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ABSTRACT

SCAFFOLDING NARRATIVE WRITING IN A FOURTH-GRADE CLASSROOM THROUGH ACCELA’S EXPANDED TEACHING AND LEARNING CYCLE: A CASE STUDY

MAY 2023

JUAN PABLO JIMÉNEZ CAICEDO, B.A., UNIVERSIDAD DEL VALLE COLOMBIA

M.A., WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY

Ed.D., UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST

Directed by: Professor K. C. Nat Turner

The socio-political context of education reform of the last two decades in the United States (e.g., No Child Left Behind Act, Race to the Top, anti-bilingual education laws in several states, The Common Core State Standards, and the Every Student Succeeds Act) has limited the capacity of urban public schools to address the academic literacy needs of the increasingly growing population of emerging bilinguals in this country; which as of fall of 2019 represented 10.4 % (5.1 million students) (NCES, 2022). This problem has been exacerbated when large numbers of emerging bilinguals have been placed in mainstream classrooms with inadequately prepared teachers (Robinson, 2012, Gebhard, 2010; Schleppegrell, 2004, de Oliveira 2023), in which they are expected to develop their L2 literacy, as well as disciplinary literacies in English, while receiving increasingly less support in the students’ first language.

The purpose of this study is to make a contribution to the field of L2 literacy by providing a systematic and longitudinal description of a fourth-grade multilingual teacher’s literacy instruction and the academic writing development of a focal multilingual student in an urban elementary school in western Massachusetts. In trying to
understand how Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) pedagogies may be utilized in classrooms with predominantly diverse learners, this study addresses two research questions: 1) How did a multilingual teacher participating in the ACCELA Alliance professional development implement SFL genre-based pedagogies in designing literacy instruction for culturally and linguistically diverse students?, 2) How did the academic writing in English of a multilingual student change over time as she participated in the teacher’s exploration and negotiation with genre-based pedagogies and state mandated curriculum?

This ethnographic case study combines qualitative research methods and uses concepts associated with sociocultural theory and SFL genre methods. The analysis of the data involves two phases: The first analyzes the instructional process data using an ethnographic case study approach (Stake, 2000), and discourse analytical techniques, to trace changes in the teacher’s L2 literacy practices over time, as she implemented genre-based pedagogies while participating in the ACCELA professional development. The second phase analyzes the product data (e.g., the texts produced by the focal student) using SFL genre-based criteria regarding the specific generic moves and the lexico-grammatical register features associated with the genre of personal narratives. Specifically, on tracing the focal student’s academic literacy development through the internalization of the concept of the personal narrative genre over time, in relation to her teacher’s implementation of genre-based pedagogies.

The findings show that, throughout the academic year, the teacher increasingly incorporated the different steps of the ACCELA expanded Teaching and Learning Cycle (TLC) in her instruction. Namely, her literacy instructional practices shifted from
the typical show, tell and do writing strategies to a more task-focused scaffolded
instruction through a teacher-student interaction, as well as explicit mediation about the
lexico-grammatical resources of language, drawing on the SFL framework. The
documented growth in the teacher’s L2 literacy instruction also reflected a significant
improvement in the overall quality of the focal multilingual student writing over the
academic year. These findings indicate that the integration of sociocultural theory and the
SFL frameworks has a positive impact on both, the development of teachers’ knowledge
about language, their ability to instruct students by focusing on language and literacy
development, and the writing development of multilingual learners.
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CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

Background and Statement of the Problem

The number of English Language Learners or emerging bilinguals1 (Garcia & Kleifgen, 2010) from different socio-cultural backgrounds attending public schools in the United States continues to rapidly grow. According to the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) in the fall of 2019, the percentage of public-school students identified as English Language Learners reached 10.4 % (representing 5.1 million students), as compared to 9.2 percent (or 4.5 million students) in the fall 2010 (NCES, 2022). Notwithstanding this demographic trend, the socio-political context of increasingly standardizing education reform and language policies mandates of the last two decades in this country (e.g., The No Child Left Behind Act, anti-bilingual education laws in several states, The Common Core State Standards, and the Every Student Succeeds Act) has limited the public schools' capacity to address the academic literacy needs of this growing population of emerging bilinguals. Literacy researchers have argued that teachers of emerging bilinguals “are faced with an additional task of scaffolding students’ learning about not only content and the language that supports different genres, but also students’ knowledge about a new language” (de Oliveira & Smith, 2019, see also Gebhard, 2019; Daniello, Turgut & Brisk, 2014). However, many school districts do not serve the full number of these students because the amount of

---

1 According to Garcia and Kleifgen, by using the term emerging bilinguals "Instead of being regarded as 'limited' in some way or as mere 'learners of English' as the terms limited English proficient and English Language Learner suggest, students are seen instead for their potential to become bilingual, and bilingualism begins to be recognized as a cognitive, social and educational resource, which is consistent with research on this topic" (Garcia & Kleifgen, 2010, p.3). Therefore, following these authors, in this study I will preferably use the term emerging bilinguals or emerging multilingual learners interchangeably, though English Language Learners or ELLs will be used whenever I refer to state and other policy documents and entities.
bilingual or ESL specialists in schools is limited, therefore emerging bilingual students end up attending general education classes most of their time in school (de Oliveira, 2023).

Specifically, the passage of anti-bilingual language policies in key states (e.g., Proposition 227 in California, proposition 203 in Arizona, and Question #2 in Massachusetts), which were later defeated in California and Massachusetts in 2016, created a highly contested socio-political context. In these three states, large numbers of emerging bilinguals were placed in mainstream classrooms “with inadequately prepared teachers” (Robinson, 2012. See also Gebhard, 2010; Schleppegrell, 2004), in which they were expected to develop their second language (L2) literacy in English, while receiving increasingly less support in the students’ first language.

This heated educational context was exacerbated by the standardization movement initiated by the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) educational reform of 2002, as well as the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) of 2010 and, more recently, the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015, at the federal level. For over 13 years the NCLB educational reform allocated school funding and resources according to the schools’ implementation of academic standards, mandated curriculum and standardized testing. Dixon, Zhao, Shin, Wu, Su, Burgess-Brigham, Unal Gezer & Snow (2012) state that “[NCLB] set policies that had unforeseen consequences for L2 learners and L2 education” (p.47), by mandating that states assessed all students, including emerging bilinguals, in the three areas of English language arts, math and science. Under NCLB mandates, emerging bilinguals needed to take annual standardized assessments, such as the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS), and their scores needed
to be reported. These emerging bilinguals were required to pass the tests for their high school graduation (Menken, 2009). Such standardized assessment practices still continue with the CCSS and the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015. Consequently, these emerging bilinguals are not only being neglected their ethnic, cultural, linguistic and academic needs through standardized pre-packed curriculum, inadequate instruction and standardized assessment in urban public schools in this country, but more critically, these students are expected to perform well in school and to even know how to write in academically sanctioned ways in their second language (English) in those standardized tests. Thus, building on Darling-Hammond’s (2006) NCLB policy analysis, other L2 literacy researchers such as Gebhard and Harman (2011) conclude that NCLB, and I would argue that by extension CCSS and the Every Student Succeeds Act, “[have] created testing regimes that are pushing these very same [emerging bilingual] students out of school in higher numbers” (p. 46).

The review of literature for the present investigation indicates that there has been a historical paucity of research on the specific issue of L2 writing development of emerging bilinguals (e.g., Latine ELL students) during the last two decades in K-12 schools in the United States. However, in the last decade there has been an increase in the number of studies addressing this pressing educational issue, specifically studies drawing on the SFL pedagogical framework. This scarcity of research on Latine ELLs L2 literacy needs to be addressed, considering the fact that the ELL population will

---

2 In recent years, the use of the “Latinx” term has been criticized for arising out of academia and not out of community (Torres, 2018). Instead, here I use the term “Latine” because it suggests a step towards better inclusion of both non-binary individuals as well as for Spanish speaking communities who may not feel comfortable using the Latinx term in casual conversation (Kamara, 2021).
undoubtedly continue to grow, placing challenges for the K-12 educational system. Some of those challenges pointed out by research reviewed here constitute the lack of professional development of teachers serving culturally and linguistically diverse learners who are trying to learn disciplinary content and develop their L2 academic writing at the same time.

Accordingly, these researchers argue that the professional development needed by current or future teachers of multilingual learners require teacher education programs to critically analyze how everyday school practices are infused by current socio-political issues and the discourses of educational reform (Harman, 2013; Gebhard, et al. 2011; Gebhard, Accurso & Harris, 2019; Ramirez, 2008). Also, teacher education should focus on increasing preservice and in-service teachers’ linguistic knowledge base for them to be better equipped for their literacy instruction (Gebhard, Willet, Jiménez-Caicedo and Piedra’s, 2011; Accurso and Gebhard, 2020). This linguistic knowledge, for instance, should pay attention to critical components of language to support emerging bilinguals in their development of explicit knowledge of the academic register of school genres (de (Aguirre-Muñoz et al. 2015; Brisk, 2014; de Oliveira & Smith, 2019).

Furthermore, this dearth of research focusing on the L2 writing development of emerging bilinguals in K-12 settings in this country concur with Silva and Brice’s (2004) early findings on the scarcity of research on early writing in general (e.g., at the K-12 educational levels) in the United States. For instance, there is little literature addressing the instructional demands and practices looking at emerging bilinguals of different backgrounds and English proficiency levels such as Latine students in elementary schools (Anstrom, DiCerbo, Butler, Katz, Millet & Rivera, 2010). This lack in our field
notwithstanding, the studies reviewed in this dissertation signal important shifts in informing our collective understanding of the multiplicity of factors affecting the writing development of Latine and possibly other emerging bilingual students and the ways researchers have described and operationalized it. Rather than isolating writing development to the individual capacity of displaying discrete lexical and grammatical elements in a given texts (e.g., Fisher & Frey, 2003; Reynolds, 2002; 2005), most of the studies drawing on a socio-cultural perspective of literacy and second language writing located writing development as depending on the possibilities of writing created by the teachers in and outside the classroom context (Patthey-Chavez, Matsumura, & Valdés, 2004; Wollman-Bonilla, 2000, 2001), and as displayed of textual features in students’ texts. For example, some studies operationalized writing development as the appropriation and or display of genre specific features such as in scientific-like discourse Wollman-Bonilla (2000), in hybrid and situationally appropriate texts and narrative development (Solsken, Willett, & Wilson-Keenan, 2000; Bloome, Katz, Solsken, Willett & Wilson-Keenan, 2000), and in letter writing (Gebhard, 2002; Gebhard, Harman, & Seger, 2007). Others described L2 writing development as growth in communicative ability and expression of students’ voices (Valdés, 1999; Coady & Escamilla, 2005).

Even more significant is the shift to a critical agenda developed by some researchers who located L2 writing development as intrinsically connected to curricular decisions made by the teacher, and the school administrators at different levels under the overwhelming pressures of the increasingly normalizing and regulating school reform agendas (Bloome et al., 2000, Gebhard, 2002; Gebhard et al., 2007; Gebhard & Willett, 2008; Willett, Harman, Hogan, Lozano & Rubeck, 2013, among others). These authors
ask the difficult and critical questions of how the people concerned with the education of non-mainstream students (ELL students’ families, teachers, administrators, policy makers, researchers) might alter standard-like mainstream instruction into a more socially responsive pedagogy in order to better meet the needs of Latine and other multilingual learners. How stakeholders committed to an emancipatory education, assume, negotiate and/or resist passive and subjugating roles assigned to us by the discourses and policies reforming our public schools?

In brief, the work of Bloom, Gebhard, Patthey-Chaves, Austin, Willett, and their teams of colleagues, graduate students and school collaborators demonstrates how the everyday literacy practices enacted by teachers and students in urban schools are permeated by large macro socio-political pronouncements that dictate what gets taught, to whom it gets taught, and under what physical and material circumstances. The critical work of these teams of researchers constitutes a political act of denouncing and resisting the ill-prevailing unequal conditions created and perpetuated by neo-liberal educational reforms and standardizing agendas in the United States.

In addition to the lack of research on Latine emerging bilinguals, my review of the literature identified the need to explore alternative ways to define and trace L2 writing development. For instance, there seems to exist important methodological concerns regarding data collection and analysis. Namely, most of the studies reviewed looked at either one student’s writing sample collected at one data point (Coady & Escamilla, 2005), or at multiple students’ writing samples written for different audiences and purposes; that is, written in multiple genres (Gebhard, 2002; Gebhard et al., 2007; Gebhard, Willett, Jiménez-Caicedo, & Piedra, 2011; McCarthey & Garcia, 2005;
Reynolds, 2002, 2005; Valdés, 1999; Wollman-Bonilla, 2000). Such methodological concerns are further supported by August, Shanahan and colleagues’ meta-analysis report (2006, 2008), in which they argue that because of the diversity in tasks and assessment criteria employed in the few studies on the academic writing abilities of English Language Learners “we cannot use their findings to draw substantive conclusions about the writing development of language minority students” (2006, p.62, see also August & Shanahan (2008). They even make a case for using longitudinal approaches to be able to extract significant findings about the factors influencing the trajectory of writing development.

**Purpose of the Study**

All these existing issues on how to define, operationalize and trace L2 writing provide evidence of the need for more research and the necessity to identify alternative methods to investigate the academic writing development of school children in K-12 settings; in particular, under current standardizing national education reforms affecting non-main stream students. In other words, not only do we need to contribute to expanding on the limited body of knowledge on the writing development of emerging bilinguals in K-12 settings; but more importantly, we need to devise other methods for tracing and documenting L2 writing development over time, in ways that would allow us to inform practice research and theory, and hopefully participate in the current and future policy making debates in public education in this country.

Therefore, the purpose of the present study is to make a contribution to the field of L2 writing, first by building on the foundations laid by previous qualitative and quantitative research from multiple disciplines and fields (e.g. linguistics, educational
linguistics, L2 writing research, etc.), and second by taking up Martin’s call on the need to open up “a transdisciplinary dialogue” (Martin & Rose, 2005) among these disciplines in the study of emerging bilinguals’ writing development. Specifically, and drawing on SFL genre-based methodologies, I will attempt to provide a systematic and longitudinal description of a fourth-grade teacher’s literacy instruction and the academic writing development of a focal emerging bilingual. The aim is to answer the overarching question of how a focal student develops her academic writing by internalizing the concept of genre (e.g., developing control over the genre of personal narratives), while participating in her teacher’s exploration with SFL genre-based pedagogy. Thus, the specific research questions guiding the present study are:

1) How did a teacher participating in the ACCELA Alliance professional development implement SFL genre-based pedagogies in designing literacy instruction for culturally and linguistically diverse students?

2) How did a Latina emerging bilingual academic writing in English change over time as she participated in the teacher’s exploration and negotiation with genre-based pedagogies and state mandated curriculum?

**Timeline of the Study**

The life of a scholar is not free of hindrances and difficulties, however this seems like a taboo in academia. In my personal case, a very important aspect to consider in making sense of the present study is that it was not completed in a typical linear fashion due to several personal, and health-related, as well as academic setbacks that I have faced over these years.
Specifically, I completed the data collection over the course of the 2004-2005 academic year, within the sociopolitical context of restrictive bilingual educational policy of Question 2 in Massachusetts. However, at the end of Spring 2006, right before taking my doctoral comprehensive exams based on my initial literature review and preliminary analysis of the data, my family and I were involved in a horrific car accident that affected my health and my academic progress for more than two years.

I defended my comprehensive exams in the summer of 2008 and took a full time teaching job at a private university in New York. I was able to defend my dissertation proposal the summer of 2012, even though I struggled with my initial theoretical and analytical framework combining Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) and corpus linguistics analysis.

Unfortunately, during 2014-2020 my research and dissertation work went into hiatus due to a serious health condition that affected my ability to continue with the work, having to take professional leaves. I also lost close family members in Colombia.

Finally, in the fall of 2020, I re-enrolled in my doctoral program to re-engage with the research project for my dissertation. Specifically, I updated my literature review to include the most recent and related research coming from professional development programs based on the framework on Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) over the last two decades, including ACCELA (2004-2019). This time, I also refocused my theoretical and analytical framework on SFL and genre-based analysis, which is presented in detail in chapter 3 of this dissertation.
Overview of the chapters

This dissertation is organized into six chapters. The introduction presents the general background, statement of the problem and the importance of the study of emerging bilinguals L2 writing development in K-12 settings in the United States. It introduces the main gap identified through the review of the literature regarding the lack of research on Latine emerging bilinguals as well as the need to explore alternative methods to define and trace L2 writing development. Next it presents the purpose and the main research questions of this study, followed by a brief description of each of the chapters of this dissertation.

Chapter 2 provides a detailed review of existing literature on research addressing the second language writing development of emerging bilinguals (e.g., Latine ELLs) in K-12 settings over the last two decades. Two questions guided the review of the literature for this dissertation: 1) How has L2 writing development of ELLs been studied in the United States in the midst of the “English-Only” context? 2) What are the methodologies used in those studies?

Chapter 3 introduces the theoretical framework and the main concepts guiding this study of a teacher’s literacy instruction and the academic writing development of one focal fourth grade emerging bilingual in an urban elementary school in western Massachusetts. It introduces Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) as a social theory of language in alignment with sociocultural theories of learning and writing development. The chapter continues with an introduction of genre based pedagogy along with an explanation of the SFL’s Teaching and Learning Cycle (TLC), and on how it was used
and expanded within the ACCELA Alliance teacher’s professional development, from which this study originated.

Chapter 4 presents a detailed description of the methodology and the rationale used in the study. I start with a statement about my intersectional identity and positionality as a researcher, Then I introduce the research design, describing the setting, educational context and the participants. It also introduces the different ethnographic methods of data collection as well as the two phases utilized in the qualitative analysis of the data, in order to trace the academic writing development of a focal emerging bilingual in relation to her teacher’s implementation of SFL genre-based pedagogies.

Chapter 5 presents the findings of the study based on the two interrelated levels of analysis: First, an analysis and discussion of the instructional context in which the focal student’s texts were produced, such as the readings and instructional and scaffolding tools the teacher used at each of the three units during the academic year. Second, a detailed analysis of the texts produced by the focal student at each of those units. The analysis includes a description of the purpose and audience, the identification of generic stages, and the lexico-grammatical features that realize each stage of the focal student’s written production.

Chapter 6 provides the conclusions and implications of this investigation. The chapter revisits the background, the problem and the main purpose of this dissertation as framed within a socioculturally-informed study of L2 literacy instruction and the writing development of emerging bilinguals in K-12 settings in the United States. Next, it summarizes and discusses the main findings regarding changes in the teacher’s instructional practices with a focus on genre-based pedagogy, made possible through a
sustained professional development with the ACCELA Alliance. The chapter continues with a discussion of the writing development of Karina (the focal fourth grade student) in connection with the teacher’s implementation of this SFL-oriented literacy instruction methodology. Then, the significance and implications of this study are presented within the context of the ACCELA professional development from which this investigation originated. The chapter concludes by describing some of its limitations and by suggesting ideas for further research in the field of L2 literacy and the literacy and academic development of emerging bilinguals in K-12 public schools in the United States.
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW

This literature review focuses on research addressing the second language writing development of English Language Learners (e.g., Latine ELLs) in K-12 settings. In relation the study’s timeline presented in the introduction chapter, the initial review looked at research carried out between 1998 and 2008, based on the assumption that the teaching of writing in formerly bilingual classrooms could have been impacted by the elimination of bilingual programs, and by the prohibition of using the multilingual students’ native language in the mediation of classroom instruction. Next, after re-engaging with my dissertation research, I updated my literature review to include the most recent and related research coming from professional development programs based on the Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) framework over the last two decades, including ACCELA (2004-2019). Specifically, the guiding questions for this review are: 1) How has L2 writing development of ELLs been studied in the United States in the midst of the “English-Only” context? and 2) what are the methodologies used in those studies?

The chapter begins with a discussion of the methodology used for locating the studies, and presents an overview of previous reviews on second language writing in general. It continues with, a summary of technical aspects of the studies reviewed on L2 writing development of ELLs in K-12 settings. Next, drawing on a “grounded theory” (Glasser & Strauss, 1967) methodology, a summary of those studies is presented, organized under two main thematic and contrasting epistemological views drawn from the available scholarly work on the writing development of ELLs: one that sees literacy and writing development as a skill-based individual capacity, and another that conceives literacy and writing development as a sociocultural practice.
The findings of this review accentuate the need for research in the field of second language academic writing of ELLs in K-12 settings in the United States. Given the increasing numbers of minoritized students entering and attending public schools in this country, it was worrying to find that only a few studies addressed this compelling issue of Latine ELLs second language academic writing in K-12 settings. Nevertheless, a set of studies took a critical perspective to demonstrate how the everyday literacy practices (e.g., reading, writing, talking about texts) in K-12 urban schools are permeated by macro socio-political pronouncements that dictate what gets taught, to whom, and under what physical and material circumstances. Aligned with this critical perspective, in the last decade a growing number of studies have focused on the Systemic Functional Linguistics Genre-based pedagogy and analytical methods for the study of literacy development of multilingual learners including Latine ELLs. Finally, Implications for future research on K-12 second language writing are presented in connection to the present study.

This review of the literature addresses the second language writing (L2 writing) development of K-12 ELLs students, with specific focus on Latine students, carried out after the passage of the first English-Only proposition in the United States (California). The rationale for focusing on students is to try to move away from generalizing categories that treat or represent all ELLs in this country as a homogenous group. For example, research on ELLs has shown that language, cultural background, emigration and educational experiences differ (McCarthey & Garcia, 2005). Moreover, other factors such as how school personnel respond to students, support their native language, and maintain school-family connections also have been found as affecting ELLs and Asian students’ academic performance (August & Hakuta, 1997). Thus, in order to draw some overarching conclusions among the studies and to identify a gap in the
literature, the main goals for this review are: to evaluate research studies dealing with the L2 writing development of ELLs in K-12 settings; to analyze the main areas in which research on writing development for this specific population has focused and the methodologies used in those studies.

**Scope and Methodology**

This review focuses on recent research on L2 writing development reported in journal articles and book chapters with a focus on studies on the writing development of English Language Learners in K-12 urban school settings over the last two decades. This time frame coincides with the passage of the first English-Only proposition in the United States (e.g., proposition 227 in California in 1998), followed by Massachusetts Question 2 in 2002 and Arizona’s Proposition 203. Therefore, special attention was paid to identifying trends in the research that connect to this issue. The rationale behind this criterion is based on the assumption that the teaching of writing in formerly bilingual classrooms could have been undoubtedly impacted, first by the elimination of bilingual programs, and second, by the prohibition of the use of the students’ native languages, such as Spanish, in the mediation of their literacy and writing development in their classrooms (Cummins, 1994; Gebhard, 2002; Valdes, 1997).

**Limitations and procedure**

This review is limited to scholarship published in refereed journals and book chapters. The reason for doing this was, first because of the large accessibility and dissemination of

---

3 It is important to clarify that in this review I do not discuss writing instruction in particular. For such a discussion, as it relates to the teaching of writing in mainstream classrooms, see the seminal work of Donald H. Graves’s *Writing: Teachers and Children at Work* (1983) and Lucy McCormick Calkins’s *The Art of Teaching Writing* (1986). For a discussion and debate about writing instruction to non-native speakers of English using methods and approaches designed for native speakers, see Valdés (1992). For general discussions on these topics see the *Handbook of Writing Research* (MacArthur et al., 2006).
specialized journals and edited volumes, and second because these publication channels have strict requirements regarding the relevance and quality of the studies in their publications (Booth, W. C., Colomb, G. G., & Williams, J. M., 2003; Light & Pillemer, 1984). Thus, a thorough search in meta-database search engines (a software application for running simultaneous searches into multiple databases) was conducted, namely ISI Web of Sciences, the Educational Resources Information Center (EBSCOHOST) and Google Scholar. In addition, an effort was made in trying to locate other studies that could have not been identified through those automatic searches. For this reason, a manual search using the bibliographic references of the initial studies found was also conducted. The following is an illustration of the approach for locating the body of research.

