.seirtec.org/publications/NewsWire/Vol7.1.pdf>
- Foorman, B. R., Francis, D. J., Fletcher, J. M., Schatschneider, C., & Mehta, P. (1998). The role of instruction in learning to read: Preventing reading failure in at-risk children. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 90, 37-55.
- Frost, R. (2006). A Task-based approach. Retrieved from [www.teachingenglish.org](http://www.teachingenglish.org)
- Garcia, P. (2009). Connecting research about English language learners to practice: An introductory guide for educators. Retrieved from Learning Point Associates: [http://www.learningpt.org/pdfs/ConnectResearchPractice\\_ELL\\_IntroGuide.pdf](http://www.learningpt.org/pdfs/ConnectResearchPractice_ELL_IntroGuide.pdf)
- Genessee, F. & Geva, E. (2006). Cross-linguistic relationships in working memory, phonological processes, and oral language. In D. August & T. Shanahan (Eds.), *Report of the National Literacy Panel on K-12 youth and adolescents* (pp. 175-184). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Gersten, R., & Geva, E. (2003). Teaching reading to English language learners. *Educational Leadership*, 60(7), 44-49.
- Goldenberg, C. (2008). Teaching English language learners: What the research does – and does not – say. *American Educator*, 32(2), 8-23; 42-43.
- Hart, B., & Risley, R. T. (1995). *Meaningful differences in the everyday experience of young American children*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.
- Harvey, S, Goudvis, A. (2007). *Strategies that work* (2nd ed.). Markham, Ontario: Pembroke.
- Hobgood, B. (2005). Simple strategies for effective teaching with English language learners. *SEIR-TEC News Wire*, 7(1), 7-11. Retrieved September 21, 2011, from <http://www.seirtec.org/publications/NewsWire/Vol7.1.pdf>
- Hoover-Dempsey, K.V. & Sandler, H.M. (1995). Parental involvement in children's education: Why does it make a difference? *Teacher's College Record*, 97, 310-331.
- Kindler, A.L. (2002). *Survey of states' limited English proficiency students and available educational programs and services*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition.
- Lareau, A. (1989). *Home advantage: Social class and parental intervention*. New York: Falmer Press.
- Marvin, C. A. & Wright, D. (1997). Literacy socialization in the homes of pre-school children. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, 28, 154- 163.
- McCarthy, P. A. (2008). Using sound boxes systematically to develop phonemic awareness. *The Reading Teacher*, 62(4), 346-349.

## ■ References (continued)

---

- McGee, L. M., & Ukrainetz, T. A. (2009). Using scaffolding to teach phonemic awareness in preschool and kindergarten. *The Reading Teacher*, 62, 599-603.
- National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition. (2011). The growing numbers of English learner students, 1998/99–2008/09. Retrieved September 10, 2011, from [http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/uploads/9/growingLEP\\_0809.pdf](http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/uploads/9/growingLEP_0809.pdf)
- National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. (2000). Report of the National Reading Panel. Teaching children to read: an evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction: Reports of the subgroups (NIH Publication No. 00-4754). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Pinker, S. (1994). *The language instinct: How the mind creates language*. New York: Harper Perennial.
- Pugh, K., Sandak, R., Frost, S., Moore, D., & Mencl, W. E. (2006). Neurobiological investigations of skilled and impaired reading. In Dickinson, D. K., & Neuman, S. B. (eds.), *Handbook of early literacy research* (Vol. 2, pp. 64-74.)
- Skinner, B. F. (1957). *Verbal behavior*. Acton, MA: Copley Publishing Group.
- Snow, C. E., Burns, M., & Griffin, P. (1998). *Preventing reading difficulties in young children*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Snow, C. E. & Hoefnagel-Hohle, M. (1978). Critical period for language acquisition: Evidence from second language learning. *Child Development*, 49, 1263-1279.
- Tabors, P. (1997). *One child, two languages: A guide for early childhood educators of children learning English as a second language*. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes.
- Torgesen, J. K., Wagner, R. K., Rashotte, C. A., Rose, E., Lindamood, P., Conway, T., et al. (1999). Preventing reading failure in young children with phonological processing disabilities: Group and individual responses to instruction. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 91(4), 579–593.
- Van Scoter, J., & Boss, S. (2002). *Learners, language, and technology: Making connections that support literacy*. Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. Retrieved September 4, 2011, from: <http://www.netc.org/earlyconnections/pub/llt.pdf>.
- Vellutino, F., Scanlon, D., & Jaccard, J. (2003). Toward distinguishing between cognitive and experiential deficits as primary sources of difficulty in learning to read: A two-year follow-up of difficult to remediate and readily remediated poor readers. In B. R. Foorman (Ed.), *Preventing and remediating reading difficulties: Bringing science to scale* (pp. 73-120). Baltimore: York Press.
- Vellutino, F. R., Scanlon, D. M., Sipay, E. R., Small, S. G., Pratt, A., Chen, R., & Denckla, M. B. (1996) Cognitive profiles of difficult-to-remediate and readily remediated poor readers: Early intervention as a vehicle for distinguishing between cognitive and experiential deficits as basic causes of specific reading disability. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 88, 601-638.
- Verhoeven, L. (2011). Second language reading acquisition. In Kamil, M. L., Pearson, P. D., Moje, E. B., & Afflerbach, P. P. (Eds.). *The Handbook of reading research: Volume IV*. London: Routledge.
- White, L. (1989). *Universal grammar and second language acquisition*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

## ■ References (continued)

---

Ybarra, R., & Green, T. (2003). Using technology to help ESL/EFL students develop language skills. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 9(3). Retrieved August 12, 2011, from <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Ybarra-Technology.html>

Yeh, S. S. & Connell, D. B. (2008). Effects of rhyming, vocabulary and phonemic awareness instruction on phoneme awareness. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 31(2), 243-256.

Zehr, M. A. (2007). Interactivity seen as key. *Education Week Digital Directions*, 1, 29. Retrieved August 27, 2011, from <http://www.edweek.org/dd/articles/2007/09/12/02ell.h01.html>

## ■ Authors

---

**Aubry Threlkeld** is a doctoral candidate in Language & Literacy at the Harvard Graduate School of Education. He was a special education teacher and then a special education instructional coach in New York City Public Schools for five years. He taught graduate-level courses in literacy and special education for Pace University and is a teaching fellow for numerous literacy and research methods courses at the Harvard Graduate School of Education. Mr. Threlkeld has also been a Presidential Instructional Technology Fellow at Harvard University, designing online courseware on qualitative research methodology. He is an educational consultant working in schools around the country to provide professional development and coaching on literacy, technology integration, science, and differentiating the curriculum for struggling learners.

**Maria Kessler** has been an educational editor and writer for over eight years, with an emphasis on K-8 curriculum products and professional educational writing. Prior to that, she was an educator in elementary bilingual classes and adult English as a second language courses. Throughout her entire educational career, she has maintained a focus on English language development. She received her Bachelor's degree in English from the University of California in Irvine, a Master's degree in Comparative Literature from the University of Arizona, and a Master's degree in Linguistics from the University of Southern California



The Leader in Differentiated Instruction

---

**To learn more about Achieve3000  
and its proven solutions,  
call 888-968-6822 or e-mail  
[office@achieve3000.com](mailto:office@achieve3000.com)**

---