

Cognition, Language, and Literacy for Diverse Young Learners Seminar
Rema Sawyerr
November 11, 2015

| Component of Assignment | Points | Notes |
|---|---------------|---|
| Posted appropriate research article at least two weeks before the seminar | 3/3 | Thank you for selecting a research article that gave us an opportunity to not only discuss the content but also the methods. We enjoyed thinking about the way word-level and verbal skills contribute to written expression in learners with English as their first or second language. |
| Provided face-to-face and online help and feedback to classmates | 2/2 | From what we were aware, both face to face and online discussions were productive. |
| Introduced topic and provided a closing as a group | 2/2 | The brief introduction helped to set the stage for the discussion across the three articles. It was helpful to have a summary of the main focus of each article before discussing them individually. The closing activity was a great way to connect the readings to our previous work. |
| Provided handouts as needed | 3/3 | <p>Your handouts were helpful and supported the discussion. We appreciated your putting them in a folder. Folders help some of us stay organized! The graphic representation of the “Simple View of Writing” provided a jumping off point for discussing the complex nature of writing. We also found the sheet that included information about the measures used to be very useful. Knowing what each instrument measures helps us understand the results more fully. The printed blog entries were also very helpful.</p> <p>Please be sure to include citations on your handouts. If you copy and paste from a website, you need to indicate where it was retrieved. Check the APA manual for formatting of the citations.</p> |
| Facilitated an engaging and intellectually stimulating discussion | 9.5/10 | You did a nice job of introducing the topic and explaining that you selected the article because you are interested in the role that vocabulary plays in writing and that you are specifically interested in the impact of teaching vocabulary on young children’s writing. It was evident that you used your classmates comments on the blog to shape the discussion. This was especially |

| | | |
|-------|-------------|---|
| | | <p>apparent when you referred to Rabaah's question and included information from another study that you searched for in order to respond to her question.</p> <p>Your discussion was well organized. You started by facilitating a discussion of the introduction and then moved to the methods, results, and discussion sections of the article. By discussing the theoretical framework and methods, you were able to help us think about the results and conclusions in light of the theoretical orientation, data collection, and data analyses.</p> <p>We suggest as you plan for future facilitation of discussions and seminars that you plan ways to promote discussion when there is a lull. We suggest having some guiding questions with additional prompts to use as needed.</p> <p>Overall, you seemed to have a good understanding of the content in the article. This is important when facilitating a discussion.</p> |
| TOTAL | 19.5/ 20 | We appreciate the effort you put into researching your topic, selecting an interesting article, preparing for the discussion, and facilitating the discussion. |

Feedback From Peers that made deadline for reflection

Peer #1

Following Rema's seminar, I'm still curious about the populations that the tests/assessments used were normed on. I agree with Dr. Burns that the authors needed to choose a set of expectations, otherwise they could not have done a quantitative study. At the same point, I question deeply which words/levels/etc. are considered "right". This is because, at least in the US (which is my only basis for comparison), most assessments are normed on white, male, middle to upper middle class students, which do not address the knoweldge of so many other populations. I agree with Jayne's concern about the accuracy of the results if children are not assessed in their home languages. Are there assessments normed on other populations? I felt the discussion was rich, but may have benefited from a more direct question/area for Rema to begin the discussion with as a focus.

I like that Sehyun started the discussion, but when no one spoke (when she asked about thoughts about interliteracy) that she could continue the discussion. I appreciate that the take away is that even though the process of becoming bilingual is complicated and individualized, it is ultimately beneficial for the child. We really need more research on children learning a variety of languages, or being multilingual as opposed to bilingual. This is a reality of our world, particularly in our area, and teachers need to know how best to meet the needs of these children.

We also need to define consistently across the field the different, and often confusing, definitions of bi- and multilingualism. For example, what does it really mean to be an English Language Learner as opposed to learning English as a second language? Or being a simultaneous or sequential bilingual? If we all used the same terminology and definitions, that may help :)

Jayne, I think it was a very interesting discussion and I agree with your links to Dyson, but I still don't completely understand the difference between diffuse and indirect appropriation. Diffuse to me sounds like they used elements of lessons taught (p 415), whereas indirect were concepts that emerged from lessons rather than being explicitly taught to the students (p. 418).

I'm sorry that I wasn't able to be in class in person, but am thankful to technology for allowing me to participate remotely. At the same time, I felt like something was missing for me by not being able to converse as directly and comfortably as I'm able to do in class. I wonder if there have been studies completed or underway about the quality of online as opposed to in person phd classes? I know there are some regarding undergrads, but I'm curious if there's a difference.

Peer #2

I enjoyed listening to each article on writing especially and how each one focused on a different aspect of writing. The idea of code switching is very important as children begin to write. Having interactions with one another and drawing on each other's similar cultural aspects and linguistic repertoires is important for composing especially as children transition from L1 to L2. I know in my classroom the students converse and look to each other for help in retrieving words in English that they know only in Spanish. Vocabulary is so important in writing I do agree this and with structured writing lessons that are carefully scaffolded writing can help increase vocabulary as does reading. I did think the idea of appropriations is interesting as it made me think of my own writing mini lessons and how students appropriate my teaching tools in their writing. I think the researcher was thorough in his description of the different appropriations, but the important take away is that the students were utilizing these appropriations but at different times and different ways. All three articles did give reference to the idea that further research is needed with bilingual and multi lingual students and I agree.

Peer #3

The seminar started off pretty well with Jayne's brief introduction of the three articles and then each presenter taking turns in presenting their articles. All presenters began their seminars by handing us relevant handouts that could be used to get straight into the discussion of the topics.

I also found it helpful that all presenters walked us through each section of the article, but I felt that some presenters took longer to get to the main key findings of the study. Like during her discussion of the article, Jayne took longer to dissect the conceptual framework (direct vs. indirect vs. diffusion) than going through the main findings and discussions. Sehyun spent more time talking about the methods

section, but quickly caught up with the results and discussion section. Reema, I felt, was able to pace herself in facilitating the discussion of all the main sections of the article. Still all presenters added something new to my growing knowledge of the topic of early writing and bilingual children's writing. During Reema's seminar, I learned that the models of L1 and L2 were similar, but also different such that the L1 students' vocabulary could have a different impact on writing quality compared to L2 students' vocabulary. From Sehyun's seminar, I learned that researchers have spend more time investigating Hispanic children's rather than Korean children's writing. From Jayne's discussion learned about (and am still learning) the differences between direct, indirect, and diffuse.

Overall, the last activity (concept map) was well thought out of. It reinforced some of the key points from each discussion. Thank you Reema, Sehyun, and Jayne for facilitating a great seminar!!