A general search in the Web of Science meta-database using the descriptors Writing development and specifying the search criteria displayed below, yielded 51,316 results. A narrower search in that same meta-database combining the terms Writing AND Elementary and using the same search criteria yields 3,984 results. However, to narrow the search even more, the terms Writing development AND Elementary were combined, and this yielded 911 results. Then the terms Writing development AND ELLs were used, yielding 59 studies. This was followed by a reading of the abstracts of each article and the methodology section of the identified results applying the following overall inclusion criteria related to the present study.

**Inclusion criteria and coding**

The following inclusion criteria was established, which needed to be met for a study or research report to be included in this review of the literature. Studies needed to be:

1. Of research on second language writing development, primarily involving English Language Learners.
2. Published in the form of referee journals or book chapters.
3. Carried out in classroom settings in K-12 schools in the United States.
4. A report of primary research (qualitative or empirical)
5. Research carried out after the passage of the English-Only mandate in California in 1998.

Therefore, after a close reading of the abstracts and the description of the participants or subjects in the methodology section of each study, 28 reports that met the specific criteria were identified. Next, each of the studies was closely read and a summary table for each of them was created. Those preliminary summary tables included specific information regarding the author(s) and year of publication, the contexts and focus of the study, the research questions being addressed, the data collection and analytical methodology, as well as the main findings of each study. Once all the studies included in this review were read, a reviewed the summary tables followed, and sometimes a second reading of the specific articles was done in order to identify or confirm thematic elements among the studies.

**Identification of themes and concepts**

Regarding the identification and analysis of core themes and concepts among the studies, a combination of a systematic interpretative procedure analogous to a constant-comparative qualitative procedure was followed (Glaser, 1978) to identify thematic threads among all the thirteen selected and reviewed studies, and “grounded theory” (Glasser & Strauss, 1967) techniques to “develop and interrelate categories of information [in order to] …write theoretical propositions or hypothesis, or present a visual picture of [the findings] (Creswell, 1998).” For instance, when reading and re-reading, both the summary tables and the introductory and theoretical orientation sections for each study, first a chart was developed (presented in the summary of studies section below) with two emerging main umbrella categories regarding
theoretical orientations of the studies that could be characterized as: A socio-cultural perspective, and a psycholinguistic skill-based and individualistic perspective on literacy and writing development. Second, the research questions along with the specific analytical methods of the studies were identified. This allowed to further locate other emerging and specific codes or concepts across studies; such as the problems studied, description of the focus of the investigations (e.g., instruction, students’ appropriation of discourse or lexico-grammatical features in their texts), that were associated with each of the two umbrella theoretical orientations presented above. In the next section, an overview of some of the previous literature reviews on writing on second language writing in general is presented.

**Previous Studies and Reviews of Writing Research on K-12 second Language writing**

Edesky’s (1981) seminal work was the first one looking at the development of writing in bilingual programs in the United States. She studied children’s writing in three classrooms in three grades (first, second and third grade) in the only Spanish-English bilingual program in Phoenix where children wrote on a daily basis. This was in a time when, according to the author, writing was a rare event in bilingual classrooms in Arizona, Florida and Texas, where “children fill in blanks, answer written questions on basal-reader stories and textbook selections, and put weekly spelling words in sentences or stories (p.65).” It was also a time when research on the writing process -defined a set of recursive thinking processes orchestrated by a writer during the act of composing (Flower & Hayes, 1980)- was beginning to gain some attention.

With a focus on understanding the specific writing context to analyze the student’s production, In her study she looked at what happens over time to several aspects of the children’s writing (e.g., spelling, structure, punctuation, use of code-switching “sense of genre”, etc.)?,
is writing in Spanish related to writing in English? and what can we learn from biliteracy about literacy and literacy instruction? (Ibid).

The findings of the study are presented against several myths about the writing of bilingual children at that time. For instance, regarding the myth that bilingual children who are exposed to two languages “unsystematically” mix codes at random, she found that code-switching in the analyzed students’ texts was an infrequent phenomenon, occurring almost always intra-sentential and most often as a word rather than a phrase. A few code-switches function to represent more realistically the reported event, such as quoting a character in a movie or story in English. Also, young writers are sensitive to the demands of written texts, “Children have a strong sense of what is appropriate in oral vs. written texts (p. 77)”. For example oral code-switching occurs with a higher frequency as compared to a lack of it when writing in English, however they use it when writing in Spanish.

It was also found that when bilingual children write in English, even single words, they usually rely on Spanish orthography (e.g., “ai joup llu gou agein tu scu” for I hope you go again to school) (p. 80). Regarding punctuation, “some children use no internal punctuation. Only a capital at the beginning and a period at the end of a long piece, or at the end of each line (p. 84), but the variety of and frequency of invented punctuation patterns decreases with age, and such patterns are generated by students not by instruction or printed materials available to the students. In relation to children’s sense of genre, they produced texts of genres that were familiar to them outside the classroom. For example, thank you letters or invitations look and sound like what they are, but social studies reports were almost impossible to identify as such, because this school-based genre does not exist outside of the classroom (p. 86). Based on the findings of her
study, Edelsky concluded that there is not one general thing called reading or writing ability (p.90).

There have also been several in-depth reviews of multiple studies on writing as a general field of study during the last few decades or so. We find for instance, Hillocks’ (1984) meta-analysis of experimental research on composition; Durst’s (1990) overview of writing research; Juzwik, M. M., Curcic, S., Wolbers, K., Moxley, K. D., Dimling, L. M., & Shankland, R. K., (2006) meta-analysis of the broad landscape of writing research; Nystrand’s (2006) historical overview of the field of writing research from 1960 to the present; Matsuda and De Pew (2002), and Silva and Brice’s (2004) recent review on applied research in teaching second language writing. (For recent reviews on literacy instruction in teacher education drawing on Systemic Functional Linguistics see Accurso & Gebhard, 2020; and de Oliveira and Smith, 2019).

Hillocks’ (1984) work, for example, has been considered a seminal meta-analysis of experimental research on composition studies encompassing the time known as the emergence of field studies in the United States (1963-1982). Reviewing only experimental studies and looking at what works in teaching composition, this author found that not all writing-process instructional approaches are created equally, and specifically advocates a more teacher-directed approach to the teaching of writing. A few years after Hillock’s large meta-analysis, Durst (1990) published a general overview of writing research carried out between 1984 and 1989. He reviewed studies on composition in English included in ten bibliographies of the Research in the Teaching of English Journal. Out of the 969 studies Durst located in these bibliographies, he identified a few common and recurrent patterns that have been corroborated by other more recent reviews. For instance, Durst found that writing process research dominated the mid 1980’s with most of the research being based on college students. He also found that contextual studies of
writing were very rare. That is, most of the research focused on studying and analyzing writing as an individual endeavor using experimental large-scale research designs. For the focus of the present review, an important aspect of Durst’s findings needs to be clarified here. Namely, Durst noticed that research on elementary-age population was high (90/302 studies); however, it is implied in his review that those studies refer to research on the composing process of monolingual English-speaking students and does not specify studies on ELLs. Nevertheless, Durst does bring attention to the growing cultural diversity of students in schools and colleges at the end of last century and predicted that research on writing focusing on this population would start to appear in future research.

Over fifteen years later, in a meta-analysis of research on writing, Juzwick and her colleagues (Juzwik et al., 2006) examined current trends and foci in research on writing as we entered into the 21 Century. In this overview, the authors identified and discussed three particular dimensions of writing research: problems studied, population age groups studied, and the method used in the studies. Regarding their second dimension as it relates directly to the focus of the present review of the literature, they found that pre-school-aged children and middle and high school-aged students are least studied (p. 451). This is rather unexpected given Durst’s (1990) prediction that the growing diversity of students in schools and colleges would generate the need for research on the writing of this population, and that it would soon start appearing in the map of our professional field.

Other researchers have taken a narrower thematic focus for carrying out their reviews. For example, we can find Dyson and Freeman’s (2003) socio-cultural review; Fitzgerald’s (2006) general overview on multilingual writing and Silva and Brice’s (2004) in-depth review on applied research in teaching second language writing. Among these thematically focused
reviews, some specifically have reviewed the literature dealing with early (e.g., K-12 grades) L2 writing worldwide, in which the authors have pointed to the dearth of research in this area.

Matsuda and De Pew (2002), for instance, state that “Yet, research on early L2 writing does not seem to have become a major focus within the field of second language writing (p. 262).” They found that a review of articles published in the well-established Journal of second Language Writing revealed that only 3% of articles have dealt with L2 writers in secondary schools’ contexts and that any study has addressed the issue of emergent (ELLs) L2 writing. Following this claim regarding the scarcity of studies on L2 writing in the K-12 context, and arguing for a more prominent role of writing in classroom-based studies of second language acquisition, Harklau states that “although writing as a communicative modality has been marginalized, it is key to understanding second language acquisition in contexts such as elementary and secondary level content area classrooms where literacy plays a central role in communication and transmission of subject matter (Harklau, 2002, p. 329).” Likewise, Reynolds (2002) argues that historically in the field of L2 writing there has been an inherent bias in the research with a clear focus on university level second language writers. This author points out that “what is needed now is more research on younger, school-age learners who are learning to write at the same time that they are learning a second language and for whom progress is measured over years and not in single courses (p.312).” Moreover, in their comprehensive review on the research in teaching of L2 writing encompassing the years 2002–2004, Silva and Brice (2004) give evidence of this growing concern arguing that historically research on L2 writing has focused on higher education contexts. Namely, these authors found the astonishing low number of 24 studies addressing early L2 literacy issues in a variety of contexts worldwide.
Paradoxically, regardless of the theoretical and epistemological orientation as well as the methodology used in these reviews, their findings have repeatedly signaled a gap in the research activity focusing on early (e.g., K-12 grades) L2 writing in classroom settings. Indeed, those previous reviews of the literature clearly indicate that a focus on L2 writing has been traditionally neglected in research on classroom-based second language learning at all levels, and even more studies focusing on specific populations (e.g., ELLs) within the large spectrum of English Language Learners attending or just entering public schools in the United States. Therefore, this situation warrants a closer look at the available literature on the writing development of ELLs in K-12 settings in the United States, which is the focus of the next section.

**Summary of studies on ELLs Academic Writing Development in K-12 Public Schools**

As an overview of information about the studies reviewed, we can see that the different studies presented reviewed here were published after 2000, two years after the passage of the first restrictive bilingual mandate in the United States, namely Proposition 227 in 1998 in the state of California. Those research studies were actually carried out under what I called “English-Only conditions,” mainly in California and Massachusetts. For example, Gebhard’s (2002) is a report on data collected between 1995 and 1997 in the midst of school restructuring and the heated debate leading to the passage of Proposition 227 in California. Patthey-Chavez and her Colleagues (Patthey-Cahvez et al., 2004) studied the effects of the process approach to writing “codified as the standard for instruction” (p.462) as a means to raise ELLs’ literacy skills in California as well.

On the other hand, we see that Valdés’ study was published in 1999, (Valdés, 1999). A closer reading of it reveals that the study actually was carried out during a different time period,
and most importantly in a very distinct socio-political and historical context. That is, in 1991-
1993 bilingual education programs not only were still available, but constituted the core of
California’s K-12 educational system. Nevertheless, I included this study in the present review
for two reasons: First, because it deals with the particular problem, population and the academic
context which are the focus of my review (The writing development of ELLs in secondary
schools); and second, because it was published within this review’s time frame. Therefore, any
references to this particular study need to be evaluated against that background.

Regarding the contexts in which the studies were situated, we can see that the
instructional contexts ranged from community centers in underprivileged communities in the
South, to schools located in affluent suburban neighborhoods in California, Michigan and the
Northeast -mainly in Massachusetts. Most of the studies draw on data from different instructional
programs as well. These included ESL programs for English Language Learners within schools
(e.g., (Fisher & Frey, 2003; Reynolds, 2002, 2005; Valdés, 1999), bilingual programs in states
where the anti-bilingual movement has not succeeded, such as in Colorado (Coady & Escamilla,
2005) and Illinois (McCarthey and Garcia, 2005). The research in the context of language arts
classes focused on “mainstreamed” ELLs (e.g., (Solsken et al., 2000) in two of the states where
English-Only mandates were administratively adopted; though the study by Solsken and
colleagues was carried out before the inception of anti-bilingual policies in Massachusetts. Thus,
a preliminary conclusion drawn based on these findings regarding the instructional context of the
studies is the scarcity of published research on the area of L2 writing (academic writing or
writing development of ELLs) after the passage of “English-Only” mandates (e.g., L2 writing in
mainstreamed classrooms under “English-Only conditions”). Another compelling finding thus
far is the absence of research reports in the context of Arizona, which was the second state to approve English-Only policies.

In terms of educational levels, the majority of studies situate themselves within elementary schools. Even though it seems that the studies distribute evenly between the lower and upper elementary levels, it is important to notice that the two research reports by Wollman-Bonilla (Wolman-Bonilla, 2000, 2001), draw on the same body of data. Something similar occurs with the reports by Bloome and colleagues (Bloome et al., 2000) in which part of Solsken’s study (Solsken et al. 2000) is reported. Three of the studies on the upper elementary take place in four grade classrooms, which is considered to be a turning point “in which the linguistic and academic demands placed on students increased (Gebhard, 2002, p. 21).”

An interesting finding with regard to the educational level is the fact that only two studies focus on high school. For example, Fisher and Frey’s (2003) is actually a study on a remedial course for struggling ELLs who are not performing at the expected grade level (ninth grade). Similarly, Accurso and Gebhard’s (2019) is a study on “students with limited or interrupted formal education (SLIFE). The remaining studies dealt with middle school grades, especially seventh grade. Then, with the exception of Harklau’s earlier work (e.g., Harklau’s 1999), there has been a clear paucity of research on high school grades, and therefore there is a clear need for more studies focusing on middle and secondary students. The explanation for this paucity is not clear. One could infer that the reason for the overall focus on fourth and seventh grades within the limited research on K-12 second language writing is based on the presumed room for educational interventions aiming to remediate and/or provide opportunities for learning development. Since, as noted earlier, these grades are considered critical points in the linguistic and academic demands of the different school subjects.
The research questions addressed by most of these studies reflect their epistemological stance and research analytical methodologies (see discussion below). For example, socio-culturally oriented questions dealing with instruction and curriculum focused on the cultural and linguistic practices students draw on in their texts, students’ appropriation of discipline-specific language and genres, family literacy practices and students’ attitudes towards writing as well as on writing assessment more appropriate for bilingual writers. Other researchers asked questions that went beyond the immediate classroom in trying to connect current daily school literacy practices with broader educational reform issues. These questions for instance challenged standardized curriculum by looking at hybrid literacy practices that deviate from it (Solsken et al. 2000). Others focused on the effect of instructional policies such as the writing process codified as the standard for writing instruction (Patthey-Chavez, et al. 2004), and on the implications of new ways of organizing teaching and learning for second language learners (Gebhard, 2002).

In contrast to the previous set of questions, studies framed within a cognitive individualistic skilled-based perspective of literacy and writing development asked cause-effect hypothesis-based type of questions such as: “Does the developmental process for children learning to write in a L2 mirror that of learning to write in a L1?” (Reynolds, 2002), “Whether and how the English as a Second Language and regular language arts students differ with respect to the development of linguistic fluency in writing?” (Reynolds, 2005), and “what happened with writers’ and readers’ development when exposed to a gradual release writing approach?” (Fisher and Frey, 2003).

Now, in terms of the research methodology, we can see that the majority of the studies reviewed) used qualitative and ethnographic methods mainly reporting on specific case studies Including Valdés, (1999); Wollman-Bonilla, (2000; 2001); Solsken, et al. (2000) and Bloome, et
al. (2000), as well all the studies drawing on Systemic Functional Linguistics’ informed pedagogies discussed in detail starting on page 42 of this chapter. Only two studies did not explicitly mention their research design (e.g., data collection and analytical methodology). For example, in Fisher and Frey’s (2003) study, the methodologies for data collection and data analysis are not clearly stated and explained. One can infer that these authors drew on qualitative techniques by the way in which they describe some of the data and findings using case study-like style of writing for reporting. However, toward the end of their report one finds references to the use of some pre and post assessment, as well as a summary reporting quantitative findings such as on word fluency, accuracy ratio and length of responses, which instead of clarifying, these rather confuses the reader.

A similar research design issue is reflected in Coady and Escamilla’s (2005) study, in which one can identify that the data comes from elicited timed writing based on writing prompts similar to the Colorado Student Assessment Program (CSAP), collected at two data points in the fall and spring of the academic year (p. 464). However, the authors do not clearly explain a data collection methodology nor the analytical technique used, which implicitly seems to be a content analysis of students’ texts.

Only three of the studies are described as quantitative research. The two reports by Reynolds, (Reynolds, 2002; 2005), which draw on the same body of data from elicited writing from district level writing prompts resembling the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) standardized test and collected at one data point. The other quantitative study (Patthey-Chavez, et al. 2004) is more robust and longitudinal in nature. It included a two-year data collection process involving multiple participants and data samples from five different schools serving primarily ELLs in California. Data collected at three data points (fall, winter and spring)
came from 11 teachers who provided four samples of student work from three different language Arts assignments, totaling a corpus of 64 students’ writing samples. For the analysis, the authors utilized a combination of analytical methods, namely descriptive statistics and qualitative analysis to confirm the statistical results. They also used inter-rater reliability measures over assignments randomly chosen.

After summarizing the technical aspects and methodologies of the body of literature, what follows is a focused discussion of major themes identified across the different studies reviewed. To facilitate the reading of this discussion, a conceptual map is included and displayed in Figure 1 (above), which serves as an advance organizer of the ongoing articulation and understanding of the readings. As Glasswell & Kamberelis (2007) state it “articulations are ongoing struggles to position practices within dynamic fields of force in particular ways to produce discursive-material geographies within which certain modes of thought and actions are possible (p. 319).” Accordingly, this heuristic represents both, an attempt to try to make sense of the body of literature reviewed here, as well as an articulation and analysis of how literacy and writing development is understood and operationalized among the different studies. In other words, how the authors located literacy and writing development and how they analyzed the development of these concepts in the data.

Needless to say, it is not implied that the scheme displayed in Figure 1 is a fixed or rigid one, since some of the studies may overlap over one or two aspects, and readers of this review may not share my view and disagree with my classification and even the labeling of the categories. For instance, the work of Solsken and her colleagues (2000) could be placed under instruction, instruction and texts or under a new grouping dealing with family literacy practices.
Research question: **How has the L2 writing development of ELLs been studied in the United States in the midst of the “English-Only” context?**

**Literacy (writing development) as a sociocultural practice**
- As development of literacy practice:
- As dependent of immediate context and opportunities for writing:
  - Valdes, 1999; McCarthy & Garcia, 2005.
- As discursive practices constrained by institutions:
  - Gebhard, 2002; Patthey-Chavez et al., 2004; Coady & Escamilla, 2005.

**Literacy (writing development) as skill-based individual capacity**
- As appropriation of SFL genre features through instruction:
  - Schleppegrell & de Oliveira, 2006; Achugar, et al., 2007; Schleppegrell, et al., 2008; Aguirre-Muñoz, et al., 2009; Aguirre-Muñoz, et al., 2015; Moore and Schleppegrell, 2014; O'Hallaron & Schleppegrell, 2016; Brisk & Zisselsberger, 2010; Brisk, et al., 2010; Gebhard et al., 2007; Schulze & Ramirez, 2007; Gebhard et al., 2011a; Gebhard et al., 2011b; Harman, 2013; Willett et al., 2013; Gebhard et al., 2014; Schilze, 2016; Gebhard, 2019; Gebhard, 2019; Ramirez, 2008; 2014

**As display of content and writing conventions:**

*Figure 1 Summary of Studies by Theoretical Orientation and Methodological Approaches*
What it is hoped to be accomplished with this organization strategy is to allow the readers to imaginatively take part in the experience of reading the articles themselves. Therefore, and drawing on Figure 1, first, grounded understandings are provided (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) of L2 writing development as one the main evolving themes. This will immediately be followed by a discussion of specific thematic concepts in an attempt to weave, both the synthesis and the linking of common and sometimes contradicting findings among the studies. Finally, overall concluding remarks of this review will be provided. The next section presents different understandings of writing development extracted from within the studies reviewed.

**Two contrasting epistemological views literacy and writing development of ELLs**

Figure 1 displays two major umbrella categories representing contrasting epistemological views that emerged from the reading of the studies: One that views second language literacy and therefore the development of L2 writing as mediated by and appropriated from students’ participation in socio-cultural practices, and another one that conceives second language literacy (and therefore L2 writing development) as an autonomous “set of cognitive-linguistic skills acquired by an individual (Bloome et al. (2000).” The branching out under the two main umbrella categories represents grounded concepts and issues derived from either the conceptual framework from which the studies draw on, or the problem(s) addressed by these studies. Accordingly, the association of a study with one or several of these conceptual categories depended on how the researcher(s) approached and located the study of writing development. In the next
section, the first epistemological orientation on second language literacy development is briefly discussed.

**Second language literacy as an autonomous cognitive-linguistic skilled-based endeavor**

Looking at Figure 1, the right side displays the first epistemological perspective devised through the readings of the research reviewed here. Studies under this perspective draw on narrower definitions of literacy as “autonomous” (Street, 1995) and discrete skills-based piecework. They predominantly located writing development in the individual learners and their texts as either displaying (or not) correctly or incorrectly discrete mechanical features at the sentence or text level (e.g., capitalization, spelling, word segmentation, use of connectors and causality marker, etc.).

Studies that fit under this category included the work by Fisher and Frey (2003) and Reynolds (2002, 2005). Both of Reynolds’ studies draw on the same data, in which he analyzed whether the developmental process for children learning to write in an L2 mirror that of learning to write in an L1 by specifically looking at the use of causality markers in students’ texts. Reynolds found that when comparing changes across levels in the ratio of regularity (e.g., and, then, when, typical of oral language) to power markers (because, so, therefore, thus -more common in written language) no general development appears to exist for L1 writers (Reynolds, 2002, p. 320). The findings of the study also revealed that regularity markers were more frequent than power markers for L1 and L2 students across topics and grade levels in the study.

One of the limitations of the study is clearly the narrow skill-based conception of writing development and consequently the analytical tools employed in it. It could be
argued that a more socio-cultural orientation to language, such as genre theory (e.g., Cope & Kalantzis, 1993; New London Group, 1996, among others), would have generated a more compelling analysis and interpretation of the data. For instance, carrying a genre-based analysis of the writing prompts themselves. By looking at what kind(s) of genre(s) the prompts used in the study were eliciting, and therefore the lexicogrammatical options available for the students, the findings would have pointed to different conclusions. That is, an analysis drawing on functional notions to language and language in use would have indicated that the two prompts were actually eliciting two different kinds of genres (e.g., a narrative genre vis-à-vis a how-to procedural genre), which required or delimited the different language choices and causality markers available for students to use in the texts they produced. Based on the analysis and interpretation of the two prompts used in Reynolds’ study, it could be considered that the difference in genres elicited by the prompts was what caused the “genre confusion” displayed in the students’ text, and consequently the differences in the use of causality markers. A type of analysis of the problems and the specific language demands of district writing prompts has been recently documented by Gebhard, et al. (2007) (see discussion below).

**Second language literacy and writing development as sociocultural practices**

The left side of Figure 1 displays the studies that conceive literacy and L2 writing development as embedded in socio-cultural practices. According to Prior (2006) socio-cultural studies of schooling “have sought to describe not only how writing is used and learned in schools, but also how school writing is located in larger and deeper currents of socio-cultural practice (p. 60).” In agreement with this line of thought, we find that most
of the studies included in this review address socio-culturally oriented issues. These issues could be grouped according to four main core thematic lines among the studies: One that focused on the students’ culturally and linguistic family literacy practices and their relation/contradiction to school-based practices; a second that looked at classroom-based instructional and opportunities for writing, a third thematic concept linked everyday classroom practices to larger socio-cultural and political issues that extend beyond the classroom, and a forth theme studying writing instruction and development based on a Systemic Functional Linguistics’ (SFL) Genre-based pedagogies. In what follows, these four themes within the socio-cultural perspective to L2 writing will be discussed.

