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EDRD 830: Article Critique

Castro, D. C., Paez, M. M., Dickinson, D. K. & Frede, E. (2011). Promoting language and literacy in young dual language learners: Research, practice, and policy. *Child Development Perspectives, 5*(1), 15-21

The purpose of this article was to discuss current knowledge about effective instructional strategies for promoting language and literacy development among young dual learners. This article reviewed literature regarding instructional strategies for promoting language and literacy development in young dual learners and provided recommendations for policy and for future research.

According to Casto, Paez, Dickinson, & Frede (2011), it is important to create a literacy rich environment using visual aids, gestures, emphasizing important words in a sentence and repeating key vocabulary words. I think that creating a rich literacy and learning environment is important. Classroom teachers must make the learning environment conducive for students and must ensure that the classroom has a rich print environment. Labeling objects, and creating a word wall are some of the ways of creating rich literacy environment. I agree with the authors that teachers need to use visual aids when teaching children. Not all children learn in the same way. There are different learning styles. Some children learn better when they see pictures and images, others are auditory learners, some children learn through kinesthetic. Therefore classroom teachers need to know how their students learn and to make an effort to use different methods in teaching children. According to Casto, Paez, Dickinson, & Frede (2011), teachers need to repeat key vocabulary words. I think that vocabulary words should be repeated. However, for children, especially dual learner learners to learn vocabulary, teachers need to teach vocabulary words and their meanings in context and based on the text and the instructional method must be interactive. Just repeating vocabulary words to dual language learners is not enough to make learning vocabulary meaningful.

I agree with the authors that teachers need to provide concrete experiences and material to children. Dual language learners learn better when they see concrete objects and will be able to retain information better than when teachers teach abstractly. The authors indicated that it is important to extend talk on a single topic and to provide opportunities for students to converse with the teachers. This made me think of the various articles that we discussed in class regarding developing oral language skills and creating opportunities for children to talk about ideas.

According to Casto, Paez, Dickinson, & Frede (2011), using children’s first language in instruction leads to higher social, cognitive and academic achievement levels. This to me is an ideal way of teaching. However, it is of my opinion that there aren’t enough bilingual teachers in our schools. Teachers need to have professional development in this area. Secondly, it would be ideal if teachers can speak more than one language. Teacher preparation programs should make it a point to prepare preservice teachers in this area and should provide preservice teachers the option to learn a second language.

Overall, this article provided some background information on the instructional strategies that classroom teachers can use in teaching dual language learners. I liked the fact that, the authors provided recommendations for policy and for future research. I agree with the recommendations that the authors made. However, the authors indicated that there is the need to ensure the provision of resources for enhancing language and literacy-based materials. I must say that currently, most school system are experiencing budget cuts. As a result, it might be difficult for administrators to provide the needed resources for classroom teachers to use.

**CRITIQUE OF A REVIEW OR SYNTHESIS ARTICLE (not a research study)**

The *reference* for the article being critiqued must be written in APA (6th ed.) style. Minor errors detected. -.1

The *purpose* of the review/synthesis is a description of what the review/synthesis examined.

See comment in text- the purpose should be restated in your own words or directly quoted from the article. I’d much prefer you restated instead of quoted since academic writing style requires that quotes only be used when the writer truly cannot restate in his/her own words.

In the *summary* section you need to summarize the most important points of the review/synthesis. Identify the most critical points that were presented and discussed. Think about the following issues: 1) Are theoretical/definitional issues addressed? 2) How is the review/synthesis organized? 3) Does the organization reflect the purpose? 4) Is the review/synthesis thorough? 5) Are the conceptual issues clear and coherent?

I’d like more critical comments in this section that pertain to the required points above. You did a nice job going through the authors’ points and adding your comments, but I’d like you to practice taking a step back to examine the issues, organization, and clarity of the piece as much as the step-by-step comments. -.1

The *conclusions* section should include the conclusions that the author(s) drew from the review or synthesis of the particular topic.

Again, I’d like to see more critical comments in this section. They ended with policy and practice recommendations, but you commented on just one aspect of materials provision. What about the other recommendations? -.1

The last section, *critical comments* are very important. In this section, you have the opportunity to comment on the value of the review/synthesis as conceptualized, organized, reported, and on the practical value of the review/synthesis for the field, teachers, students, and schools. Think about the following issues: 1) Are the conclusions linked to the evidence that was reviewed or synthesized? 2) Does the review/synthesis identify problems and areas for future research?

I’d like to see more critique and critical comments here as well. How, in your opinion, should this piece be used (or not) to advance thinking about DLL instruction? -.1

Score 9.6/10