**Writing development as embedded in culturally and linguistic family literacy practices and schooling**

Under this first theme, we found that the studies by Wollman-Bonilla (2000, 2001), Solsken et al (2000) and Bloome et al. (2000) focused on responsive curriculum and on bridging classroom teaching practices to family and community literacy practices, with an emphasis on how these could support each other. For example, in a study of two-first grade classrooms in suburban Boston, Wollman-Bonilla (2000) drew on genre-based notions to analyze text structure and lexico-grammatical features of children’s journal messages to their families. L2 writing development was located and analyzed by looking at how young children appropriated the patterns of science writing and used them flexibly for their own purposes in other genres, such as in family written dialogues describing school-based activities to their parents. Thus, the author argues that her findings complement previous work claiming that “good teaching of writing” requires a context
where students are guided to compose specific texts through teacher modeling followed by independent practice (Christie, 1998; Martin, 1998; as cited in Wollman-Bonilla, 2000). As a result, Wollman-Bonilla states that “teacher’s need professional development on genre-based pedagogies (p.58).”

A limitation of Wollman-Bonilla’s (2000) study seems to take genre as fixed structures and therefore fails to account for the “genre hybridity” (see Solsken et al. 2000 below) in student journal messages as displaying conventions of science but keeping the social communicative purpose of the journal messages, which represents the expected genre for the academic task. In other words, Wollman-Bonilla did not explore the purposeful, audience-directed nature of the main writing task (Halliday & Martin, 1993) by analyzing the students' texts (journal messages genre) with the unifocal genre lens of science reports.

In a similar study of first and second graders focusing on an ethnographic action-research case study of a Latina student (Blanca), Solsken et al. (2000) interrogated on what cultural and linguistic practices the student may have been drawing on in her hybrid texts and how they were responded to in the classroom. Through a micro-analysis of intertextuality in oral and textual language practices, the authors concluded that students interweaved language practices of home, school, and peers to serve social and personal agendas. However, Solsken and her colleagues warned that these hybrid sophisticated and situationally appropriate texts are not typically acknowledged in a classroom characterized by hegemonic normalized practices, for example the “Latino/a conversational style, code switching” (p.180). The authors argue that the understanding of genre as fixed schemata “informs thinking about curriculum and pedagogy by both
educators and the public, underlies the standard movement and most curriculum
frameworks, and is enforced by high-and low-stakes testing (p. 205).” From a critical
perspective, this study signals how “nonstandard” literacy practices of linguistically and
culturally diverse children (as opposed to those of their white middle-class counterparts)
are not valued within the schools, state system and curriculum, thus typically depicting
non-dominant students as underperforming. More research focusing on documenting
those non-standard literacy practices is needed to build a body of literature supporting
these authors’ findings.

In a subsequent study drawing on the same body of data, Bonilla (2001) shifted
the analytical focus from the students’ texts to the written replies to the children’s family
journal entries written by their parents and caregivers. The author asks how family might
contribute to children’s learning to write. The analysis of lexico-grammatical features of
the four-case-study families’ replies to message journal entries illustrated how those
families typically considered less capable of participating in children’s literacy
development had much to contribute to it. Bonilla states that family messages displayed
genre hybridity (p.188) that challenged mainstream expectations. This study does not
look at children’s L2 writing per se nonetheless it supports the critical role of family
involvement in developing children’s L2 literacy. Thus, the findings of this study extend
Gonzalez, Moll and Amanti’s (2006) work on the validation of non-mainstream families’
funds of knowledge in the education of ELLs.

As a final comment regarding writing development as embedded in culturally and
linguistic family literacy practices and schooling, it seems that due to the fact that
Bonilla’s 2000 and Solsken et al. (2000) studies were being written at about the same
time, the findings of these studies did not inform each other. That is to say, had Bonilla read Solsken’s and colleagues work, she would have seen that what she termed re-contextualization (e.g., features of scientific discourse present in students’ family journal entries) actually demonstrates ELLs texts’ highly sophistication and situational appropriateness as discussed by Solsken and her colleagues.

**Writing development as dependent on the immediate context, and instructional opportunities for writing**

This second thematic line permeating the socio-culturally oriented perspective on Latine L2 writing considered second writing development to be inherently dependent on the classroom-based instructional opportunities for learning (or not) how to write (e.g., instructional methods and activities). Two studies were identified as following this line:

The first study is a two-year study of four focal students placed in ESL classes in three different middle schools. Valdés (1999) focused on ESL instructional activities, and students’ exposure to English in and out of the classroom. As guiding research questions this author looked at what ESL instruction was and did in each school, and at how much access to English students had, both in and out of class. Based on her findings, Valdés argues that, as it is the case with the majority of ESL teachers, because of lack of teacher’s training on the teaching of writing, the instruction by the focal ESL teachers in her study revealed an understanding of writing development as “a very controlled process in which students slowly learn how to write individual sentences using correct grammar and vocabulary (p.149).” Only one of the four focal teachers (Mr. Samuel – An ESL teacher in a more affluent school) displayed a more complex view of literacy and writing development as a social and meaningful communication activity. Therefore, writing
development across the two-year-span of the study revealed different levels of development among focal students. For example, Bernardo’s writing ability developed very little (moving from level one to level three in the author’s self-developed criteria); while “Elisa and Manolo, both reached level seven (p.170),” which was considered by the author to be the highest level of development according to her criteria.

Analyzing ESL instruction and the opportunities for students writing development, Valdés (1999) denounces schools as lacking faculty prepared for the increasing demands placed by arriving ELLs with limited or no English at all. She continues by pointing that teachers’ lack of familiarity and knowledge of second language acquisition contributes to the “ghettoization of non-English-language-background students (p.146).” However, Valdés concluded in her study that students’ writing development depended on multiple factors such as “the students’ academic and family background, on the instruction they were exposed to, and on their own determination and talent (p.171).” Doing so, this author seems to fell in the same trap other authors have fallen in locating these factors as existing only in the immediate classroom instruction, and within the students and their families’ background, thus wrongly indexing her alignment with a deficit model, which blames family educational background for Latine students’ academic under achievements. It seems like the author missed the opportunity to connect these findings to macro socio-political and historical issues affecting the education of Latine and other minority students in this country (See the discussion of Gebhard’s, 2002 below).

In the second study under this theme, through a cross-case analysis of five Spanish speakers and six Mandarin speakers attending a bilingual education program in
an elementary school in the Midwest, McCarthey and García (2005) investigated how students make sense of their writing instructional context, and “how students’ understanding of the purposes of writing and their attitudes towards writing may play a central role in their development as writers (p.41).” McCarthey and García suggest that the types of writing practices students were exposed to seemed to influence their views about writing and how they perceived themselves as writers (p.53), thus showing the importance of contextual aspects in first and second language writing development. These two authors also found that authentic writing opportunities in the schools they studied were very limited due to the fact that most of the writing students did was connected to district assessment (p.51). However, they see the problem in classroom instruction missing the opportunity to also charge against this burning issue by connecting it to the larger institutional and political phenomenon of standardized testing and accountability movements nationwide. McCarthey and García also concluded that cultural and linguistic background factors reflected in students’ home literacy experiences influenced positively or negatively students’ practices and attitudes (p. 69). For example, family plans to return to their home countries, parents' literacy level and expectations as well as concerns for succeeding in the United States (Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco 2001). This is one of the few studies that clearly points to other specific factors beyond socio-economic status and low literacy levels of parents as affecting the home-school disconnect (e.g., family plans to return to their home countries) that are associated with the literacy and first and second language writing development of ELLs. In sum, McCarthey and García’s findings seem to challenge Valdés conclusions on writing
development as merely connected to the students’ academic and family backgrounds and on their own talents and determination.

**L2 writing as developed (or constrained) by institutional and macro discursive practices**

This third thematic line within the socio-cultural perspective takes a critical position on L2 literacy. Studies framed within this notion link everyday classroom and school practices (and therefore L2 writing development) to larger socio-cultural and political issues that extend beyond the immediate classroom context. (e.g., school restructuring, English-Only mandates, discourses of accountability and standardizing curricula). The first study aligned with this theme is Gebhard’s (2002) two-year ethnographic study of a 4th grade mainstream Latina student (Alma) in a restructuring elementary school in California. This author asked two critical questions: “What are the implications of new ways of organizing teaching and learning for second language Learners,” and “how do L2 learners assume, negotiate, and resist the roles assigned to them by the discourses of school reform (p.18).”

In her analysis Gebhard used a bifocal approach, namely critical discourse analysis (CDA) of the discourses of classroom literacy practices (reading and writing) and content analysis of the focal student’s text. She concluded that the discourses of school reform placed ELLs in vulnerable positions in classroom literacy practices cutting them off from the much-needed sociolinguistic know-how distributed in the school and community (p.32). For example, under the new educational model adopted by the school, all students were expected to be independent learners regardless of their linguistic abilities. In addition, other macro discourses of educational reform such as English-Only
placed Alma (the focal student) as not “web material.” For instance, the presence of non-standard features in Alma’s writing “framed her as learning disable (p.36).” Gebhard’s assertion of second language acquisition as an institutional phenomenon (Gebhard, 1999), in which textual practices shape and are shaped by the institutional context, helped her to reveal how current educational reform discourses create an institutional disservice for ELLs. For instance, “Despite a 300% jump in the number of students institutionally designated as ‘Limited English proficient’ (Gebhard, 2002, p.27),” the school officials and teachers did not have a plan to face the challenge posed by the increasing number of non-dominant students. The school instead hid this fact on the discourses of the school’s restructuring into a high-performing science and technology school.

Adding to this critical perspective of socio-cultural research on L2 writing, Patthey-Chavez, Matsumura and Valdés (2004) investigated the writing process “codified as the standard for instruction in many states and districts (p. 463)” under reforms aiming at raising students’ literacy. Viewing feedback “as a key site of knowledge construction between expert and novice, a time when teachers are more likely to provide explicit form-focused and individualized instruction to students (p.463),” these authors focused on the quality of teacher’s written feedback on early and subsequent drafts of students’ written texts. In this empirical study the authors found very little evidence in the work of 11 teachers in five middle schools that students were provided with written comments that deepened their understanding of texts, help them understand how to use writing to express ideas, or expand their thinking skills (Patthey-Chavez, Matsumura & Valdés, 2004, p. 474). That is, students received little content-level feedback (a mean of four edits on 92% of the early drafts on early drafts) and the quality of students' writing
showed little improvement over successive drafts. Most of the feedback was regarding surface level feedback (e.g., 58% of students received only feedback on punctuation, grammar and spelling) and students incorporated these more readily (p.470). This demonstrated that the middle school teacher in this study focused basically on helping students acquire a command of written language conventions. The authors concluded that the written feedback as an integral part of the process approach codified as the standard for writing instruction did not provide an opportunity for the kinds of collaborative assisted interactions central to learning (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988; Vygotsky, 1978, as cited in Patthey-Chavez et al. (2004). They also claim that teachers need “collaborative assisted professional development to grow as instructors and create more effective learning environments for students” (p. 475).

In summing up the discussion and synthesis of L2 writing as developed (or constrained) by institutional and macro discursive practices, we can see that this third theme takes a more critical position revealing how institutional and macro discursive practices clearly impact ELL students and their teachers in their everyday literacy practices and consequently their second language writing. For instance, the work of Coady and Escamilla (2005) reflects a critical orientation by asking how teachers can use bilingual students’ writing as a springboard for deeper explorations into societal inequalities, and on how writing assessment could be more reflective of Spanish speaking students as opposed to assessment developed on a model of English monolingualism (p. 464). See also Ramirez 2008, and 2014.
Writing instruction and development based on Systemic Functional Linguistics’ informed pedagogies

This fourth theme within the sociocultural orientation to literacy and writing development is actually one that evolved after updating my literature review as mentioned in the study timeline in the introduction chapter.

I looked at the most recent research coming from professional development programs based on the framework on Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) informing the present study, which has become more prominent during the last two decades. It groups research on writing instruction and Development based on a Systemic Functional Linguistics’ (SFL) Genre-based pedagogies. Accurso and Gebhard, (2020) state that SFL was Initially used as a discourse analytic approach but has been increasingly used as a pedagogical framework for preservice and in-service teachers “to expand teacher’s knowledge base in ways that increase their ability to respectfully negotiate difference in their literacy teaching practices” (p.2). Also, the integration of the SFL pedagogical framework in teacher education and teachers’ professional development has shown “to have a positive impact on developing teacher’s knowledge about language, their ability to instruct students by focusing on language and literacy development, and their focus on critical components of language for diverse learners” (de Oliveira & Smith, 2019, p. 1; see also Brisk, 2014). Most importantly, de Oliveira and Smith write that most of the work on “SFL in teacher education has focused on working with teachers to use SFL-grounded pedagogies in multilingual contexts to support linguistically diverse learners with varying degrees of language proficiency” (p. 10), (e.g., Achugar et al., 2007; Brisk & Zisselsberger, 2010; de Oliveira, 2010; Fang, 2008, Gebhard, 2010; Gebhard, 2019;
Schleppegrell & de Oliveira, 2006; among others). However, Gebhard and Harman (2011) write that this interest in genre theory extends beyond supporting ELLs in trying to pass state exams, and argue that practicing test-taking genres is not likely to close the achievement gap between speakers of dominant and non-dominant varieties of English, especially ELLs. These authors recommend that teachers learn to unpack how academic language works in the genres they typically ask their students to read and write in school; “expand the range of linguistic choices available to students in communicating for particular purposes and audiences; and support ELLs in using academic language to accomplish social, academic, and political work that matters to them” (Gebhard & Harman, 2011, p. 46).

The majority of the studies drawing on Systemic Functional Linguistics’ (SFL) framework (e.g., Genre-based) reviewed below come from teams of researchers including leading SFL figures in the United States, their doctoral students and even in-service teachers. Their research draws on teachers' professional development initiatives in California (The California History Project), Michigan (The Language and Meaning Project), and Massachusetts (The Russell Elementary school project and The ACCEL Alliance). In what follows, a brief introduction of each of these professional development initiatives is presented, along with the corresponding studies derived from each initiative.

**The California History Project (CHP)**

In the early 2000s, Mary Schleppegrell, one of the first implementers of the SFL framework, led a project called “Literacy in History”, an approach for in-service professional development in a context where virtually every classroom had ELLs but few teachers had backgrounds or training in ESL teaching. Her team and participating
teachers developed several tools for language analysis based on this framework, during week-long summer institutes where they designed instructional units that used language analysis to focus on history content, that is, an integrated language and content approach for history teachers (Schleppegrell & de Oliveira (2006).

Scholars in Schleppegrell’ California History Project (CHP) summarize their findings by stating that students of the participating teachers in the CHP made significantly greater gains on the state exams than students whose teachers had not participated in the workshops, and ELLs in particular demonstrated the greatest benefits (Achugar, Schleppegrell & Oteíza, 2007; Schleppegrell, Greer and & Taylor, 2008). in one of the studies, Aguirre-Muñoz, Park, Amabisca and Boscardin (2009) report on the effectiveness of their professional development focusing on the linguistic features of academic writing in English Language Arts (e.g., the genre of written response to literature) and in-service middle school teachers’ ability to use that knowledge to support and assess ELLs who are “above intermediate proficiency” (Aguirre-Muñoz et al., 2009, p. 298). Results indicate that the training was effective in drawing teachers away from traditional grammar feedback and planning to providing feedback and planning that corresponds to the SFL-based operationalization of academic language (p. 307). That is, the training supported and developed teachers’ understanding of the linguistic features of academic language focusing their “analysis of ELL writing on meaning and providing feedback and instruction to students centered on developing their linguistic resources for improving clarity in their writing” (p.p. 308-309).

Similarly, in Aguirre-Muñoz, Chang and Sanders’ (2015) mixed methods study they examine SFL-based writing instruction in fourth grade classrooms. Qualitative and
quantitative analysis of a random sample of 24 students’ writing revealed a significant improvement in students’ descriptive writing over time on important linguistic elements necessary for effectively representing experiences through the use of participants, processes or verb types and circumstances. For example, they found development in action and relating verbs use; as well as an increase in the use of embedded clauses in students’ descriptions (p. 76). These findings suggest that explicit instruction using a Functional Grammar approach (SFL) can support students’ writing development.

The Language and Meaning Project in Michigan

Schleppegrell and other colleagues developed a second project around supporting the literacy development of ELLs in a high poverty school district in Michigan. Their focus was on “designing curricular materials and researching how teachers and young multilingual students engaged with SFL tools as they read, wrote and discussed English Language Arts and science texts” (Gebhard, 2019, p. 94). For example, Moore and Schleppegrell (2014) focused their professional development of in-service teachers on meaning in the literature that primary school children (grades 2-5) read and the academic language of the English Language Arts (ELA) Curriculum. Taking the perspective that dialogue about texts and their meaning is the context through which learning takes place, the authors offer evidence from classroom interactions showing “how grammatical metalanguage and scaffolding artifacts can support ELLs in meaningful discussion that extends both their language and content knowledge” (Moore & Schleppegrell, 2014, p.93). For instance, SFL metalanguage supported explicit talk about figurative language (“red as a cherry”) and helped students engage with the literary metalanguage of showing (“stormed”, “walk in slowly”). Students were also able to make sense of characters’
feelings conveyed through their actions by paying attention to the experiential and interpersonal meanings presented (p. 103).

In another study, O’Hallaron and Schleppegrell (2016) report on a case study on teachers’ assessment of 2nd and 4th graders’ science arguments after receiving professional development on SFL-based features of writers’ voice, as part of their “project to support ELLs’ teachers in exploring language and meaning in texts across subject areas” (p.66). Their analysis of raters’ scores and of evaluative comments on students’ argumentative writing suggests a potential mismatch between teachers’ expectations for voice and the logical arguments emphasized in standards, curricula and assessment adopted by a large number of U.S. states. These authors claim that this mismatch “does not offer an understanding of voice that enables teachers to prepare students to present an authoritative stance [voice] in writing across disciplines” (p.71). They call for the development of rubrics identifying the language resources used to project the kind of voice valued in different disciplines and contexts in order to support teachers in teaching and assessing students’ writing.

**The Russell Elementary school project in Boston**

In 2007 Brisk and colleagues developed another SFL-based professional development initiative as a collaboration between Boston Public schools and Boston College, with the goal of implementing and researching the impact of this school-wide approach to teaching writing using the Teaching and Learning Cycle (TLC) (Gebhard, 2019). In one of their studies, Brisk and Zisselsberger (2010) report on the impact of an SFL professional development on eleven participating teachers and through the analysis of one teachers’ class and the writing development of three kindergarten bilingual
students’ writing of fictional narratives in her mainstream class. In their findings “teachers remarked that the [professional development] had heightened their awareness of the need to teach writing” (p.117). For example, they indicated that Writers’ Workshop helped them structure their classes, while organizing their teaching of writing around several genres and SFL concepts generated specific ideas of what to teach. In the case of the focal kindergarten students, although “not all students responded to these demands with equal success… they were all given the opportunity and the support, and each showed some development without being made to feel different or inferior” (p. 123). For example, Hassan (one of the focal students) wrote stories blending the structural components of fictional narratives with features of personal recounts. The other two students -Clarisa and Lorena- created stories with fictional characters thus showing further writing development.

In another study, Brisk, Hodgson-Drysdale and O’Connor (2011) examines the effects of professional development on SFL and the ways the theory informs instruction focusing on report writing in elementary grades. They analyzed the report writing of seven focal students from K to 5th grade regarding the students’ understanding of the purpose and structure of reports [genre purpose and genre moves]; “… their understanding of field and grammatical rendering of the topic; their understanding of tenor as reflected in their language; and their ability to organize and use language produce a coherent text” (p. 6). Their findings indicate that with “careful scaffolding by teachers through shared writing, questions, or deconstructing texts with the purport of graphic organizers” (p. 9) elementary students were able to produce reports. For example, in the early grades, students wrote reports in the typical voice of the report genre by using
the third person focusing on the topic and not on the writer, thus conveying expertise on
the topic. However, they also found that students were not fully capable of properly using
cohesive devices. Students’ texts throughout the grades commonly displayed unclear
referents, did not use synonyms to avoid repetition and “the theme of sentences or
paragraphs was often the central participant repeated throughout the piece” (p.10). SFL
theory with a focus on genre and register provided these teachers with a framework for
how to scaffold report writing. Describing the effectiveness of the professional
development initiative based on state test scores, Brisk (2016) states that Russell School
went from being one of the lowest performing schools in Boston designated as a ‘failing
school” (Level 5) in 2007 to a “high performing’ school (Level 1) a decade later.

The ACCELA Alliance in Western Massachusetts

From 2002-2014, the School of Education at the university of Massachusetts-Amherst established a partnership “with professionals and community members from two
local school districts serving large numbers of students designated as ELLs” (Gebhard,
2019, p. 97). One of the main goals of this partnership was to support teachers and
administrators, among others, in understanding and responding to the critical professional
development needs of these stakeholders in the education of linguistically and culturally
diverse students (Gebhard & Willett, 2008). ACCELA offered three programs: A
bachelor's degree in general studies for bilingual paraprofessionals and community
leaders, a master’s degree in education for in-service teachers in elementary and
secondary schools, and a doctoral program to support multilingual doctoral students in
using ethnographic methods and the SFL pedagogical framework to collect and analyze
data with local teachers (Austin, Willet, Gebhard & Montes, 2010). As Gebhard (2019)
states it, in its twelve years of existence, ACCELA attempted to create groundbreaking hybrid pedagogical spaces simultaneously supporting multilingualism, students’ disciplinary literacy practices, and the professional development of teachers. This was achieved through action research projects requiring “teams of teachers and literacy researchers to use SFL tools and the TLC to identify content objectives, disciplinary literacy objectives, and social justice objectives” (Gebhard, 2019, p. 98). The following are studies that originated from the ACCELA Alliance, which are connected to the present investigation on Latine ELLs writing development.

One of the first studies dealing with the particular case of public schools under “the English-Only mandate” in Massachusetts is Gebhard, Harman and Seger (2007). These researchers pursued a teacher’s inquiry on how teachers can support all students in making sense of academic language (and passing high-stakes tests), but do so in a way that maintains space for reading and writing about issues the students care about. These researchers report on a qualitative case study of a fifth grader Puerto Rican student – Julia. In their analysis, Gebhard, et al. (2007) connected teaching practices and genre-based analysis of focal student’s literacy practices. Their findings demonstrate that by connecting students’ concerns with the official curriculum, together with explicit genre-based writing instruction the teacher created a meaningful and authentic audience for their reading and writing activities and therefore supported Julia’s, as well as other ELLs,’ L2 writing development. Through her written texts, Julia “presented herself as an engaged, capable language learner as opposed to a struggling student” (p. 428). Furthermore, the summary of the findings and the critical stance of these authors are clearly articulated in the following quote: “[The teacher’s] use of the tools of SFL offers
a robust conception of grammar and academic literacy development that can support other teachers in negotiating the demands of school reforms in their work with language learners (p. 428).” An important aspect of this study is how the authors interweaved throughout their report -from teacher’s own inquiry to the conclusions and implications sections- a constant connection/reflection on how broader socio cultural (e.g., demographic changes) and political factors of schooling (e.g., NCLB education reform, English-Only language policies, standardized high-stakes testing) were affecting the institutional context and classroom literacy practices in many respects. For instance, how the administrative decision to dedicate more “instructional time to testing and test taking (p. 419)” was replacing teaching; how the passage of anti-bilingual education eliminated or diminished the institutional support for English language Learners such as Julia (e.g., language support from bilingual and ESL specialists) consequently affecting the students’ literacy development (p. 423).

In a second study during the same year, Schulze and Ramirez (2007) examined how elementary ELLs used intertextuality to compose informational texts. Using Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) of language and ideology and SFL as the tool for linguistic analysis, the main focus of their investigation was on uncovering instances of manifest intertextuality and literary borrowing evident in the focal students' informational reports. They looked at three Puerto Rican ELLs in one ESL classroom who were receiving supplemental language arts support with native language instruction limited to use for "clarification purposes" only under Massachusetts English Only regulations. In their theoretical framework, Schulze and Ramirez implemented the concept of intertextuality defined as re-voicing of that which has been said over and over again to explain how
students' informational texts reproduced structural and content features from the websites students used as a resource. Their findings indicate that students' informational genre texts demonstrated intertextuality in terms of the experiential, interpersonal, and textual metafunctions. The ELLs appropriated the generic structure of the target text by using relational processes to define and classify the topic. The researchers identified instances in which the ELLs' texts shifted from one function to another and noted the process change that accompanied these functional shifts. “Students appropriated and used content from the internet to compose their own informational genre texts” (p.81). Participants and processes remained largely unchanged in the texts. One student appropriated the participants from the website without any change in her own text, but employed a "denominalization" when expanding the nominalization "Evaporation" to "The water evaporates". This 'unpacked' nominalization is more typical of oral genres than of written genres (p. 82). The student chooses not to rename the participant, but instead simplifies the participant to "the eye" and locates the eye "in the middle". Their findings suggest that students' grammatical moves to make the text their own may increase their linguistic control over the target genre.

In another ACCELA study, Gebhard, Shin and Seger (2011) studied how a teacher used SFL to design a blog-mediated curriculum to support 2nd grade ELLs’ L2 literacy development in an urban elementary school in western Massachusetts. They present a case study of a student -Diany- profiled as a second language “struggling reader and writer.” (Gebhard et al., 2011, p. 285), and analyze the SFL-based teaching practices in relation to the texts produced by the focal student with a focus on genre and register features. Their findings illustrate that “Diany used the class blog to communicate with an
expanded audience for a wide range of academic and social purposes in ways that also expanded her semiotic resources” (p. 289). For example, In SFL terms, she used blogging in interpersonal ways to construct and display social roles related to being a valued peer and good student. She developed a greater metalinguistic awareness of the semiotic resources available in online communication to textually display these roles as well as to better manage the flow of her written discourse. Specifically, Dian’s texts displayed more varied and complex clause structures, a greater control over tense and modality, and a better understanding of the differences between oral and printed discourse (Ibid).

The same year, Gebhard, Willet, Jiménez-Caicedo and Piedra’s (2011) study describes a case study of SFL-based literacy practices enacted by a fourth-grade teacher and one of her students involving the narrative genre as part of the English Language Arts curriculum framework. Specifically, the focus was on changes in “teaching practices and how those changes influenced the narratives produced by an academically struggling ELL student named ‘Eloy’” (p. 95). With regard to teaching practices, their findings reveal that the teacher -Amy- gained a deeper understanding of the structural, lexical and grammatical features of narratives and “developed a more sophisticated understanding of how to incorporate SFL-based pedagogy in her work with ELLs as a way of teaching them disciplinary knowledge and supporting their academic literacy development” (p. 107). In terms of changes in students’ ability to produce written narratives, their findings show that Eloy developed a greater ability to use words and phrases (lexico-grammatical choices) to signal essential narrative genre moves (e.g., orientation, series of events, and the resolution), and to shift from an oral to a more written register by avoiding the overuse of and to initiate clauses, using the narrative past, more complex clause
structures and conventional punctuation and spelling. Finally, the teacher’s critical use of SFL tools allowed her to author her own teaching materials supporting students as capable readers and writers of their own narratives, legitimizing “the use of multicultural children’s literature and the display of bicultural identity while supporting the academic literacy development of ELLs” (p. 108).

Next, Harman’s (2013) qualitative study was conducted to explore a 5th grade teacher's genre-based approach to literary writing instruction, informed by sociocultural and systemic functional linguistics perspectives on meaning-making and centered on the use of intertextuality. The focal teacher developed her approach during her three-year participation in ACCELA’s professional development initiative. The study examines how the approach supported two focal students (Miguel and Bernard) in expanding their meaning-making processes by helping them appropriate particular lexico-grammatical resources from children's literature to build cohesion in their writing. “The teacher’s permeable curricular approach encouraged them to see writing as a co-constructed dialogic activity -literary texts and classroom-scaffolding activities could be used in agentive ways to craft their texts” (p.137). Harman’s SFL analysis demonstrates that reading and writing literature supports academic literacy development. Also, using an SFL perspective, teachers can analyze with students how academic and literary texts linguistically construe knowledge, establish interactions and an evaluative stance with the audience, and organize the flow of information for particular communicative and disciplinary purposes.

In a similar study, Willett, Harman, Hogan, Lozano, and Rubeck (2013) argue that English language learners (ELL) need strong first-language literacy preparation and
content knowledge, and that their needs range from special talents to physical, learning, or emotional disabilities which teachers need to take into consideration when planning instruction. Their study took place at an underperforming elementary school in Western, Massachusetts serving approximately 775 students in grades kindergarten through fifth grade (68% of the students were Latine). It focuses on teachers Joanne (fifth grade) and Andrea (second grade), and two Puerto Rican ELLs in fifth grade (Kendria and Bernardo).

To accomplish the goals of fostering students’ understanding of the linguistic and stylistic features of literary narratives, while writing about their own issues, in their combined unit, Andrea and Joanne “transformed the routine practices of their classroom into meaningful practices that had a particular social purpose and audience” (p.38). For example, they selected trade books with themes related to the children’s emotional issues (e.g., anger, jealousy, depression) and created a curricular unit that used the fifth graders as facilitators to the second graders’ reading process of the trade books. To develop a sense of audience for their writing, students were asked to share their complaints about school and home and Kendria wrote about how her brother had placed a bucket of worms in her bed (p.41). The teachers also read excerpts from books and articles to help them understand how writers craft their stories, and after a one-to-one session with the instructor, Kendria decided to write about her older brother who becomes jealous of his younger sister. This study shows that students need to understand that genres are both structured and dynamic so that the specific audience and context of a text directly influence its generic structure. By creating texts for authentic purposes with audiences larger than their own teachers or classmates, students began to understand the functional
and meaningful interconnections of text and context. According to these authors, it is imperative for teachers to help their students understand that genre is a plastic entity that changes according to its audience and context. They must also teach students how to identify the generic features that tend to recur across similar text types (e.g., abstract nouns, logical connectors, relational verbs in expository texts). The authors conclude that ELLs count on their teachers to reach their hearts and minds in ways that no outside expert, packaged curriculum, or mandated practice could ever do. They argue that it is impossible to imagine generic scripted curriculum or teacher-proof materials, strategies, or routine practices capable of connecting as well with particular children” (Willet, et al., 2013, p. 50). The authors also provided a set of principles for teachers to evaluate and integrate practices into their curriculum units, so that they provide opportunities for academic learning and language development.

Another ACCELA study, Ramirez (2014) provides principles to apply Genre based pedagogy in middle schools. He brings to the discussion the prevalence of the English as a second language (ESL) pull-out approach in the United States (Crawford & Educational Resources Information Center (U.S.), 1997; García & Baetens Beardsmore, 2009) and its dissociation with disciplinary knowledge despite the fact that ESL taught via content area instruction (social studies, math, science, and so on) is associated with higher long-term educational attainment (Snow, Met, & Genesee, 1989; Thomas & Collier,1997). This case study describes the genre-based procedures and pedagogy of engagement principles inherent to the Strategic Alignment approach (Ramirez, 2008). Strategic Alignment described as a critical pedagogic framework that regulates and aligns the kind of official or non-official knowledge a teacher chooses to foreground and when
(Ramirez, 2008). In his study, Ramirez highlights the teaching that is aligned to the students’ needs, rights, and backgrounds aspects of the model through the focused tools of SFL theory and genre-based pedagogy. The focal Puerto Rican student at Pleasant Valley Middle School, Jorge, was perhaps the most vulnerable student. He was in eighth grade in a self-included special education classroom with other students with mild disabilities. Under the Strategic Alignment framework, the institutional mandates were radically transformed to serve the needs, rights, and backgrounds of students without losing sight of what was required academically of them. The academic development described in this chapter owes much to a Strategic Alignment position that in this classroom essentially utilized the multiple and appropriate affordances of a functional approach to language. The educational focus of this approach gives teachers and students the language to track closely the meanings embodied in written texts, providing a unique orientation that focuses on what students can do, identifying their strengths and making clear and positive suggestions as to how to make their texts more effective. The findings suggest that this approach helps practitioners move away from a knowledge blindness position overtaken by an overreliance on the knowers with a rhetoric of deficiencies to be remedied, a discourse of mistakes, risk or “lack,” and to resist serving as simple facilitators or passive spectators surrendered (see also Ramirez’ work Undoing Linguistic Imperialism in English Language Teaching, in press).

In another ACCELA study, Gebhard, Chen and Britton (2014) explore how a teacher (Lynne) used SFL metalanguage to support students' academic literacy development over an academic year, and how students use SFL metalanguage while engaging in reading and writing activities. The authors claim that scientific language is
difficult to understand for ELLs because it uses technical terms and dense clause structures that pack meaning into a single sentence. However, using systemic functional linguistics and genre theory, the teacher analyzed third-grade students' texts and designed an SFL-based curriculum that supported students in developing the grammatical resources required for reading and writing more structured and propositionally packed texts. For example, to attend to the text's "orientation," through the use of metalanguage, she guided students in noticing how authors use "time words," and tense, and how processes in "record of events" were realized in the past and reviewed how it is constructed in English.

According to the study, the three focal third-grade ELL students benefited from learning how to use SFL metalanguage to read and write disciplinary texts. They created graphs to display concepts discussed in the reading, and then produced explanations of their own. For example, Raquel's first draft began with an identifiable outcome, but she did not further develop the topic of work or safety (p.113). Damaris used her emergent genre and register knowledge to produce a coherent biographical explanation reflective of planned written discourse as opposed to a more informal spoken register. These students produced longer texts that required less scaffolding and used language more typical of disciplinary texts, which was consistent with their progressively higher Fountas and Pinnell and state English proficiency test scores. Their findings suggest that “teachers and even young learners can get started relatively quickly in using SFL tools to analyze texts in productive ways” (p. 123), by focusing on selected genres and a limited number of register features that support the construction of meaning in these text types. Lynne used SFL metalanguage to go "deeper into texts" with students, and contrasted this approach to
what she called the disjointed "curriculum surfing" characterizing many ESL materials and professional development workshops she had attended. This study suggests that explicit functional metalinguistic knowledge of how disciplinary discourses work to construct meaning can support teachers in designing effective academic literacy instruction for ELLs.

Considering that academic language instruction particularly in the content areas has become an essential ingredient in effective teaching practices, Schulze (2016), studied how emergent bilingual (e.g., ELLs) students can benefit from SFL-based pedagogy in ways that help them develop greater control of persuasive language through instruction that focuses on academic writing both at the genre structure and clause level. The study focused on Laura, a 13-year-old 8th grader from the Dominican Republic, who had been in the United States for less than a year and was identified as a beginning-level ELL. According to her school records, her parents, and the researcher’s observations, she was fully literate in Spanish. Data collected included students’ notebooks, written drafts, and field notes after each class. Two versions of students’ texts composed during the course of the study were collected. The first text was a “first draft” representing the “un-coached” version of a persuasive text created prior to the implementation of SFL-based pedagogy. The second text was composed following the teaching and learning cycle.

The SFL analysis of Laura’s writing was conducted on her second text in order to identify changes in the discourse structure and register and subsequently evaluate changes in her persuasive writing practices following SFL-based pedagogy. To analyze the extent to which Laura employed the recognizable discourse structure expected of persuasive texts, her text was divided into clauses, identified and labeled each stage of the
schematic structure typically found in arguments using SFL Criteria. The analysis indicates that “SFL-pedagogy had a significant impact on bringing Laura closer to the intended goal of writing effective persuasive texts by providing instructional support to demonstrate the connection between form and purpose”; and by improving her ability to include academic persuasive language at the clause level.

Schulze’s study shows that through explicit teaching focusing on the stages and linguistic features of persuasive writing, emergent bilingual students may potentially learn to construct detailed and coherent arguments. From the perspective of a teacher and teacher educator, the study also highlights how SFL analysis can pinpoint what our students can do with language and provides a way to potentially track that development and design instruction to enhance persuasive writing development. Given that teachers have experience with process-based approaches to writing instruction, having an explicit SFL analysis of texts can serve as guide and example of the ways teachers can bring attention to language and potentially support ELLs in increasing their control of grammatical and lexical resources through culturally-relevant SFL based pedagogy.

In a more recent investigation, Gebhard, Accurso and Harris (2019), report on an action research project focusing on supporting the disciplinary literacy practices of high school SLIFE students (Students with Limited or Interrupted Formal Education). The pedagogical intervention consisted of developing five curricular units (in English language arts, science, math and social studies) over two years, based on an expanded version of the SFL Teaching and Learning Cycle (TLC). The authors present a case study of a Guatemalan student named “Valencia” that illustrates how she “was able to produce longer texts made up of multiple well-written paragraphs to achieve specific purposes
(e.g., recounting, describing, reporting, explaining and arguing)” (p. 241). Valencia’s writing also showed a gradual increase in her capacity to write texts using more complex clause structures, pack noun groups and an expanded range of verbs, participants and circumstances. Additionally, she passed state exams in English Language arts and math. Because of Valencia’s different learning experiences at home, school and work, Gebhard et al. do not claim that the teacher’s use of the expanded TLC caused these gains, however they “do maintain that two aspects of the expanded TLC were relevant to Valencia’s evolving literacy practices” (Ibid): (1) the availability of several multilingual and multimodal resources for scaffolding the completion of challenging academic tasks, and (2) the availability of model texts to guide her reading and writing practices.

To summarize, it is very evident through the studies reviewed under the fourth theme within the sociocultural orientation to literacy and writing development that the SFL framework and accompanying pedagogies has become a very prominent area of L2 literacy research, in particular during the two decades. This line of inquiry clearly adds to critical work under a socio-cultural notion of second language literacy development. In addition to being a language focused orientation to literacy development, their work focused on language practices that support critical pedagogies aiming at constructing a more democratic multicultural curriculum in order to subvert movement toward increasingly normalizing hegemonic practices in schools (e.g., Gebhard, et al., 2011; Gebhard, 2019; Ramirez, 2008; 2014, in press; Willett et al. 2013), and call for the urgent need of teachers’ professional development for the teaching of writing to emerging bilinguals.
Conclusion

This chapter set out to review the scholarly work on the L2 writing development of ELLs students carried out mainly under “English-Only conditions” during the last two decades in K-12 schools in the United States. Through its rationale, it tried to link a research focus on Latine L2 writing development with the highly contested socio-political context created after the passage of restrictive bilingual education policies in key states (e.g., Proposition 227 in California, proposition 203 in Arizona, and Question #2 in Massachusetts), and their later repeal in California in 2016 and the amendment of Question 2 in Massachusetts in 2017. This heated educational context was exacerbated by the standardization movement of the NCLB act of education reform, as well as the Common Core Standards Initiative at the federal level. Nevertheless, as the findings of this literature review have shown, there has been a historical paucity of research on this specific issue. It is mainly during the last decade or so that there has been an increase in the number of studies addressing this current and pressing educational issue, specifically those studies drawing on the SFL pedagogical framework. This scarcity of research on Latine ELLs L2 literacy needs to be addressed, considering the fact that the ELL population will undoubtedly continue to grow, placing challenges for the K-12 educational system. Some of those challenges pointed out by research reviewed here constitute the lack of professional development of teachers serving culturally and linguistically diverse learners (e.g., Latine emerging bilinguals), who are trying to learn disciplinary content and develop their L2 academic writing.

Accordingly, some of these researchers argue that the professional development needed by current or future teachers of ELLs requires first, teacher education programs to
analyze critically how everyday classroom practices have been and will continue to be permeated by current and future socio-political issues under the discourses of educational reform (Harman, 2013; Gebhard, et al. 2011; Gebhard, Accurso & Harris, 2019; Ramirez, 2008). Second, this professional development of preservice and in-service teachers should aim at expanding their linguistic knowledge base for them to better support their literacy teaching practices (Gebhard, Willet, Jiménez-Caicedo and Piedra’s, 2011; Accurso and Gebhard, 2020) while focusing on critical components of language for diverse learners such as the academic register of school genres (de (Aguirre-Muñoz et al. 2015; Brisk, 2014; de Oliveira & Smith, 2019). This while at the same time drawing and/or enacting the teaching of second language writing as an ideologically committed practice (Martin, 2005).

Moreover, this dearth of research focusing on the L2 writing development of Latine students in the primary, middle and high school levels in this country reinstates Silva and Brice’s (2004) early findings on the scarcity of research on early writing in general (e.g., at the K-12 educational levels) in the United States. Furthermore, there is little literature addressing the instructional demands and practices looking at ELLs of different backgrounds and English proficiency levels (Anstrom, DiCerbo, Butler, Katz, Millet & Rivera, 2010). This lack in our field notwithstanding, the studies reviewed here index important shifts in informing our collective understanding of the multiplicity of factors affecting the writing development of Latine and possibly other emerging bilingual students and the ways researchers have been described and operationalized.

Most of the studies drawing on a socio-cultural perspective of literacy and second language writing locate writing development as depending on the possibilities of writing
created by the teachers in and outside the classroom context (Patthey-Chavez 2004; Wollman-Bonilla 2000, 2001) and as displayed of textual features in students’ texts. For example, a few studies operationalized writing development as the appropriation and or display of genre specific features such as in scientific-like discourse Wollman-Bonilla (2000), in hybrid and situationally appropriate texts and narrative development (Solsken, 2000; Bloome et al. 2000), and in letter writing (Gebhard, 2002; Gebhard et al. 2007). Other studies described L2 writing development as growth in communicative ability and expression of students’ voices and lives (Valdés, 1999; Coady and Escamilla, 2005). All these studies contrast with the cognitive perspective that focuses on isolating writing development to the individual capacity of displaying discrete lexical and grammatical elements in a given texts (e.g., Fisher and Frey, 2003; Reynolds, 2002; 2005).

Yet more significant is the shift to a critical agenda envisioned and developed by some researchers who located L2 writing development as intrinsically connected to curricular decisions made by the teacher, and the school administrators at different levels under the overwhelming pressures of the increasingly normalizing and regulating school reform agendas (e.g., Bloome et al., 2001, Gebhard, 2002; Gebhard et al., 2007; Gebhard & Willett, 2008; Willett et al., 2000, among others). In essence, these authors make an attempt to ask and answer the difficult and critical questions of how all of us concerned with the education of non-mainstream students (ELL students’ families, teachers, administrators, policy makers, researchers) might alter standard-like mainstream instruction into a more socially responsive pedagogy in order to better meet the needs of Latine and other multilingual learners. How do we, as stakeholders committed to an
emancipatory education, assume, negotiate and/or resist passive and subjugating roles assigned to us by the discourses and policies reforming our public schools?

In sum, the work of Bloom, Gebhard, Patthey-Chaves, Austin, Willett, and their teams of colleagues, graduate students and school collaborators demonstrates how the everyday literacy practices enacted by teachers and students in every urban school are permeated by large macro socio-political pronouncements that dictate what gets taught, to whom it gets taught, and under what physical and material circumstances. It could be argued that when taking a sociocultural approach to literacy we are “exiting the mind” (Gee, Hull and Lankshear, 1996. p. 4), and removing the sole responsibility of learning from the individual learners, their families, and ultimately, their teachers, we finally enter the highly politicized world of educating linguistically and culturally diverse learners under discourses of educational reform imposed on K-12 urban schools in the United States. The critical work of these teams of researchers constitutes a political act of denouncing and resisting the ill-prevailing unequal conditions created and perpetuated by neo-liberal educational reforms and standardizing agendas in the United States (see Ramirez, 2008; 2014; in press).

In concluding, I would like to suggest that based on the findings presented and discussed in this literature review, the scarcity of scholarly work in this area constitutes a paramount issue for those of us working in this field. In particular, more research is needed on the literacy development of specific marginalized groups such as Latine students, among many other ELL students entering (and/or unfortunately leaving) public schools each year. As a Latino myself, drawing on my multiple subject positions (e.g., an “educated” Latino, a Latino graduate student, a Latino teacher, a Latino researcher, a
Latino father of Latino children, among others), I have been taking an increasingly advocate role in voicing and denouncing the conditions that contribute to the reproduction of the socio-political inequalities of Latine and other ELL students in urban schools and communities. As Harklau (2002) argues:

we cannot operate outside of the meaning-making effects of discourses and our own social positioning. And although representations give the effect of fixing meaning, they are not deterministic and are subject to continual change and revision. Students' and educators' agency -the fact that we can and do take action as individuals- means that we are continually recreating and reshaping notions of identity in the course of classroom interaction (p.63).

Therefore, in suggesting future research agendas, based on the synthesis and discussion presented in this chapter about the different ways to analyze and describe second language writing development, the following are some of the timely questions regarding the current pressing situation of English language Learners and their L2 academic writing development: 1) How can L2 writing development be described under national mandates and normalizing classroom practices?, 2) Regarding the teaching and learning processes, what features of L2 academic language can be taught explicitly at the elementary, middle school or high school levels?

Finally, exploring these and other related questions would undoubtedly help us gain new understandings on how different writing teaching approaches (e.g., genre-based approaches) may better serve Latine emerging bilinguals in their development of academic literacy within the highly politicized context of public urban schools in the United States. Thus, this dissertation aims to contribute to this body of work by focusing on the study of how a Latina emerging bilingual, participating in a teacher’s exploration and negotiation with genre-based pedagogies and state mandated curriculum, develops (or not) her academic writing in English as evidenced in her written production.
CHAPTER 3: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter presents the conceptual framework and main concepts guiding the present investigation on the academic literacy development of a 4th grade emerging bilingual in an urban elementary school in western Massachusetts. The chapter begins with a discussion of writing development from a sociocultural view. It continues with a presentation of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) as a social theory of language in congruence with sociocultural theories of learning. The three SFL metafunctions (ideational, interpersonal and textual) are explained, along with the concepts of genre and register (e.g., field, tenor and mode).

Next, genre-based pedagogy is introduced followed by an explanation of SFL’s Teaching and Learning Cycle (TLC), and how it was used and expanded within the ACCELA Alliance teacher’s professional development. The chapter concludes with a brief summary.

A Sociocultural Perspective on Writing Development

Writing has been considered to play a key role in both, learning and in accomplishing and carrying meaningful social tasks and purposes in different cultures. Historically, writing has also been fundamental to the cultural development of individuals as a mediating cultural tool for developing higher order thinking. Vygotsky, for instance, in his discussion of the early stages of written speech development in the context of his cultural historical theory, states that:

The development of written language belongs to the […..] most obvious line of cultural development because it is connected with the mastery of an external system of means developed and created in the process of the cultural development of humanity (Vygotsky 1997, p. 133).
In spite of Vygotsky’s fundamental theoretical argument on the importance of writing within a broader literacy perspective in the cultural development of every individual, and recontextualizing such argument into K-12 urban schools settings serving predominantly emerging bilinguals (Garcia & Kleifgen, 2010) in the United States, we find that the teaching of writing in these contexts (and therefore to this population) has been traditionally displaced by a focus on developing oral, and lately, reading skills (Davenport & Jones, 2005). For instance, an earlier study by Zehler, Fleishman, Hopstock, Stephenson, Pendizick, & Sapru (2003) reveals that approximately 85% of emerging bilinguals can communicate orally in English; however, they have difficulty when using English for academic tasks in classroom settings; that is, because children’s school progress “is constantly monitored and evaluated through their ability to write, be it a project, an essay or written examination” (Foley and Lee, 2004, p. 99). Thus, arguing for a more prominent role of writing-and the teaching of writing- in schools dealing with this population of second language learners, Harklau (2002) states that:

Although writing as a communicative modality has been marginalized, it is key to understanding second language acquisition in contexts such as elementary and secondary level content area classrooms where literacy plays a central role in communication and transmission of subject matter (Harklau, 2002, p.329).

Regarding second language learning and drawing on the previous sociocultural work of Lantolf, (2000), Vygotsky (1978) and Wertsch, (1998), Gebhard (2002) points out that a sociocultural orientation of second language acquisition (SLA) “takes as a starting point an understanding that the origin and structure of cognition are rooted in the daily social and cultural activities in which people participate” (Gebhard, 2002, p. 19.)
For more sociocultural oriented discussions on SLA, see also Canagarajah, 1999, Lam, 2000; Morgan & Ramanathan, 2005; Pennycook, 2001).

Building on the Vygotskian sociocultural theory of mind extended by Cole (1998) and Wertsch (1998), Lantolf (2000) states that “the most fundamental concept of sociocultural theory is that the human mind is mediated (p.1)”. Lantolf (1994) also explains that “mediation, whether physical [e.g., tools] or symbolic [e.g., language], is understood to be the introduction of an auxiliary device into an activity that then links humans to the world of objects or to the world of mental behavior” (p. 418). For example, in the same way a physical tool such as a pencil and paper provide us the means to write a text allowing us to materialize our thoughts and ideas. In terms of development (learning), sociocultural theory maintains that “development does not proceed as the unfolding of inborn capacities, but as the transformation of innate capacities once they intertwine with socioculturally constructed mediational means” (Lantolf & Pavlenko, 1995, as cited in Ellis & Barkhuizen (2005). In line with this sociocultural orientation to language learning and discussing writing in particular, Prior (2006) states that sociocultural studies of schooling “have sought to describe not only how writing is used and learned in schools, but also how school writing is located in larger and deeper currents of sociocultural practice” (p. 60).

In sum, these sociocultural perspectives have brought attention to the importance of particular socio-cultural contexts and the way second language literacy or literacies are intimately bound up with institutions such schools and social relationships and literacy practices in the classrooms. Such literacy practices usually demand students to appropriate new discourses, that is, new ways of talking, thinking, believing, knowing,
acting, interacting, valuing and feeling (Gee, 2007), and of course new ways of writing, such writing in academic genres (e.g., narratives, informational text, etc.).

**Systemic Functional Linguistics and Language Development**

In agreement with a socio-cultural view of learning (Vygotsky, 1978), the study proposed here also draws on a semiotic or functional approach to language learning based on the Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) theory of language (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014; Wells 1994), which “presents the view that children learn to use language in interactions with others for a range of purposes and in a range of cultural and situational contexts (Gibbons, 2004, p. 201).” In relation to writing and discussing the differences between highly context-dependent discourse – oral language- and context-independent or written discourse, Halliday (1993) maintains that “children learn to construe their experience in two complimentary modes: the dynamic mode of the everyday common sense grammar and the synoptic mode of elaborated written grammar (p.112).” This explains how emerging bilinguals, for instance, may develop at a much rapid pace first their oral abilities in their L2 through everyday interactions with friends in social contexts like the playground. The synoptic mode may take longer, and formal instruction, for them to learn how to restructure their understanding of their second language when re-contextualizing their experiences in the written mode (e.g., when writing in schools). Furthermore, Ortega and Byrnes argue that SFL provides a coherent framework for the study of academic literacy development, because “it provides a theoretically compelling set of concrete linguistic tools to analyze and explicate L2 development. (Ortega & Byrnes, 2008, p.9).” These concepts and linguistic tools will be explained in the next section.
SFL Concepts and Tools to Mediate L2 Writing Development

Halliday’s Systemic functional linguistics (SFL) is a social semiotic theory of language that sees language as a resource for making meaning in context (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014), where meaning resides in systemic patterns of choices made by writers or speakers to serve their particular functions and communicative needs. The typically unconscious language choices depend on the social and cultural contexts in which meaning is exchanged (Fang & Schleppegrell, 2010). These contexts are referred to in SFL metalanguage (language to talk about language use) as genre, or the realization of the context of culture, and register, or the realization of the context of situation, which are explained in the following paragraphs.

The Context of Culture or Genre

The context of culture, or genre, represents the culturally expected structure of different texts and the way register is realized (de Oliveira & Smith, 2019). This study draws on Jim Martin’s (1984) characterization of genre as staged, goal-oriented, social processes; which Rose further explains as being social “because writers shape their texts for readers of particular kinds; goal-oriented because a text unfolds towards its social purpose; staged because it usually takes more than one step to reach the goal” (Rose, 2009, p. 153). Hassan (1989) argues that every text has a recognizable form or generic structure that is related to its social purpose. For example, everyone familiar with a recipe, a poem, or business letter can easily recognize these types of texts. Genres (e.g., text types) have identifiable elements of text structure (some are obligatory and some are optional), more commonly known as moves of the genre. These genre moves can appear
in different order while attempting to fulfill a partial purpose within the text, and simultaneously contributing to realizing the overall communicative purpose of such text.

**Genre as concept**

Within a sociocultural perspective, theoretical concepts, such as those of discourse genres (e.g., personal narratives, recounts, reports, etc.), represent not an individual’s personal experience but the generalized experience of a culture (Karpov, 2003, p.66). This socioculturally-based argument is similar to Martin’s systemic linguistic notion of genre as representing the context of culture. That is, the soci-historically constructed and perceived ways of representing experience in a social group or community (Martin, 1992; Martin & Rose, 2003). Then, based on the previous articulation of both a sociocultural and a Hallidayan semiotic functional approach to language learning and language development, it seems possible to operationalize discourse genres as concepts that emerging bilinguals need to gain control over in order to develop their second language writing and become members of the immediate academic writing community in their elementary schools.

Here genre as a concept is operationalized following Johnson’s (2008 -see also Arievitch and Stetsenko (2000), description of theoretical and scientific concepts as “cohesive abstract units of culturally created meaning” (p.44) that evolved from the culture and become cognitive readily available tools to mediate learning. Hence, in this theoretical articulation the concept of genre “is seen as a tool to solve a problem” (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 164), and simultaneously as the unit for pedagogical intervention (Negueruela & Lantolf, 2005, p. 2) to assist emerging bilinguals in their meaning-making capacity when learning to write in academically sanctioned ways in public schools.
Consequently, there is a dialectical relationship existing between L2 teaching and learning by which L2 academic writing development (learning) and instruction is understood as being:

…about internalizing and developing control over theoretical concepts that are explicitly and coherently presented to learners, who in turn are guided through a sequence of activities designed to prompt the necessary internalization and control over the relevant concepts (Negueruela & Lantolf, 2005, p. 2).

Furthermore, Negueruela (2003) stresses the importance of bringing into the L2 learner’s attention those relevant concepts by means of specific and overt instruction on the concepts and through concrete learning activities that allow learners to manipulate specific aspects of the target concept.

**The context of situation or register and SFL’s Three Metafunctions**

Within the SFL framework, the context of situation represents the choices of field (what the language is being used to talk about), tenor the “role relationships [play] between the interactants,” and mode (“the role language plays in the interaction,”) whether it is written or spoken (Eggins, 2004, p. 90). These lexico-grammatical features of texts at the clause level are considered to be functionally responsible for the realization of each generic move, and consequently the overall communicative purpose of a given text. Also, the three variables of field, tenor and mode realize what Halliday calls the three metafunctions in language (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014).

SFL provides a simultaneous trinocular view on language (Matthiessen, 2020) to analyze meaning in different types of spoken or written texts, in terms of what the texts says about the world (the experiential meaning or ideational metafunction); in terms of the social relationships, it enactment (the interpersonal meaning or metafunction), and in terms of the organization of the meaning into a coherent message (the textual meaning or
metafunction) (Fang & Schleppegrell, 2010, p. 592). These meanings correspond to the register variables of field, tenor and mode, that is the trinocular view of language at the register level (Matthiessen, 2020).

**The ideational metafunction**

It represents the writer or speaker experience at the clause level through the field variable of the register. Lexicogrammatically, each clause presents participants (expressed through nouns), engaged in some sort of process (expressed through verbs), under specific circumstances (expressed through prepositional and adverbial phrases) (Eggins, 2004; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014). SFL recognizes four major process types: doing (realized by action verbs such as work and clap), sensing (realized by thinking and feeling verbs such as know and fear), being (realized by relating verbs such as be and have), and saying (realized by talking verbs like speak and say). Participants are the people or things involved in the process, typically realized in noun groups (e.g., the child, you, the water cycle), and the participants assume different semantic roles according to the different process types. For example, participants in material processes can be Actors (the one who does the action); Goal (the one who is affected by the action); Recipient (the one who receives something); and Beneficiary (the one for whom something is done) (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014). Participants in sensing processes include the Senser (the one who does the sensing) and Phenomenon (what is perceived, thought, or appreciated). Participants in being processes take on several roles, depending on the kind of clause in which the being process is used: (a) Carrier, an entity being described, and Attribute, the description of the entity; (b) Possessor, the one owning or containing something, and Possessed, the thing owned or contained; and (c) Token, an entity being equated with
another, and Value, the other description. Participants in saying processes include Sayer (the one who communicates), Addressee (the one receiving the message), and Verbiage or Message (what is said). Processes also take place around circumstances (of time, space, conditions, purpose, etc.), typically realized in adverbs (e.g., finally, rapidly) or prepositional phrases (e.g., around the house, with a stick) (de Oliveira & Smith, 2019). Transitivity analysis, that is, looking at participants, processes, and circumstances in clauses reveals what is going on the text, and answers the question who or what is doing what to whom under what circumstances.

**The interpersonal metafunction**

This refers to the ways relationships are established among writer and reader or speaker and listener including their opinions and attitudes, and is connected to the tenor variable of the register. In SFL terms, the mood and modality systems realized at the clause level allow us to make statements (typically expressed in declarative mood), ask questions (usually expressed in interrogative mood), and declare commands (normally expressed in imperative mood). The modality system allows us to see the different ways in which someone expresses evaluation, attitudes, and judgments of various kinds (Eggins, 2004; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014). Also, the modality system allows us to express possibility, certainty, normality,-usuality, necessity, and obligation. This system includes modal verbs (e.g., should, might, could), modal adjectives (e.g., frequent, usual), modal adverbs (e.g., probably, certainly, typically), and modal nouns (e.g., condition, necessity). According to Fang & Schleppegrell, (2010) analysis of the language used to enact the interpersonal meanings can help readers make sense of “how an author
positions and persuades readers in particular ways, an understanding that is important in the development of critical literacy” (p. 592).

The textual metafunction

This refers to how information is organized in and across a text. It is linked to the mode variable of register (Eggins, 2004; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014) and it is realized through the linguistic systems of theme/rheme and cohesion. Clauses in a text usually begin with something (theme) that is familiar to the reader and then present new information (rheme) about that theme. Additionally, cohesion is the way a text hangs together using devices such as personal pronouns, synonyms, antonyms and conjunctions. The analysis of theme/rheme and cohesion structures allows us to see the overall organization and information flow in a text, as well as how its genre stages or moves develop.

In sum, Halliday’s SFL theory maintains that every text (and every clause) simultaneously makes these three ideational, interpersonal and textual meanings through the grammatical systems of the language. Thus, a functional analysis allows us to explore what is going on in a text by looking at transitivity. We can also analyze the author’s interaction with the reader or his/her perspective in the text by looking at mood and modality. And finally, we can analyze how a text is organized by examining its theme/rheme and cohesion devices. Figure 2 below is a visual representation of the relationship between genre, register and language based on SFL’s theory of language.
Figure 2 Stratified model of SFL text-contexts relationship (Adapted from Martin, 1992)

**Halliday’s Semiotic Functional Approach to Language Learning and a Sociocultural (SCT) Approach to Development**

Within an SFL orientation, L2 development occurs over time and is manifested as an expansion and/or refinement of aspects of language use in context (e.g., academic writing) (Achugar & Colombi, 2008). Academic writing then requires awareness and control of the written genres associated with formal schooling. Here genre (e.g., personal narrative genre) is therefore taken as a theoretical concept used to mediate emerging bilingual’s academic writing development. Consequently, it is possible then to align a Hallidayan semiotic functional approach to language learning with a sociocultural (SCT) approach to development which as Negueruela (2003) emphasizes:

…places paramount emphasis on the activities that learners engage in during the learning process… [SCT] conceptualizes L2 development as a revolutionary process affected by the conditions of the activities, which in turn, are the explanatory principle to understand the genesis of the human mind
[development]. Language as an activity [(i.e., speaking) or writing] and internalization as transformation are the cornerstones of SCT (p.43).

The present study draws on these theoretical constructs to the study of academic writing development based on the appropriation and internalization of the concept of genre (e.g., personal narrative genre). Development, however, is not seen here as a direct “cause and effect” phenomenon observed after a particular research treatment. Rather, from a Vygotskian perspective, development is complex, historical and social and as Lantolf and Thorne (2006) further emphasize development from one stage to another is unlikely to be “neither smooth nor discreet” (p. 396). Thus, taking a Vygostkian perspective for the study of academic writing development here would require to follow the genetic method, in which the analysis of the process “…[is] likely to be more revealing of the organization of mental activity than merely observing the product” (Byrnes, 2006, p.8). Thus, analyzing the process in connection with the product data would allow to trace the history of concept formation (e.g., the developing understanding of the concept of discourse genres such recounts and narratives).

Similarly, within an SFL orientation, change in individual ELL students (ontogenesis) over time is best understood as a social –sociogenetic- phenomenon, in which interaction with the immediate and larger contexts (e.g., classroom, school, society) critically influence what kind of linguistic resources these emerging bilinguals develop and how they develop them (Achugar & Colombi, 2008). Nevertheless, immediate manifestations of academic writing development or “short-term change” (Ibid, p.39) can be found in the logogenesis (the text history) –the process of development of a student’s text from draft to draft. Needless to say, such short-term textual instantiations of
ELLs’ academic literacy development need to be analyzed against the context of the students’ process of concept formation in classroom instruction over time, such as an academic year.

**Sydney School Genre Pedagogy and L2 Writing Development**

Over the last four decades, genre theories have been developing in various areas of linguistic research and applied linguistics in particular, which, in turn, have evolved into different trajectories and foci. According to Hyon (1996) there are three well-known genre traditions. Namely, English for specific purposes (ESP), North American New Rhetoric studies, and the Australian systemic functional linguistics. To maintain a clear focus and consistency throughout the present theoretical framework, I will not discuss each of these genre traditions at length, however, I will broadly mention their characteristics and analytical focus.

According to Paltridge (2001), these three genre traditions represent three different approaches to the analysis of genre in the area of language teaching and learning with some commonalities and differences, such as the type of learners they focus on and their theoretical concerns. On the one hand, following Swales (1990) seminal work on academic settings, the ESP perspective identifies structural elements of texts and examines genre-specific language in traditional grammatical terms (e.g., verbs, noun phrase, and parts of speech) mostly in college-level second language writing (Flowerdew, 2005).

---

4 Hyon (1996) provides a detailed map of these three genre theories and research areas, as well as their teaching applications.
On the other hand, the Australian systemic genre perspective has principally drawn on the Hallidayan social theory of language (e.g., Systemic Functional Linguistics). Genre analysis from this Australian perspective (specifically termed here as the Sydney School of Genre) also identifies structural elements of texts but discusses their genre-specific language using functional terms (e.g., verbs as processes of action, being, having, or feeling), with a “focus on primary and secondary school genres and non-professional workplace texts rather than on university and professional writing” (Hyon, 1996, p. 697). Some examples of the Australian systemic genre work are Callaghan, Knapp, and Noble, (1993), Christie & Martin (2005); Schleppegrell (2004), Gebhard, Harman & Seger, 2007; Ramirez, 2014, 2018, 2020, in press; Gebhard, Willett, Jiménez Caicedo & Piedra, 2011, among others). Finally, the third genre tradition, the North American New Rhetoric (e.g., Miller, 2015) focuses “less on features of the texts and more on relations between text and context” (Paltridge, 2001, p. 13). Similarly, the systemic view of genre also discusses this genre-context relationship in terms of “how the ‘context of culture’ and ‘context of situation’ impact textual structures and choices in grammar and vocabulary; while the ESP tradition discusses how the social and cultural context impact the language features of a text” (Ibid). Clearly, these three approaches to genre analysis share many commonalities and overlap among them (Bloor, 1998; Paltridge, 2001; Swales and Hyon, 1994; Flowerdew, 2005).

Based on the previous discussion, the Sydney School systemic genre framework constitutes an organic theoretical and analytical framework for the present study. That is, the Sydney School approach aligns with both the main purpose of clearly operationalizing the study of emerging bilinguals writing development over time and the
two major sociocultural theories that theoretically ground the present investigation (e.g., Vygotskian Sociocultural Theory of learning and Halliday’s Systemic Functional Linguistics theory of language). However, I will further explain the rationale for drawing on the Australian systemic functional linguistics perspective on genre in this investigation (e.g., genre theory, genre-based pedagogy, genre analysis).

**Table 1 Similarities Between Two Educational Projects Drawing on Australian Genre Theory**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects</th>
<th>Language and Social Power Project</th>
<th>ACCELA Alliance Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project nature</td>
<td>Action research project in a university-school partnership</td>
<td>Action research project in a university-school partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origins</td>
<td>A reaction to process writing approaches in Australia</td>
<td>A reaction to process writing approaches and NCLB school reform in The United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistemology and Theoretical grounding</td>
<td>Critical theory SFL as a social theory of language Sociocultural theory of learning</td>
<td>Critical theory SFL as a social theory of language Sociocultural theories of learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall goal</td>
<td>Achieve equity in education</td>
<td>Achieve equity in education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions involved</td>
<td>The University’s Linguistics Department and a Public school district</td>
<td>The university’s Language, Literacy &amp; Culture Department, and two public school districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociocultural Context</td>
<td>Urban schools in disadvantaged areas (Sydney’s Metropolitan East region)</td>
<td>Urban schools in disadvantaged areas (Western Massachusetts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target population</td>
<td>Working-class, Aboriginal, and non-English speaking children</td>
<td>Working-class, immigrant, and non-English speaking children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational levels</td>
<td>Elementary and secondary schools</td>
<td>Elementary and middle schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical approach</td>
<td>Teachers’ professional development on ‘learning through language, learning about language’ (Halliday, 1985b) through explicit teaching.</td>
<td>Teachers’ professional development on ‘learning language, learning through language, learning about language’ (Halliday, 1995) through explicit teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical goal</td>
<td>Literacy and writing development</td>
<td>Literacy and writing development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Unit/ Analytical Unit</td>
<td>Written genre(s) addressed at each school grade.</td>
<td>Written genre(s) addressed at each school grade.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The rationale for preferring the Sydney School genre analysis over the other two genre traditions discussed earlier is based on the epistemological parallelisms found between the research project from which the Australian genre theory originated, and the
professional development and research project from which the proposed study here evolved; namely the Language and Social Power Project (Cope, Kalantzis, Kress, Martin, 1993, p. 238) and the ACCELA Alliance (Access to Critical Content and English Language Acquisition). Both of these projects are theoretically and methodologically grounded on the Australian genre theory and focus on the literacy and writing development of a very similar population of disadvantaged non-mainstream children. Table 1 above shows that such parallelism includes but is not limited to the following aspects: the nature of the project, its epistemological and theoretical orientations, the institutions involved, the sociocultural context, the target population, the educational levels addressed, the pedagogical and professional development goals of the projects regarding the field of literacy, and most importantly the focus on writing development in primary and secondary schools.

**The Teaching-Learning-Cycle (TLC) as SFL’s Genre-based Approach to Writing**

From an SFL orientation, the choices students make when writing are related to the resources available to them in the immediate context, and teachers help build these resources through their instruction (Brisk, 2014, p.9). Within the SFL genre-based pedagogy, Joan Rothery (1994) developed the teaching-learning-cycle (TLC) as an approach to the teaching of writing. This approach was based on the notion that effective teaching entails providing students with explicit knowledge about language, as well as the principle of “guidance through interaction [and scaffolding] in the context of shared interaction.”

---

5 The alliance was established in 2002 to support teachers and administrators, among others in understanding and responding to the critical professional development needs of these stakeholders in the education of linguistically and culturally diverse students (Gebhard & Willett, 2008).
experience” (Martin & Rose, 2005, p. 253). That is, the guidance provided by teachers in talking, reading and writing while students write about something that they share as an activity or experience.

The TLC focused on walking student writers through four phases: the negotiation of field or developing content knowledge, deconstruction of mentor or expert texts, joint construction of text, and independent construction of text. The TLC is represented as a circular instead of a linear process that can be repeated as students become more familiar with specific genres, and it allows students different entry points and enables teachers to start at any of the phases (de Oliveira & Smith, 2019).

In the negotiation of the field phase, the teacher designs and leads activities to help students develop a shared understanding of the topic they will be writing about and the language needed to communicate their ideas or knowledge. This phase is critical for emerging bilinguals because in formal education settings the context for learning are curriculum and discipline topics (and academic genres) that students won't necessarily experience outside the classroom. This “contrast to the home and community where the events of everyday life usually form a shared context for learning” (Derewianka & Jones, 2016, p. 52).

In the deconstruction phase the teacher presents mentor texts in a given genre that students are expected to read and later write (e.g., personal recounts, narratives, procedural texts). The teacher guides students through demonstrations, visual representations, modeling and discussions about the text’s purpose, structure (genre moves) and language features typical of the focal genre, and continues building up the students’ knowledge (field) of the content. According to McKeough (2013), in the
deconstruction phase teachers and students should read the text as writers in order “to turn the text inside-out, to see how it is made, how it is held together, and what makes it work” (p. 87).

In joint construction both teachers and students work collaboratively in the writing of a text in the same genre. In the co-construction of texts, “teachers are expected to provide a bridge for students between their everyday language and the academic language of school so attention will be directed to text organization issues such as purpose, stages and language features” (de Oliveira & Smith, 2019, p. 8).

In the independent construction phase students work independently in writing their own texts in the expected genre, editing and “publishing” it.

Brisk (2014) asserts that the TLC helps teachers to develop a metalanguage to talk about the genre and the language features of students' writing. “This metalanguage labels with greater precision and function the resources students need to use to carry out their writing” (p. 9-10). For example, when talking about a personal narrative, using the SFL labels of orientation, sequence of events, complication, resolution, and evaluation is more descriptive and precise of the content of each generic move than using the typical terms beginning, middle and end that appear in teacher’s manuals.

**Reading to Learn**

In order to address issues with reading comprehension in literacy instruction across the curriculum at all levels, Martin & Rose (2005, Rose & Martin, 2012) further developed the teaching-learning-cycle (TLC) this time with a focus on reading. The new cycle includes six phases, starting with “prepare before reading” and moving clockwise to “detailed reading,” “sentence or note making,” “joint rewriting,” “individual
rewriting,” and “independent writing.” According to de Oliveira and Smith (2019), the reading-to-learn cycle gives “teachers a framework to provide students with more intense scaffolding support in reading and making sense of the text, co-constructing another example of the same genre, and independently writing in the same genre” (p.9). For a new recontextualization of the Reading to Learn (R2L) pedagogy in the context of bilingual R2L see Ramirez, (2014, 2018, 2020, in press).

**ACCELA’s expanded TLC**

Gebhard (2019) explains that ACCELA faculty in their teacher professional development initiative in Western Massachusetts expanded the TLC into a ten-staged approach to planning and teaching culturally relevant curricular units aligned with state and national standards, critically reflecting on student learning, and sharing findings from action research projects to build the institutional capacity of local school districts and the university in regard to the education of multilingual and multicultural learners (p. 98).

These ten stages in ACCELA’s approach to planning and teaching are:

1. Planning linguistically and culturally responsive curriculum
2. Identifying model texts and determining assessment criteria for students’ final projects
3. Building the field of knowledge
4. Modeling reading to text deconstruction
5. Modeling writing through joint text construction
6. Constructing a disciplinary text more independently
7. Presenting work to an authentic audience
8. Assessing student work
9. Critically reflecting on instruction through data collection and analysis
10. Sharing findings from action research projects.

Stage one: Planning Linguistically and Culturally Responsive Curriculum

Drawing on their initial SFL and genre pedagogy knowledge, teachers planned their curricular units by identifying a topic relevant to the students, and a focal genre to teach them how to read, write and critically discuss grade-level content on the topic. Teachers also identified the specific state and national standards being addressed in their units.

Stage Two: Identifying Model Texts and determining Assessment criteria for Students’ Final Projects

Teachers identified published texts or wrote their own model texts to help students learn new disciplinary knowledge and to develop their genre knowledge. They also developed SFL-based rubrics to assess their students’ writing. According to Gebhard (2019), “this stage is meant to address current school reforms that place more emphasis on teaching students how to read more critically and write more expertly across grade levels and in all content areas (e.g., Common Core state Standards and Next Generation Science Standards)” (p. 101).

Stage Three: Building the Field of Knowledge

During this first instructional stage of the expanded TLC, teachers draw on what students already know about the topic and language, and they scaffold deeper genre knowledge using hands-on activities and in-class discussions. This stage requires the
teacher to carefully design lessons using different oral, written and multimodal materials in English or the students’ first language.

**Stage four: Modeling Reading to Text Deconstruction**

In this stage the teacher engages students as a whole class or in small groups in explicitly noticing and naming specific generic moves. They also pay attention to the register choices made by the author to talk about something (field), enact a relationship with the reader (tenor) and control the flow of information or thematic development in a text (mode). Students are not asked to identify and name all aspects of language, but only the targeted textual features (at the genre and register level) identified by the teacher in the planning stage one.

**Stage Five: Modeling Writing through Joint Text Construction**

At this point in the expanded ACCELA TLC, students should have a very clear understanding of the purpose of the writing they are producing and how their work will be evaluated. Through previous guidance on reading and deconstructing model texts, students should be prepared for writing a similar text in the focal genre as a whole class activity led by the teacher. The goal of this stage is to make linguistic know-how and decision-making visible and open to discussion, as well as to expand the students’ repertoire of the linguistic choices available to them for their writing (Gebhard, 2019).

**Stage Six: Constructing a Disciplinary Text More Independently**

At this stage students were asked to produce a text in the focal genre but with less guidance from teachers, peers or their family. However, ACCELA teachers were encouraged to use the process approach to writing instruction along with the TLC and
provided opportunities for students to get feedback when drafting, revising and editing their writing.

**Stage Seven: Presenting Work to an Authentic Audience**

Drawing on Dyson’s (1993) notion of designing a permeable curriculum that uses students’ funds of knowledge and expands students’ audience beyond the teacher, this stage of the expanded TLC focused on identifying a wider audience to motivate “students to invest in their hard work of learning to read and write in new ways and in making questions regarding the purpose and audience for students work more concrete and less hypothetical” (Gebhard, 2019, p. 107). For example, in addition to having students share their work with classmates, posting their work in bulletin boards and parent teacher conferences, many ACCELA teachers planned culminating activities (e.g., parties with Puerto Rican traditional food and music) for students’ families at the end of their curricular units.

**Stage Eight: Assessing Student Work**

This stage circles back to the assessment criteria determined during the stage two (Identifying model texts and determining assessment criteria for students’ final projects) of the expanded TLC. Teachers used the SFL-based assessment rubrics they developed to track changes in students’ writing over time. This made grading less time consuming and rewarding.

**Stage Nine: Critically Reflecting on Instruction through Data Collection and Analysis**

This stage of the expanded TLC required teachers to complete action research projects in order to reflect on their instruction and its impact on students' learning. These
projects were part of teachers’ required coursework in the ACCELA professional development and to state assessments required for licensure. They included the design of a curricular unit, a case study of a student, and analysis of the impact of teaching practices on student learning (Gebhard, 2019).

**Stage ten: Sharing Findings from Action Research Projects**

The key aspects of critical reflection and professional development in an action research approach to teaching are captured in stages nine and ten. ACCELA’s professional development initiative drew on the seminal work of Marylin Cochran-Smith and Susan Lytle (1993) and their conception of “teachers as producers of knowledge from inside their classrooms” (Gebhard, 2019, p. 111) by providing venues for teachers to present findings from their research projects to other local stakeholders. These included other ACCELA teachers, school administrators, and UMASS faculty. Some teachers even presented their work at state, national and international conferences and published their research in different scholarly publications related to language and literacy.

Clearly, the ACCELA Alliance recontextualized the TLC in responding to the multiple demands faced by teachers and students in urban schools in Western Massachusetts under current national and state educational reforms. The expanded version of the TLC included additional stages focusing on planning culturally responsive and standard-based curricular units, on reflecting on students’ learning and disseminating findings to a wider audience (Gebhard, 2019), therefore positioning teachers as producers of knowledge. Furthermore, recontextualizations of the TLC by ACCELA initiated scholars continue to have current impact in teacher education programs in Georgia.
(Harman, 2018), Florida (Ramirez, 2020), in British Columbia (Accurso, 2020), and in Massachusetts (Gebhard, 2019). Figure 3 below is a graphic representation of the ACCELA Expanded TLC.
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**Figure 3 The ACCELA Expanded Teaching-Learning-Cycle (Adapted from Gebhard, 2019)**

To summarize, based on the constructs introduced in this theoretical framework and in agreement with the sociocultural theories of language and learning grounding this study, here writing development is defined and located as changes in student’s awareness and control over the concept of genre, as displayed (or not) in their writing samples. This concurs with Kress (1994) who maintains that genre knowledge development cannot be separated from writing development since learning to write is the learning of forms, demands, and potentialities of different genres (as cited in Donovan & Smolkin, 2006).
Thus, when analyzing the focal emerging bilingual’s product data both, an achievement perspective and a developmental perspective (Tower, 2003) of genre development will be taken. On the one hand, a developmental perspective “affords an ‘inside-out’ look at children’s writing since it starts from the inside (e.g., children’s writing) and moves outward towards models that will describe what children do as they learn to write” (Tower, 2003, p. 21). Newkirk also describes this developmental perspective as an attempt to uncover the steps that children take in achieving competence in a given genre and to characterize the intermediate forms that they create in their written texts (Newkirk, 1989, p.7). Furthermore, an achievement perspective gives “an ‘outside-in’ look at children’s writing since it starts from the outside (e.g., an adult model or rubric) and moves in as it applies criteria to assess or evaluate children’s writing” (Tower, 2003, p. 21).

To conclude, it would be fair to say that the strong influence of the socio-cultural-based Hallidayan Systemic Functional Linguistic theory on this study has to do with the University of Sydney scholars’ contribution to the development of Australian genre theory. Specifically, with regards to academic writing, Achugar and Colombi (2008) states that “SFL adds to the typical discussion of an oral-literate continuum an elaborate theoretical context, an elaborate set of concepts, … and elaborate set of analytical tools (p. 41)” for the study of language development (e.g., academic writing). Therefore, a qualitative analysis of teaching practices and genre-specific language features presented (or not) in the focal student’s writing would allow us to document emerging bilinguals’ second language writing development in the present investigation.
Summary

This chapter introduced and discussed the theoretical framework and concepts guiding the present study of a 4th grade emerging bilingual’s academic literacy development in an urban elementary school. It began with a discussion of writing development from a sociocultural perspective. This was followed by a presentation of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) as a social theory of language in agreement with sociocultural theories of learning. The major tenets of SFL theory were described, including the ideational, interpersonal and textual metafunctions as well as the concepts of genre and register with its three variables of field, tenor and mode.

Next, SFL’s genre-based pedagogy was introduced including an explanation of the teaching-learning-Cycle (TLC) as its main approach to the teaching of writing. Finally, the ACCELA Alliance’s expansion of the TLC was presented in order to contextualize the action research in the present study.
CHAPTER 4 METHODOLOGY

Given the increasing numbers of minoritized students attending public schools in the United States where they are expected to write in academically sanctioned ways, the goal of this study was to trace the academic writing development as evidenced (or not) in the written texts produced by one focal multilingual student in relation to her teacher’s implementation of SFL genre-based pedagogies. A better understanding of how to implement the SFL genre-framework will hopefully help in-service and future teachers to develop their knowledge about language, and their ability to focus on the language and literacy development of emerging bilinguals (Brisk, 2014; de Oliveira & Smith, 2019). In trying to understand how SFL pedagogies may be utilized in classrooms with predominantly diverse learners, this study addressed two research questions: 1) How did a teacher participating in the ACCELA Alliance professional development implement SFL genre-based pedagogies in designing literacy instruction for culturally and linguistically diverse students?, 2) How did a Latina emerging bilingual academic writing in English change over time as she participated in the teacher’s exploration and negotiation with genre-based pedagogies and state mandated curriculum?

This chapter presents the methodology and the rationale used in the study and describes the following components: (a) Researcher’s positionality statement, (b) Research design and research questions, (c) setting and educational context, (d) participants, (e) methods of data collection, and (f) two phases utilized in the analysis of the collected teaching’s process and focal student’s product data. The chapter concludes with a brief summary.
Researcher’s Positionality Statement

Regarding my intersectional identity and positionality as a researcher, I am a multilingual Colombian male, married to a multilingual Colombian woman and father of two multilingual boys born and raised in the USA. I am the third of four children of a working class family and the only one to earn a university degree. I grew up as a monolingual Spanish speaker and started my formal study of foreign languages in college at the age of nineteen at the only public university in my city, in the Colombian south west.

After obtaining my Master’s degree, seven years of language teaching experience and an increasing interest in the fields of second language acquisition and teacher education, I moved to Massachusetts in 2002 to begin a doctoral program in Language Literacy and Culture. I also became a graduate fellow for the ACCELA Alliance (Access to Critical Content and English Language Acquisition[1], supporting its professional development programs in urban public schools in Western Massachusetts. In addition, I took a part-time job as an ESOL (English for Speakers of Other Language) instructor teaching mainly Puerto Rican adults at an adult education community center in Milltown (pseudonym). Thus, drawing on my Colombian Latino identity and native language (Spanish), I started to gain some insider and local understanding of the local community through my teaching, and involvement with its people. For instance, I regularly obtained most of the goods and services within the community, such as food, car repairs, barbershop, social entertainment, music, etc.

Two years later, Milltown became the context of my research study when, based on my keen and continuous interest in the study of second language academic literacy
development, I was asked to join an action research project focusing on the literacy development of fourth-grade multilingual students under the instruction of a young multilingual teacher at one of the public schools participating in the ACCELA initiative. Therefore, as a Latino young researcher, in this study I take an insider or emic perspective based on my cultural and linguistic background as well as my prolonged engagement with the immediate sociocultural context of my research setting and subjects. I considered that my insider’s background and knowledge of my research context enabled me to interpret the events observed from that insider’s lens. However, while I intended to be treated as an insider during my interactions with the multilingual students, their parents and the teacher, I also attempted to play a role as a non-participant observer during my classroom observations.

Importantly, as Darwin Holmes (2020) states “the socio-historical-political location of a researcher influences their orientation” (p. 3). In my case, at the beginning of the study in 2004 and in the midst of the heated debate about restricting bilingual education policies after the passing of Question 2 in Massachusetts, I was a 32 years old international student planning to return to Colombia with my family. I was very worried about not having the opportunity of providing my two years old first child with formal Spanish-English bilingual education. In addition, through my doctoral program, I had learned and become very aware of the socio-political context and the unique challenges faced by multilingual learners in urban public schools in Western Massachusetts. For instance, the tracking of the majority of these students under the common labels of ELLs or students with learning disabilities solely because they do not speak or write in English. My concern increased when at a parent-teacher conference my two years old child was
described as an ELL in a written report by his nursery school monolingual teacher. Of course my wife and I, as educated multilinguals with knowledge on second language acquisition and bilingualism, rejected such labels and demanded the report to be changed by the instructor.

Consequently, as a Latino male, father of two Latino children, and a Latino language teacher and researcher, I am deeply committed to documenting emerging bilingual learning and the work of a Latina teacher in developing their academic literacy in English. I am also committed to disrupting assumptions about Latine students’ academic achievement. For this reason, I acknowledge that my intersectional identity, academic background and privileges have provided multiple resources to undertake my study may influence to some extent my research methods and analysis in this study.

**Research Design**

This qualitative longitudinal case study (Harklau, 2008, Stake, 2000, Dyson & Genishi, 2005) is drawn from a much larger action research project designed by professor Meg Gebhard, regarding 4th Grade emerging bilinguals L2 academic literacy practices. It is part of the collaboration among an in-service elementary teacher, a doctoral student and a university professor within the ACCELA Alliance (see Gebhard, M., Jiménez-Caicedo, J.P., Rivera, A. 2006; Gebhard, Willett, Jiménez-Caicedo & Piedra, 2011).

Here, I take Harklau’s (2008) characterization of qualitative case studies as a “naturalistic, long-term, intensive documentation of processes of second language acquisition in a small number of language learners in context” (p. 26). Thus, the object of study is to ethnographically trace the academic writing development as evidenced (or not) in the written texts produced by one of the focal multilingual student based on her
teacher’s implementation of SFL genre-based pedagogies; more specifically the focal student’s appropriation and internalization of the concept of the personal narrative genre.

**Research Questions**

1) How did a multilingual teacher participating in the ACCELA Alliance professional development implement SFL genre-based pedagogies in designing literacy instruction for culturally and linguistically diverse students?

2) How did the academic writing in English of a multilingual student change over time as she participated in the teacher’s exploration and negotiation with genre-based pedagogies and state mandated curriculum?

**Sociocultural and Political Context During the Data Collection Stage**

The data collection for this ethnographic case study was done during the 2004-2005 academic year, in the mist of the heated debate about restricting bilingual education, two years after the passing of Question 2 in Massachusetts. In spite of the research showing evidence on the effectiveness of bilingual education in producing higher academic outcomes for emerging bilinguals (Lozano, 2015; Crawford, 2002), restrictive bilingual education initiatives were gaining voters' support at that time. These initiatives began with the passage of Proposition 227 in California in June 1998, then Proposition 203 in Arizona, in November 2000, and were followed by the passing of Question 2 in Massachusetts on November 2002, where the majority of voters approved it based on the argument that English immersion was the most effective way of teaching English to immigrant children. All three propositions were funded by the multimillionaire and political activist, Ron Unz based on the argument that having one language would
provide national unity which could be attained by having all immigrant students learn English in public schools (Lozano, 2015).

**Massachusetts and Question 2**

Historically Massachusetts had been at the forefront of educational policies in the United States’ public educational system. The state is “home of the country's first board of education, the first training school for teachers, a school for mentally ill people, and a school for blind students” (Lozano, 2015, p. 34). However there was a dramatic shift in 2002 with the passage of a ballot initiative called Question 2, which restricted the use of any language other than English in classroom instruction. Specifically, Question 2 required public schools to teach emerging bilinguals (ELLs was the term used back then) through a one year sheltered English immersion program using instruction and books only in English, with minimal use of the children’s native language (Lozano, 2015). As a result, emerging bilinguals in Massachusetts were placed in mainstream classrooms with little or minimal first language support. In addition, and according to the Question 2 law, a parent or guardian could sue the school system to enforce the proposed law. This really limited schools and entire school districts to provide instruction to children in their native language. Moreover, teachers were prevented from making their own decisions about teaching materials and mode of instruction, including using the students’ native language to mediate their learning. Consequently, emerging bilinguals were increasingly classified as academically underperforming based on the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS), test results, or mislabeled as students with special needs.
Research Setting

Milltown (pseudonym) is a small former industrial city of approximately 40,000 residents that has experienced a dramatic demographic shift from being a mostly white, working-class city, to a city with a large, and economically struggling Puerto Rican population (45% of city residents). During the 1970s and 1980s mills and factories closed making steady jobs disappear. The housing, which was once used for the mill workers, became subsidized, low income housing. According to local administrators in the city (see Ortega-Bustamante, 2003) almost 10,000 (25%) of its residents need adult basic education (e.g., GED preparation, job readiness, ESOL, native language, and family literacy). Most of the remaining jobs were in the healthcare industry and required postsecondary education, the use of digital technologies, and the ability to communicate effectively orally and in writing in Spanish and English (Gebhard, Arcusso & Harris, 2019). In addition, the local media often characterize the city as having high rates of poverty and unemployment, high dropout rates, and, according to standardized test results, a chronically underperforming school district.

The educational context of this ethnographic case study was Lincoln Elementary School (pseudonym) a public school located a few blocks from the diminished commercial district in the downtown area of Milltown. The building is a three-story brick structure covering an entire block. At the time of data collection, there were 450 students in grades K-5 enrolled in this school. Most of the students could be described as low income, mostly Puerto Rican; who, based on the school zoning, come from the most impoverished neighborhoods in the city (the city’s ‘South’ and ‘Flats’ areas), with 94% receiving free lunch. According to state officials, these students persistently struggle to
pass state exams and therefore the school district has been described as a chronically underperforming district (DOE Report, 2005). Unfortunately, seventeen years later, this school district is still considered underperforming based on standardized state test results (DOE Official accountability report, 2022). Lincoln Elementary School is one of the several public urban schools participating in the ACCELA Alliance.

Participants

This study took place in Lucy Rivera’s (pseudonym) 4th Grade classroom. There were 22 students in Lucy’s classroom, 20 of whom she identified as Puerto Rican and the other two as white. Out of these 22 students, nine were officially designated as ELLs, but Lucy reported that all were having difficulties reading and writing in academic ways. Specifically, using purposive sampling (Patton, 1990), Lucy decided to focus on the literacy practices of five of those multilingual students, during three curriculum units around reading and writing the genre of personal narratives. This was the particular high-stakes language practice or “genre” that she has identified as wanting to explore in her teaching during the academic year.

The focal student

Karina (a pseudonym), the focal student in the present case study was selected because she was one of the initial five focal underperforming students the teacher wanted to focus on in the action research project. She was born in Puerto Rico and moved with her two parents and younger sister to Milltown when she was three. At the time of data collection, she was a very enthusiastic and energetic nine-year-old who was always on time and ready to learn. She actively participated in class discussions and was willing to work collaboratively with her peers. According to Lucy, she joined a mainstream
classroom in third grade. According to Karina’s DIBELS (Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills) assessment, she was described as a student with some risk and as marginal fluent. In addition, based on the Massachusetts English Language Assessment-Oral (MELA-O) Matrix used at the time of data collection in 2004/05, her teacher described her general oral linguistic profile as follows:

- **Comprehension**: understands interpersonal conversations and classroom discussions.

- **Fluency and pronunciation**: generally fluent with occasional lapses and her pronunciation has a slight influence of the primary language, which is Spanish.

- **Vocabulary**: rarely interrupted, is capable of rephrasing ideas and thoughts to express meaning.

- **Grammar**: Makes limited errors in grammar.

These MELA-O assessment would be equivalent to a Task Level 3 Developing of the currently used World-class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) standards. Task Level 3 Developing is summarized as follows:

- When communicating in sentences, is generally comprehensible and fluent; communication may from time to time be impeded by searching for language structures or by phonological, syntactic, or semantic errors, especially when attempting more complex oral discourse (WIDA Model Speaking Rubric, 2021).

Karina’s literacy practices over the course of the academic year will be reported and discussed in detail in the findings chapter of this dissertation.

**The Teacher and her Action Research Partners**

In order to explore and analyze the complex connections among changes in teachers’ approaches to designing and implementing instruction for linguistically and culturally diverse students, and changes in Puerto Rican multilingual students’ abilities to
interpret and produce academic texts in school, Lucy Rivera, a fourth-grade multilingual teacher, entered into an action-research partnership with other two members of the ACCELA teachers’ professional development initiative. Myself, a doctoral student, and professor Meg Gebhard.

Lucy, who also identifies herself as Puerto Rican, was born, grew up, and now teaches in Milltown. She attended the very same school where she now teaches and many of her former teachers are now her colleagues. After graduating from Milltown High School, she attended Milltown Community College and a local four-year college where she earned an Associate’s and a Bachelor’s degree. She started teaching in 2000 and has held different kinds of positions. These positions include being a teacher in a daycare center and a paraprofessional in an ESL second-grade classroom. Lucy seems like she was born as a natural teacher as she described herself:

> I always wanted to be a teacher because when I was younger I found that my teachers were always a big part of my life. I also showed tremendous love for children since I was the oldest of a huge family. I was always complemented on the way I handled children (…). The creativity that comes along with teaching as well as the knowledge, understanding and love for children is what I wanted and had to give the children of Milltown. It’s like my aunt would say, “you are a natural!” (Personal interview, May 2005).

At the beginning of data collection, Lucy was beginning her fourth year as a teacher, and the second as a fourth-grade teacher in a mainstream classroom. In addition to teaching full-time, Lucy has been working toward her master’s degree through the ACCELA Alliance. She joined the ACCELA master’s program in 2003. At the time of this study, she had taken courses in teacher research, second language acquisition, academic L2 literacy development, designing content-based instruction for ELLs, Spanish for academic purposes, and multicultural education.
As part of Lucy’s inquiry-based course work in the ACCELA Alliance professional development program, she was required to collect and analyze data regarding her teaching practices. Since I – Juan Pablo Jiménez – have been part of the ACCELA team of graduate fellows supporting ACCELA’s professional development programs, and have a keen interest in the study of second language academic literacy, I was invited by my academic advisor at that time, Professor Meg Gebhard, to assist Lucy in collecting and analyzing her classroom data.

Before moving to the United States, I had been an elementary bilingual teacher in Colombia, and had earned a BA in Foreign Language Education. After moving to the United States, I became a Spanish as a foreign language instructor at the college level. Three years later I received a Master of Arts in foreign language education and had continued tuning my research interests related to the development of academic writing in foreign languages, both with elementary school-age and college-level students by participating in a few research projects.

I moved to Massachusetts in the summer of 2002 to start my doctoral program and simultaneously joined the ACCELA Alliance, as a part-time project assistant. Two years after my first visit to Milltown the city became my research setting, when professor Meg Gebhard – the ACCELA Project Co-director – invited me to join her research project asking me to work closely with Lucy in her teacher inquiry-based projects connected to her ACCELA professional development initiatives. Clearly, my academic background and my evolving research interests in socio-cultural and critical perspectives of second language literacy development, teachers’ professional development, and the uses of
technology in conducting classroom research made me an ideal and organic candidate for working with Lucy.

The third member of this university-school-based partnership was professor Meg Gebhard, the co-director of the ACCELA Alliance, who also was Lucy's as well as my own professor in my doctoral program. Prior to data collection, Lucy had taken two courses with her related to second language learning and literacy development. Thus, Lucy agreed to continue to working with professor Gebhard and me during the 2004-2005 academic year as part of the larger teacher’s inquiry research project we were developing. Under this Professor’s mentorship, we agreed to work together because we were interested in how Lucy’s emerging bilingual students could learn to negotiate the demands of high-stakes testing while using their second language to accomplish real-world work they cared about in their classroom-based L2 literacy practices.

**Data Collection**

This ethnographic case study combined qualitative research methods and used concepts and techniques associated with SFL genre analysis and discourse analysis to offer some interpretations of the challenges non-traditional students (e.g., multilingual learners) face when attempting to write in both English as a second language and in academically sanctioned ways. In particular, this study attempted to provide an interpretation of the challenges emerging bilinguals faced when reading and writing in school genres such as personal narratives.

Specifically, the methods of data collection drew on ethnographic qualitative approaches to analyze both the texts produced by the focal emerging bilingual student (“product data”), in relation to the teacher’s instructional process in which those texts
were produced ("process data"). The main reasons for focusing on product and process data to answer my research questions are based on the gaps and methodological concerns identified through the review of the literature. That is, some of the previous research on ELLs’ academic writing seems to lack a concrete way to operationalize emerging bilinguals’ academic writing development, and those studies are non-longitudinal or ethnographic in nature. For example, the two major quantitative studies discussed in the literature review were so narrowly focused on the students’ texts and their features of writing mechanics, that they overlook the context of production of those texts in their analysis. Therefore, the present study made an attempt to address some of these issues identified in the review of the literature by first, providing an alternative way to operationalize writing development over time. Second, by collecting developmental product data (emerging bilinguals’ written production at three different times in the year) and analyzing it qualitatively (e.g., genre analysis) in a complementary relationship with the ethnographic process data collected. In the next section, I will describe in detail both the product and process data collected.

Product and Process Data: Emerging Bilinguals’ Personal Narratives

I collected product data in the form of multiple drafts (from outline to final draft) of the personal narratives written by the focal emerging bilingual student. The student’s texts were collected at three different times during the academic year: October, February, and May. In addition to the focal student’s texts, all contextual information regarding the teaching of the personal narrative genre and the student’s process of interpretation, production, and distribution of the model and written texts was ethnographically collected via class video recordings and field notes (This will be explained in detail later in this
chapter). Drawing on my long-standing experience within the community: as ESL teacher and as applied linguists involved with an adult education program in the city; I also had some insider and local understanding of the community through my previous ethnographic work, my teaching, and involvement with the community (e.g., I regularly obtained most of the goods and services within the community, food, car repairs and parts, barbershop, social entertainment and food, music, etc.) and through my graduate work as a fellow of the ACCELA Alliance collaborating with in-service teachers –like Lucy- in their M.A. onsite professional development projects.

While far from being a full ethnography, my research approach was ethnographically informed in that I aimed for an emic or insider perspective on the academic writing of those emerging bilinguals, involved in its production rather than trying to impose my own understandings. This allowed me to learn more about important contextual information for the later genre-based analysis, such as: how assignments were written, the structure and demands of writing assignments, and how students understood the social and communicative purpose of their texts. Thus, regarding the “process data,” I draw on the methods associated with ethnographic investigations of classroom literacy events (Heath, 1983; Stake, 2000, Dyson & Genishi, 2005). I documented how Lucy designed and implemented three SFL-based curricular units for Language Arts instruction throughout an academic year. These units were designed to teach multilingual learners how to read and write narratives in ways that reflect a greater understanding of the genre of personal narratives within the discipline of Language Arts instruction in elementary schools (Hyland, 2003; Kamberelis, 1999; Scheleppegrell, 2004). Consequently, ethnographic data collection activities for each unit included written field notes of
classroom observations and curriculum planning meetings; audio or video-taped recordings of classroom interactions and interviews with students and the teacher. It also included collecting teacher’s instructional materials, students’ school records, as well as secondary sources describing the history and politics of the city.

Since the data collection process involved video recordings of classroom interactions, interviews with students and teachers, and the collection of classroom artifacts, then informed consent was obtained from participants after verbal and written explanations of the study were given to them in English and or Spanish accordingly.

Table 2 below summarizes all data sources and the rationale for collecting and analyzing them.

**Table 2 Data Sources and Rationale for Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Video recorded class observations and field notes in class teacher-led discussions (“Rug time”).</td>
<td>Thematic analysis focused on: Teacher’s literacy Instructional and scaffolding activates. Teacher’s mediation in instruction Focal student’s literacy practices around genre-based activities and concepts.</td>
<td>Identification of evidence changes in teaching practices over time integrating genre-based pedagogies. Identification of Teacher’s SFL meta talk Identification of students’ interactional patterns and verbalization activities on the interpretation and production of narratives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teaching and classroom artifacts: Teacher’s handbook Outlines and/or graphic organizers Handouts</td>
<td>Evidence of teacher’s literacy practices and scaffolding materials.</td>
<td>Important in the identification of explicit instruction of SFL genre-based concepts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Audio recordings of verbalization activities: a. Peer review sessions b. Personal interviews</td>
<td>Identification of evidence of teacher and focal student’s development in theoretical thinking regarding the</td>
<td>Evidence of internalization and/or developing control of the concepts associated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
textual organization and lexico-grammatical features of the genre of personal narratives.

| 4. Focal student’ cumulative folder | Personal and academic background information. |
| 5. Multiple drafts of three written narratives (October, February, and May) | Genre move analysis of the focal student text production. Coding of data included abstract, orientation, series of events and problem, resolution, evaluation, and coda. |
| | Qualitative SFL-based analysis of development over time in student’s writing at the macro textual level. Evidence of control over the textual resources in relation to the genre of personal narratives. |

**Analytical Methods**

The analysis of the data was carried out in two phases: The first phase involved a descriptive and qualitative analysis of the instructional process data using an ethnographic case study approach (e.g., Harklau, 2008, Dyson & Genishi, 2005, Stake, 2000), and discourse analytical techniques, to trace changes in the multilingual teacher’s L2 literacy practices over time, as she implemented genre-based pedagogies while participating in the ACCELA professional development. The second phase involved the analysis of the product data (e.g., the texts produced by the focal emerging bilingual) using a qualitative SFL genre-based analysis with regards to the specific generic moves and lexico-grammatical register features associated with the genre of personal narratives. Specifically, the second phase of the analysis focused on tracing the focal student’s academic literacy development through the internalization of the concept of the personal narrative genre over time, while she participated in her teacher’s implementation of genre-based pedagogies. I will explain in detail the two phases of the proposed analysis in the following section.
**Phase 1: Tracing Changes in the Teacher’s L2 Literacy practices over time while participating in the ACCELA professional development**

The first phase focused on the analysis of the ethnographic process data collected in order to contextualize and support the analysis of the product data, and to consolidate the overall research design presented in this chapter. As mentioned in the description of the data collection section above, this data documents the teaching process of interpretation, production and distributions of the texts around the genre of personal narratives.

Discussing the importance of linking students’ communicative activity around their conceptual understandings and their actual written work, Johnson (2008) (citing Negueruela & Lantolf, 2005) argues that “target-like performance in itself cannot be said to be the marker of full conceptual development of a grammatical, organizational or stylistic feature of a text.” What is needed, he adds, “is to document learner performance over an array of instructional activities and over an extended period of time” (p. 138). For this reason, the array of activities documented and analyzed in the present study included the focal emerging bilingual’s participation in SFL genre-based instructional activities proposed by the teacher. Such interactional evidence suggested both, the teacher, and (hopefully by extension through instruction) the focal student’s degree of awareness and control over language specific features of written personal narratives. However, we need to consider Negueruela’s (2003) proposition that “verbalizations are key […] to explaining L2 development as a conceptual process” (p. 408), such in the case of the present study investigating L2 academic writing development as gaining control over the concept of personal narrative genre. Therefore, the focal student was asked to analyze her
writing samples through individual interviews for signs of a level of understanding of the concept of the personal narratives. However, Negueruela further warns us that even though the written performance and verbalization activities are important data sources in investigating L2 development, both are partial evidence of internalization. For this reason, according to Negueruela, Vygotsky used the method of double stimulation for finding evidence of concept formation by creating the conditions for observing the process of how concepts emerge in learning activity. Thus, in applying this method for studying the internalization of the concept of genre as L2 academic writing development here, the focal emerging bilingual was observed while using two stimuli: the “primary stimuli” being the task of writing a personal narrative, and the “secondary stimuli” being the tool(s) used to solve the writing task, namely the teacher’s made instructional materials based on SFL methods, as the main sociocultural tools used in her literacy instruction.

The focus on the analysis of the process data was not on the outcome per se, but on how the teacher’s activities scaffolded and guided the focal student use of sociocultural tools to write personal narratives. Vygotsky (1987) maintains “that it is precisely in instructional activity where we can observe concept formation in everyday human activity” (As cited in Negueruela, 2003, p. 424); therefore, as Negueruela puts it “L2 instructional activity offers us the possibility of studying genuine concept formation” (Ibid). Consequently, in the present study, the classroom video recordings of instructional activities captured important developmental instances, as the focal emerging bilingual engaged in teacher-lead lessons and discussions, as well as collaborative talk in the process of concrete activity such as peer review sessions. Therefore, the analysis of
the classroom-based instructional activity aimed at identifying evidence of the teacher’s
and student conceptual understanding of the personal narrative genre in their
verbalization and interaction within those classroom-based instructional activities. This
was done with each of the three writing projects dealing with narrative writing in
October, February and May (e.g., the three data collection times). Specifically, discourse
analysis of the transcribed data from verbal interactions was performed in search of
crucial evidence supporting the findings of the phase two genre-based analysis of the
product data. That is, to provide stronger evidence of L2 academic writing development
as taking place. In this sense, verbalization data connected “the ‘word to the world’ –the
concept to the lexico-grammatical features in the emerging bilingual texts –as Negueruela
(2003) puts it.

In sum, the first phase analysis of transcribed classroom interactions regarding the
Teacher’s and the emerging bilingual’s understanding of the concept of genre focused on
how these interactions reflected or were linked to changes in teacher’s instruction and in
the focal student’s performance in her written texts. This analysis could also be seen as a
form of triangulation of any claim related to the focal emerging bilingual’s writing
development and the internalization of the concept of genre (e.g., personal narrative
genre) based on the genre-based textual analysis of the focal student’s writing.

**Phase 2: Sydney School Genre Analysis of Emerging Bilingual’s Literacy Practices**

The second phase of the analysis involves a detailed qualitative Sydney School
genre analysis (SFL-genre analysis henceforward) of the product data; in other words, the
texts produced by the focal emerging bilinguals during the three curricular units during
one academic year in relation to changes in her textual practices.
Concerning the analysis of product data, Schleppegrell and Go (2007) argue that analyzing language from a functional perspective (e.g., SFL) reveals how different language choices construct more or less powerful texts, helping us see what is valued in students’ texts and helps us explore how language develops over time. Thus, the analysis of the product data here was based on the notion of the microgenetic approach to development (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006), tracing changes in the student’s writing and relating these changes to work done in Lucy’s classroom as the context of production of such texts.

The Sydney School genre analysis is based on the concepts and notions advanced by Michael Halliday’s Systemic Functional Linguistics theory (SFL) (Halliday, 1975, 1978; see also Hassan, 1989; Christie & Martin, 1997; Hyland, 2003; Sheleppegrell & Colombi, 2002; Sheleppegrell, 2004; Christie & Derewianka, 2008). It consists of two levels of analysis: The first one looks at the macro-level (e.g., textual/discourse level) and the second one at micro-level of analysis (e.g., lexico-grammatical) of features associated with or that characterize the focal genre, such as personal narratives in this study. The rationale for following this order is based on two reasons: First, starting at the text-discourse level (macro textual level) aligns theoretically with both a sociocultural view of learning, and the Systemic Functional Linguistic theory of language where writing (or speaking) is seen as language-in-use in concrete social activity. Both theories adopt a process-based, top-down type of analysis (e.g., goal-oriented activity and natural occurring text as units of analysis accordingly). Second, this analysis aligns with Donovan and Smolkin’s (2008) assertion in their review of the literature on children’s understanding of genre and writing development, in which they emphasize the need for
the analysis of micro and macro-level features of language learners writing (e.g., emerging bilinguals’ narrative texts). According to these authors “future studies will need to contain not only rich descriptions of teachers’ approaches to writing instruction in various genres but also measures that clearly report children’s growth” (p.140). Thus, the present study attempted to address Donovan and Smolkin’s concern about the need for clear and systematic analysis of development in students’ writing, by combining the two types of analysis presented in phase one and two. I will further explain the two SFL levels of genre analysis in the following paragraphs.

**SFL Genre Analysis Level one: Looking at the Texts’ Macro-structural Level**

First, at the macrostructural level of the texts, the genre analysis proposed here drew on the notion of genre as a socio-cultural unit of analysis using the approach suggested by Martin and Rothery (1981). Here the notion of genre serves as an abstraction that provides us with a framework for the interpretation and production of language in particular social and cultural contexts (Swales & Hyon, 1994). Following the same line of thought, Tribble states that “…the notion of genre remains helpful as it makes possible the uncovering of connections between texts, communicative purposes, and the lexicogrammatical resources that writers draw on when making texts in contexts” (Tribble, 1999, p. 70). Thus, I took Jim Martin and Rose’s (2003) characterization of genre as staged, goal-oriented, social processes; which Rose further explains as being social “because writers shape their texts for readers of particular kinds; goal-oriented because a text unfolds towards its social purpose; staged because it usually takes more than one step to reach the goal” (Rose, 2009, p. 153). Accordingly, the examination of the product data in this study paid close attention to describing how the
written texts produced by the focal fourth grade emerging bilingual displayed (or not) a developing understanding of the stages (or moves) associated with written personal narratives in English.

Regarding the analysis of a text’s structure, Hassan (1989) argues that every text has a recognizable form or generic structure that is related to its social purpose. For example, everyone familiar with letters of application can easily recognize these. Letters of application have identifiable elements of text structure more commonly known as moves of the genre. Some genre moves are obligatory and some are optional, and they can appear in different order attempting to fulfill a partial purpose within the text, while simultaneously contributing to realizing the overall communicative purpose of such text.

With regards to personal narratives, and according to Derewianka (2002), these types of texts have obligatory and optional discursive moves or stages. That is to say, a personal narrative has an orientation move in which the writer makes reference to a specific place – setting- and time of the story. The main purpose of this text move is to situate the story in time and space, as well as to introduce the main characters in it. Another important move is known as the series of events, which is characterized by the sequencing of important activities that happened, which at the same time make the narration progress. This series of events move or stage typically contains or leads to the next narrative discursive move of the complication -a major problem to be solved in the story. Then, there is the resolution, a final and very important obligatory move in narratives, through which we get to know how the main problem –or complication- which was introduced previously in the series of events, was resolved by the characters in the story. Describing the importance of the resolution move or stage in narratives,
Derewianka (2002) also maintains that the solution to a problem is what differentiates a narrative from a recount. In addition to these four obligatory moves, a written narrative text may contain two more optional stages or generic moves. That is to say, one may find a written story with an abstract move or introduction of the story. For example, “I am going to tell you a story about when I first came to 4th grade;” as well as a final evaluative commentary (evaluation or coda move), in which the writer summarizes the lesson learned or the final outcome of the story (Derewianka, 2002; Paltridge, 2001; see also Christie & Derewianka, 2008).

In summarizing the above explanation of the qualitative Sydney School genre analysis based on the examination of the discourse moves present (or absent) in the texts produced by the focal emerging bilingual, I use Johnson (2008) useful assertion regarding the importance of move analysis in qualitatively tracing students’ academic writing development:

Move and rhetorical analysis allows a researcher to trace the development of the textual organization and ways in which a given text conforms to, or subverts, reader expectations in a given discourse community. Breaking down texts in this way allows for a more objective measure of organizational practice in academic writing than a holistic measure of assessment (p. 131).

**SFL-Genre Analysis Level Two: Looking at the Texts’ Lexico-gramatical Features at the Register Level**

In addition to looking at generic moves in a text, the Sydney School genre analysis also focuses on particular genre-specific language, through the examination of lexico-grammatical features of texts at the register level (e.g., the clause). SFL considers these linguistic features as functionally responsible for the realization of each move, and consequently the overall communicative purpose of a given text. As Achugar and
Colombi (2008) put it, with regards to academic writing, “SFL adds to the typical discussion of an oral-literary continuum an elaborate theoretical context, an elaborate set of concepts, … and elaborate set of analytical tools (p. 41)” for the study of language development (e.g., academic writing). Therefore, such lexico-grammatical qualitative analysis of genre-specific language features would document emerging bilinguals’ second language writing development. That is, at the micro-clause level, following Achugar and Colombi, (2008), individual emerging bilingual’ academic writing development (ontogenesis) is conceptualized here “as a movement from congruent, oral, interpersonal registers towards incongruent, written, academic registers (p.40),” which can be operationalized by tracking the lexico-grammatical features of the texts produced by the focal student over time. Specifically, with regards to the focal genre of personal narratives in the present study, in addition to grammatical intricacy, lexical density in the oral-written continuum, the presence (or absence) of the following language features were examined within the obligatory or optional discursive moves of the emerging bilingual’s personal narrative:

- Specific participants with defined identities (usually humans, but sometimes animals with human characteristics).
- Mainly action verbs (material processes), but also many verbal and mental processes referring to what human participants said, or felt, or thought.
- Normally written in past tense.
- Many linking words have to do with time.
- Dialogue is often included, during which the story tense may change to the present or future.
• Descriptive language chosen to enhance and develop the story by creating images in the reader’s mind.

• A story can be written in the first person (I, we) or third person (he, she, they)

(Narrative language features adapted from Derewianka, 2002, p.42)

Accordingly, the tracing of such narrative lexico-grammatical features at the micro clause-level was conducted using a qualitative genre analysis of those features present in the texts produced by the focal emerging bilinguals. Finally, the systematic analysis, both at phase one and two, provided us with some indication of the progression of our focal emerging bilingual’ written academic language development during one school year.

Summary

This chapter presented a detailed description of the methodology and the rationale used in this study. It included my positionality statement, the research design describing the setting and educational context and the participants. It also described the different methods of data collection as well as the two phases utilized in the analysis of the collected process and product data in order to trace the academic writing development as evidenced in the written texts produced by the focal emerging bilingual as she participated in her teacher’s implementation of SFL genre-based pedagogies. The qualitative ethnographic methods for data collection and analysis were employed to provide a thick description of how a teacher implemented the SFL genre-framework to support the literacy development of emerging bilinguals. It also provides an understanding of how a Latina multilingual student developed her academic writing in English as she participated in the teacher’s exploration and negotiation with genre-based pedagogies and state mandated curriculum.
CHAPTER 5 FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to ethnographically trace the academic writing development of one focal emerging bilingual (Karina) as evidenced in her written texts in relation to her multilingual teacher’s implementation of SFL genre-based pedagogies in a fourth-grade classroom over an academic year. In trying to understand how SFL pedagogies may be utilized in classrooms with predominantly multilingual learners, this study addressed two research questions:

1) How did a multilingual teacher participating in the ACCELA Alliance professional development implement SFL genre-based pedagogies in designing literacy instruction for culturally and linguistically diverse students?

2) How did the academic writing in English of a multilingual student change over time as she participated in the teacher’s exploration and negotiation with genre-based pedagogies and state mandated curriculum?

This chapter presents the findings of the present study according to the two phases utilized in the analysis of the process and product data, that is the two interrelated levels of analysis of the instructional process (ethnographic data) and the focal multilingual learner’s written texts as the product data based on her teacher’s instructional mediation. A very important aspect for understanding the analysis of the product data is a discussion of the instructional context in which Karina’s texts were produced. For example, the nature of the readings and instructional tools Lucy used in implementing the three units during the academic year, and the extent to which students were afforded opportunities to appropriate more expert language practices. The next section presents these interrelated analysis.
Classroom-Based Literacy Practices of the Multilingual Teacher and the Emerging Bilingual Student over an Academic Year

In the following analysis I describe and compare the process data regarding Lucy’s teaching practices alongside the focal multilingual student’s writing during the three curricular units. These units focused on reading, writing and understanding the genre of personal narratives, which she designed and implemented at different times during the 2004-2005 academic year (October, February and May respectively).

Curricular unit 1: “What are personal narratives?” (October)

As it is the case in many districts in which educational reform efforts aimed at improving the academic achievement of underperforming schools through raising students’ literacy skills, The Massachusetts Department of Education required Teachers in Lincoln school to adhere closely to a textbook series, which I call “the official script.” “The script” I refer to is the teacher’s manual called Scott Foresman Reading First that was mandated as part of Lincoln school receiving a Reading First Grant in accordance to The No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). This textbook was adopted by the school because it was aligned to the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks and to the states’ high-stakes exams. While the Scott Foresman Reading teacher’s manual focused mainly on developing reading skills, it also presented an embedded writing program that explicitly emphasized a step-by-step presentation of writing strategies drawn from the writing process derived from research based on cognitive processing theory (Flower & Hayes, 1981) in the United States, which has been widely adopted as the standard for writing instruction (Patthey-Chavez, et al., 2004). Lucy was not an exception to adopting the writing process approach to teaching writing throughout the academic year, as we will
see in the description and interpretation of the three curricular units in which her 4th grade emerging bilinguals participated in.

At the beginning of the school year, in October, Teacher Lucy was starting to make sense of the key components of her ACCELA’s professional development. For instance, ACCELA required teachers to use Wiggins and McTighe’s (2005) “backward design” approach to curriculum design. This approach focuses on planning lessons for students’ learning and understanding rather than on instruction; by identifying first the learning goals, developing assessments, and explicit instructional activities around grounded learning outcomes. In addition, Lucy received an introduction to the SFL theory of language and to genre-based pedagogy. More importantly, Lucy was required to draw on the state mandated curriculum under Question 2 restrictive bilingual education policy. Thus, drawing on these newly available and required tools, Lucy designed a very detailed unit focusing on personal narratives based on the Scott Foresman Reading teacher’s manual. Also, this lesson plan was strictly aligned to the Massachusetts Language Arts Curriculum Standards for the reading and literature strands, as well as the composition strand (See Appendix A). This lesson plan for the October unit became the driving plan for the three units on personal narratives during that academic year.

For Unit 1 in October, the established goals based on the content standard for fourth grade were: “Students will write a personal narrative of an event or experience in their life that has a clear focus, have a beginning, middle and end, and supporting details” (Lucy’s lesson plan, October, 2004). This was also the prompt for the writing task. The unit was driven almost exclusively by the Scott Foresman Reading textbook series, while following the writing process (pre-drafting, writing, revising and editing). For example,
in what could be seen as the negotiation and building the field phases within the SFL’s Teaching and Learning Cycle (and the ACCELA’s expanded TLC), the teacher designed and led activities to help students develop a shared understanding of the topic they were going to be reading and writing about, as well as the language needed to communicate their ideas or knowledge. Thus, during the first two weeks of October, the classroom literacy practices revolved around all of the reading selection included in the curricular unit (e.g., A Visit with Grandpa by Mildred Pitts Walter; Train to Somewhere by Eve Bunting; Yingtao’s New Friend by Lensey Namioka and Family Pictures/ *Cuadros de Familia* by Carmen Lomas Garza).

Almost every morning, Lucy directed the students to sit around the perimeter of a large, colorful rug, sometimes placed at the center or at a corner of her 4th grade classroom. During the 20 to 30 minutes of the “Rug Time” activity, as the teacher called it, Lucy and her students read aloud and discussed these stories. However, while Lucy and her school colleagues agreed that the use of the new textbook series provided coherence across the grades and made planning easier, Lucy did not feel the series was designed specifically for emerging bilinguals, nor did she feel the reading selections such as “Addie in Charge,” reflected the experiences of students of color living in urban areas like the students in Milltown (Gebhard, Willet, Jiménez-Caicedo, & Piedra, 2011). This realization came when Lucy critically reflected on her instruction based on the analysis of her own classroom data. She presented this reflection to her fellow teachers and classmates during professor Gebhard’s course on L2 instruction, part of the ACCELA professional development program in the fall of 2024. This process of critical reflection
and presentation based on her own action research became later known as the last three stages of the ACCELA’s expanded TLC (Gebhard, 2019), presented in chapter 3.

In addition, the teacher’s manual and instructional tools did little to draw students’ attention to the linguistic genre and specific register features of narrative texts. For instance, though clearly aligned to the Massachusetts Standards, the teachers’ manual defined narratives in a very simplistic, mechanical and general way. Specifically, according to the Scott Foresman Manual, the key features of a personal narrative include: “being about an interesting event in a person’s life,” the story is told using the pronouns “I” or “me,” it provides details with vivid words to express the writer's feelings and voice, and “the story flows from beginning, middle, to end” without highlighting what genre moves and specific language produce such a “flow” throughout the text (Scott Foresman Reading Teacher’s Manual -see Figure 4 below).

Figure 4 Key Personal Narrative Features from Scott Foresman Reading Teacher’s Manual
Moreover, as we can see in the following transcription excerpt of a classroom oral discussion, when Lucy attempted to mediate and support her multilingual students in constructing a conceptual understanding of the genre of personal narrative and its “Key features” as defined by then mandated teacher’s manual, she rejected legitimate responses from students, apparently because those responses did not match or corroborate with the definition of personal narratives given in the textbook series.

**Excerpt 1: “What is a Personal Narrative?”**

The following excerpt was taken from the first lesson of the unit taught in October, which focuses on students writing personal narratives. Lucy has been working around narratives for the last two weeks during the reading aloud time. She has read narratives to her students mostly from the curriculum textbook (Scott Foresman grade 4 curriculum). Students are sitting by the perimeter of a large rug, while Lucy is sitting on a chair on the left of a flip chart reading aloud the story Come On, Rain! by Karen Hesse, which was her own addition to the prescribed curriculum. According to Lucy:

I picked this story because it was good model for a wonderful personal narrative. It also had a powerful theme which reflected relationships within families, and its setting which took place in an urban community with characters that are people of color (Personal Interview with Teacher Lucy, October, 2004).

Clearly, teacher Lucy was interested in exposing her multilingual learners not only to good model texts, but also to literature that was more closely related to racialized people in urban contexts like themselves in Milltown.

After Lucy finishes the read aloud, she recalls the names of the different stories they have read during the previous two weeks: (A Visit with Grandpa, Train to Somewhere, Yingtao’s New Friend and Family Pictures/ Cuadros de Familia). Then, as
Lucy gets ready to start her customary whole group discussion on the rug, she grabs the Scott Foresman curriculum textbook on places it on her lap:

1 Lucy: Alright, personal narratives! (grabing the *Scott Foresman curriculum*)
2 St: What’s that?
3 Lucy: Exactly! What is it?… What is it? We just read a story that’s a personal narrative, we’ve been reading stories that are personal narratives, I want you to think about this story. A want you to think about *Family Pictures*,
4 Luis T: Where is...
5 Lucy: OK I want you to think about *Yingtao’s New Friend* …
6 Sts: uuu (inaudible)
7 Lucy: I want you to think about (pause) Brian!! (calling a student’s attention) *Addie in Charge*. They all have a connection, What is it? They all are personal narratives and how
8 Student: Characters?
9 Lucy: How are they personal narratives, OK? Eveliz!
10 Eveliz: Their mom…
11 Lucy: OK, does every, all of them have a mom as a character?
12 Students: No! (several students respond)
13 Lucy: Karina! (asking her)
14 Karina: Um, (pause) the… the character
15 Lucy: What about the character? …(silence)
16 Luis T.: The uuuu Miss. Rivera!
17 Lucy: What about the characters? I hear a lot of bellowing um!
18 Student: What’s that word?
19 Lucy: Bellowing? (pause -students laugh) that’s one of our vocabulary words…Bellowing I hear a lot of auuuu! I hear a lot of coyotes in this classroom, Natalia! (Lucy calls on this student)
20 Natalia: They are the (xxx)
21 Lucy: No! think of, think of , Let’s, let’s stick with characters OK go through *Family Pictures*
22 Luis T: Miss Rivera, where is the clock? (shouting across the room and interrupting Lucy’s talk asking for the clock used to track time in the bathroom)
23 Lucy: Who is the character in *Family Pictures*? Don’t just, don’t shout anything out, just think about it, and how were, how was the story written? (pause)
24 *How was the story written?* Think about *Come On Rain* how was… this character, how was it written, do we know her name?
25 Students: No!
26 Luis T: Miss Rivera where is the clock? (shouting even louder across the room to get Lucy’s attention)
27 Lucy: how about, … YES LUIS! (answering to Luis T insisting calling, but continues with questions to the group) How about um, *Addie in Charge*. 
41 We know her name, but how is, **how did they do their writing out,**
  Steven!
42 Steven: They did it about their lives
43 Lucy: Very good! **That it’s a personal narrative,** OK, **It’s about an event in**
  **your life.**

As we can see on the transcript, Lucy grabs the curriculum textbook and asks a
starting question: “Personal narratives! ... What is it?” (Lines 1-3), and she tries to
reformulate her question by asking the students to think about all the stories they have
read. As she sees that the students are silent, she poses another question: “They [the
stories] all have a connection, what is it?” (Lines 9-11) and one student replies
“Characters?” (Line 12). However, Lucy dismisses this response and tries once again to
refocus the discussion by asking one more question: “How are they personal narratives?”
(Line 13), to which students reply by mentioning some characters. Lucy seems
disconnected from the students’ responses and loses the lead on the discussion. She then
tries once again to focus the discussion on “how was the story written” (stated in line 33,
and re-stated twice in lines 34 and 35) and with uncertainty reformulates the question
again to: “how did they [the authors] do their writing out? (Line 41). A student –Steven-
finally responds: “They did it about their [the writers] lives” (Line 42); to whom Lucy
excitedly replies “Very good! That it’s a personal narrative OK It’s about an event in
your life” (Lines 43-44). Clearly Lucy validates Steven’s response, as it is the first item
listed on the “key features” of a narrative presented in the curriculum textbook while
rejecting legitimate responses from the students like Karina such as “they have
characters” (line 18) because this response was not listed in the teacher script she was
obligated to follow. As a result, to this point the classroom discussion regarding “what
makes a personal narrative” seemed to have collapsed into a guessing game as students’
tried to guess the features listed in the manual on her lap and the teacher wanted to hear back from the students the answer she knew and expected.

Next, Lucy refocuses the oral discussion trying to get students to reflect back to the different parts of the story *Come on rain!*, more specifically by asking students to describe its beginning, middle and end, which the mandated curriculum presented as the main structural elements of a personal narrative. It seems like teacher Lucy is implicitly expecting students to connect this content with the key features she had introduced before based on the mandated curriculum as shown in the following excerpt:

**Excerpt 2: “Your Personal Narrative with a Beginning Middle and End”**

1. Lucy: OK, a personal narrative provides details (pause) of the event! … that
2. were part of the one event of her life. Think about the story. **Was there a**
3. **beginning?**
4. Students: Yes! (several students respond at unisonous)
5. Lucy: What was the beginning? (a few students raise their hands to answer and Lucy calls on one of the girls) Karina (the focal student) …
6. Karina: Of that one?… (pointing to the book Lucy is holding)
7. Lucy: Yes! *Come on rain!* (recalling the name of the story for Karina)
8. Karina: Um, She was, She was waiting like to rain um,… she start like um, in the, when the story, when the story started, she always wanted like to like the rain come down
9. Lucy: Ok, before she wanted to, why did she wanted to?
10. Karina: because she was hot
11. Lucy: Ok, she was hot and she was waiting for the rain… **What about the middle of the story?** Brian W (calling on a student to respond)
12. Brian W: She told all of her friends to get their bathing suits on?
13. Lucy: she was telling all her friends to get their bathing suits on OK, … AND she was
14. doing what? (pause) Luis (Lucy asks Luis G to respond)
15. Eloy: She was um,… get, she was um… in the part of the rain, she was saying that the
16. rain come out?
17. Lucy: Ok, she was waiting for the rain, good! OK, she was saying, she kept saying
18. come on rain! Come on rain! and **what happens towards the END?** (Lucy
pauses and Eloy assumes that she is asking him, so he starts his response but Lucy
calls onto another student) Natalia!
Eloy: The end was
Natalia: It started raining
Lucy: It started raining and… something BIG happened… I think this, I think the end is
what really makes it special in her life…
Students: xxxx (inaudible)
Lucy: Because their moms came outside. The moms came outside and joined her Ok?
Alright, So in a personal narrative we should have what?
Karina: Um.. people!
Lucy: We should have what Rafael (calling on him to respond)
Ramón: A story that… (hesitant)
Karina: A story that tells an event in your life (trying to answer for Ramón)
Lucy: A story that has what?
Karina: An event of your life
Lucy: We just talk about that, we did I just go through using this book Come on rain… Kathlyn (calling on her)
Kathlyn: THE BEGINNING THE MIDDLE AND AN END! (very assertive)
Lucy: YES! a personal narrative, your stories should have a beginning a middle and an end (Lucy walks toward the flip chart and starts writing)
Luis T: Beginning…
Karina: primero, Segundo, tercero… (Explaining in Spanish to Luis T and other students while Lucy writes on the flipchart)
Lucy: Alright, it should have a beginning…
Karina: and Middle… (trying to complete Lucy’s sentence while she is writing and other students are talking)
Lucy: I can wait …(Lucy uses this statement to get students to pay attention to her)
middle (pause) and end (pause)

As seen above, in the rest of this mediating interaction Lucy was very effective in getting students’ attention to reflect on the content of the story Come on Rain!, In order to identify and recall the beginning, the middle and the end of the narration in direct alignment with the mandated curriculum (see lines 2-20 of the transcript). Karina, like most of the students, very attentively participates in the discussion describing, for
instance, what happened at the beginning of the story when the main character was hoping for the rain to come (lines 8-10). This oral interaction continues with the students describing the middle and end of the story. Then, Lucy wraps up the discussion by asking a concluding question: “So in a personal narrative we should have what?” (line 30), asking directly to Kathlyn, who responds in a very assertive way: “The beginning, the middle and an end!” (line 38). Lucy validates Kathlyn’s response (lines 39-40) and writes on the flip chart these parts of a narrative.

Interestingly Karina continues to be very engaged in this oral discussion even switching into Spanish in a form of translanguaging (García, 2009) to explain these narrative parts to other emerging multilinguals who seem to be confused about these elements in the text (line 42). Next, using the same interactional style, Teacher Lucy finishes the activity by asking about some of the descriptive language used in the story. Finally, she asks the students to go back to their seats and announces that the next day they were going to work on pre-drafting their personal narratives.

The following day, Lucy scaffolded the pre-drafting activity using as mediating tools both, a Scott Foresman’s model, and Lucy’s own pre-writing example indicating that she is going to be writing about a day at the Zoo with her young daughter. Drawing on these two samples, Karina partially completed her pre-drafting activity (see Figure 5 below).

The next day, Karina utilized her pre-writing sheet in order to start writing the first draft of her personal narrative about her first day in the United States. Students spent most of the time writing their first or discovery draft. The following morning, and before the end of the writing period, Lucy asked students to identify and mark on their first draft
Notes for a Narrative
Directions: Fill in the graphic organizer with information about the event or experience that you plan to write about.

Possible title: The Big Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What happened?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who was there?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5 Teaching Tools for pre-drafting activity and Karina’s pre-draft, October

Scott Foresman’s model

Possible Title: A Day at the Zoo

Summary: What happened? - Arianna and I went to Forest Park. When: Summer 2001 Where: Forest Park Who was there: Arianna, me, Omar, Enes, Abubakr

Beginning: Arianna and me walked in the park. Middle: Arianna fed the tawans. End: Arianna fell asleep.

Karina’s pre-draft of her personal narrative

My first day in the United States.

Summary: What happened? - When we got lost to a trip to Pensacola.

When - Christmas 2002 Where - Pensacola Who was there - Me, my sister, my brother, and parents

Beginning: Middle

End:
the beginning, the middle and the end of their stories and to add some sensory details based on what they saw, heard, smell, taste or touch the day of their particular event students wrote about.

The day after and working in pairs, teacher Lucy had students read their personal narratives to each other, and recall their partners’ personal narrative features of beginning, middle, end. In addition, she asked students to revise their writing for content, spelling, punctuation and grammatical tense. Finally, students rewrote their personal narratives into a second clean draft (see figure 6 below, also Appendix B displaying the full first draft of Karina’s text 1 with revision marks).

As it is evident in Figure 6 below, using the Scott Foresman list of “key features” of a narrative to revise their texts, students made little progress in substantially revising their stories. In fact, most of the students, including Karina, simply identified and marked on the left margins of their papers the first set of sentences in their texts as the “beginning,” the next group as the “middle”, and last set of sentences as “the end.” Students completed this assignment without specifically paying attention to how the language they used (or didn’t use) signaled the development of specific genre moves throughout their stories (see initials B and M in Figure 6 Karina’s First Draft)

Finally, as a concluding task for this first unit, Teacher Lucy asked had her emerging multilingual students to complete a Self-Evaluation Rubric of their personal narratives. This short rubric included two items about general key features of narratives, two items about the writing process (e.g., revising and editing), and two reflection questions about the content of their stories. According to Karina’s self-evaluation, she successfully completed all required components for this first writing project. These
included organizing her personal narrative including a beginning, middle and end, telling a personal experience using “I” and “me,” as well as revising and editing her text. (see Figure 7 below).

After analyzing the different mediating activities and tools utilized by Lucy in her instruction during the first unit, next I present a detailed SFL analysis of Karina’s personal narrative produced in October. For the SFL analysis I use a transcribed version of her second and final draft using conventional spelling, that is, the text’s transcription was done as close as possible to the original text (see Figure 8 below). The focus of this second phase of the analysis was first, on identifying whether and how this focal
multilingual student developed her ability to write “expert-like” personal stories in which she would include the obligatory and optional stages or moves of the genre of personal narratives at the macro textual structure. Second, on analyzing the language features associated with each of the generic moves of the student’s text at the micro register level.
Generic Analysis of Karina’s Narrative Text 1: “My first Day in the United States”

A generic analysis examines how closely Karina’s texts realize conventional macro textual features (e.g., generic moves) associated with written narratives and more academic texts at the beginning of academic year (Schleppegrell 2004, Rothery, 1996). For illustrative purposes, Figure 6 above displays an excerpt of the whole text corresponding to the discovery or first draft of a narrative text produced by Karina during her participation in the first unit regarding the genre of personal narratives at the beginning of the school year, in October; while a transcribed version of her second and final draft using conventional spelling is displayed in Figure 8 below.

As explicitly stated, and reinstated by Lucy during the different literacy events of the unit in October, the writing task and the social purpose for this first unit was to narrate a specific event in the life of the student, having the teacher and the classmates as the main audiences. Thus, based on this task’s description, we know that the expected text type for this writing assignment was a personal narrative.

From an initial generic analysis, Karina’s text at the beginning of the academic year could be characterized as an emerging narrative as the realized text type reflects more closely that of a detailed recount of Karina’s first day in the United States. That is, in Figure 8, we can identify several of the required generic moves typical of recounts and narratives: A title, a brief orientation telling us about a plural subject (we) who got on a plane to come to the United States. There is no elaboration of characters nor a description of the time and place of the actions. A rather long series of events follows, describing a detailed record of the many different actions the narrator and the main subjects perform at different locations throughout their “first day in the United States”. Interestingly, within
the series of events two minor complications are presented and later resolved. At the beginning of the story -at the airport, they needed to eat small sandwiches because they did not have much money; which is resolved when they get to

Title
My first day coming to the united states

Orientation
(1) On my first day coming to the united states
(2) We got in a Airplain.

Series of events
(3) When we got to the Newyork airport
(4) my grandma and grandpa were going to pick us up.
(5) We took out our Jackets from the backpack and slipped them on.
(6) After that we went to Burger King and eat.

Complication 1
(7) In Burger king we all ate small sandwishes
(8) because we had less money.
(9) We stade thare
(10) until we all used the bathroom
(11) so we don’t need to pull over.
(12) We got to my grandpa’s house at 5:00 clock in the morning.
(13) When we went inside

Resolution 1
(14) we started to see scary movies and ate junk food.
(15) Then we went to sleep.
(16) When we woke up
(17) in the cold ground thare Was some white stuff.
(18) I told my grandpa What it was
(19) and he told me that it was Snow.

Complication 2
(20) So I told him if I could go outside
(21) and he said no.

Resolution 2
(22) So my mom went outside to see if it was cold.
(23) When She came inside
(24) she had a red nose and Pink ears.
(25) We got dressed and went to play in the backyard a little.
We stopped and walked to Dennis to buy food. We ate in the van to show my mom part of the front yard. After we ate we went to a store could JcPennys to buy new clothes. we got tired and went home and rest a little. When we woke up my little sister said that Santacloss left presents on the living Room. I told her when did you learn that word. She did not respond me

**Evaluation**

but we all felt happy because we all had huge presents.

Figure 8 Karina’s Text 1 by Genre Moves and Clauses (Conventional writing)

their grandpa’s house and “ate junk food.” The second complication appears the next morning when the narrator (Karina) saw snow for the first time and asked her grandpa if she could go outside but he said no. This second problem or complication gets resolved immediately when the mom goes “outside to see if it was cold” and they “got dressed and went to play in the backyard”.

Karina’s text ends with an optional evaluation generic stage stating how the main characters felt at the end of her story: “We all felt happy because we all had presents”. Therefore, the above generic analysis of Karina’s text at Time 1 leads us to conclude that her text could indeed be characterized as an developing personal narrative and not only as a long recount; since the text displays several required and optional narrative discursive moves (Derewianka, 2002). It is important to mention here the contention that recounting experience is a step toward writing complex narratives (Chistie, 1997), and is also relevant for writing expository texts such as science reports or recounts of historical events (Schleppegrell & Go, 2007).
Micro Register Level analysis of Karina’s narrative text 1

An experiential analysis within a systemic functional linguistics perspective, elucidates the answers to the questions: Who (participants) did what (processes) to whom (participants) under what circumstances regarding the thematic content (or field) of the studied text. Here we can see that in Karina’s Text 1 (Figure 8 above) the major participants are humans (Karina -the narrator-, her mom, her little sister and her grandparents). This gives us the idea that this text is about a close personal event in Karina’s life: “My first day coming to the United States.” All the actions that take place in the story are deployed using material processes (e.g., doing verbs in traditional grammatical terms) written in the past tense. Moreover, a characterization of a text’s genre drawing on the generic structure analysis can be confirmed and expanded by a transitivity analysis within Systemic Functional Linguistics, as presented below.

Eggings (2004) draws on Labov’s (1972) work on the study of narratives in African American communities in New York, to exemplify how shifts in transitivity choices within a given text, that is, the movement from one type of processes over another, reflects realization of generic structure of the text, in addition to textual cohesiveness. Thus, in analyzing the choices of types of processes Karina made in her text, we can see the presence of several kinds of processes: Material, behavioral, verbal and relational at the different genre stages of the text. Specifically, behavioral processes (7/39) appeared both in the complication and resolution stages while material processes (doing verbs) are predominant in her Text 1, appearing 22 times over the 40 total number of processes. These processes are used throughout the series events, complication and resolution stages. This transitivity choice clearly constructs text 1 as Karina’s family
story and is typical of recounts and narrative texts, as well as considered the primary marker of narrative discourse (Biber, 1988).

Also, relational processes, which typically appear in the orientation stage of narratives to connect characters and events with time, are absent in Karina’s quick orientation. Indeed, this is a specific generic feature that she needs to develop further in future texts. However, two relation processes appear in the final and evaluation stage (we all felt happy because we all had huge presents -clauses 37 and 38). Additionally, there is also some use of projecting verbal processes (e.g., I told my grandpa, he said no, …She did not respond -clauses 18, 19, 20, 21, 35 and 36) in the complication and resolution stages. The use of verbal processes is important as it signals emerging features of narrative dialogue between participants. In terms of the uses of the circumstances in the clauses, we also find that these are expressed using some temporal connectives (e.g., on my first day, after that, then, next time).

To summarize, with regards to register at the micro textual level, Karina’s Text 1 indeed displays several developing features associated with the genre of personal narratives. For example, the story is written in the first singular and plural person (I, we), the main participants (characters) are human and she used mainly action verbs (material processes) with some verbal, relational and behavioral processes referring to what human participants said, felt, or how they behaved. These processes are presented in the past tense with just a few spelling mistakes, though she used a variety of irregular verbs in English. She also made an attempt to include dialogue between participants but used indirect speech reporting what the characters said instead of quoting the actual words expressed by them (Derewianka, 2002, p.42). However, it is also clear that Karina’s text
relies on features typical of spoken discourse. For instance, Karina over uses the connectors ‘and” (8 times) “so” (2 times) mainly through the series of events. This is quite typical of young children who tend to rely on spoken patterns of language, organizing their texts around people’s actions rather than around passive generic participants or objects (Halliday & Martin, 1993; Kamberelis, 1999; Wollman-Bonilla, 2000).

**Curricular Unit 2: “Two or Three Pages About our Names?” (February)**

After the Christmas break, Dr. Gebhard and I contacted Lucy to find out about when she would be starting her second unit on personal narratives as we had agreed at the end of the first unit in October, and as part of our action research project. However, we were surprised by a sudden shift and a feeling of uncertainty in Lucy’s focus for her second curricular unit. Her uncertainty in the direction she wanted to guide her students with the next writing project is evidenced in the closing of an e-mail Lucy sent us (see excerpt 2 below) about her developing lesson plan (e.g., *This is what I have so far…… I would LOVE feedback… and some help… I will continue to fill in the empty spaces*)

(Lucy’s E-mail, January, 22, 2005):

**Excerpt 2: Lucy’s E-mail about Unit 2, January 2005**

1. Meg and Juan Pablo,

2. I just came back from my [ACCELA] class and I think I want to change the unit…
3. I think I would like to focus on making a children’s book full of ‘playground games’
4. *(clap games one plays on the playground) or nursery rhymes or lullabies… I figure*
5. *that I could get the students to interview their parents about their favorite playground games (played in Puerto Rico) and the students could share theirs and they could compare them both… final activity could be showing other 4th graders how to play*
6. *them*

7. **Read aloud story about playground games, nursery rhymes, or lullabies: students**
10. come up with some they know, and write about who they learned it from.
11. Read aloud Puerto Rican playground games, nursery rhymes/lullabies: students
12. make a Venn Diagram about the two (compare and contrast)
13. Students come up with interview questions to ask parents about their playground games, nursery rhymes/lullabies
14. Students share answers and make a list of some of the playground games
15. Write playground games, nursery rhymes, or lullabies with parents/illustrate
16. Write how the playground games/nr/lullabies were passed down and how over time they have changed
17. Continue written and illustration
18. Finish final project
19. Presentation of playground games... outside
20. A book of the games in English and Spanish
21. This is what I have so far.... I would LOVE feedback... and some help... I will continue to fill in the empty spaces. I need to come up with some more ideas.
22. Thanks Lucy

There are several items worth noticing from this excerpt 2 regarding Lucy’s negotiation with the mandated curriculum, our inquiry-based collaboration, and her pristine interest in connecting the curriculum content to the students’ socio-cultural background and their “funds of knowledge” (González, Moll, & Amanti, 2006), all within the design and the writing task for her second curricular unit. The first thing we noticed in the beginning of Lucy’s email is the idea of getting students to work on a different genre or genres moving away from the genre of personal narratives which she had previously identified as the focal genre for the academic year (I think I want to change the unit... I think I would like to focus on making a children’s book full of ‘playground games’ (clap games one plays on the playground, or nursery rhymes or lullabies -lines 2-4). Though she seems not sure about it, thus asking Dr. Gebhard (Meg) and I for guidance. Apparently and understandably, this shift was based on Lucy’s desire to connect her unit to the content and requirements of the ACCELA course she was
taking that semester focusing on understanding the Puerto Rican experience through children’s literature.

Second, it is clear that Lucy was interested in designing a complex and exciting literacy unit involving multiple tasks and people; in which students would participate both in classroom activities typical of her growing teaching repertoire (e.g., read alouds, drafting, editing, etc.), as well as in new literacy practices such as the “writing of interview questions” and conducting oral interviews of their parents (lines 3 and 13). In addition to writing interview questions, one could infer that the writing tasks she was devising would consist of writing and illustrating playground games, nursery rhymes, or lullabies, and writing recounts on “how these games and songs were passed down to them and on how they have changed over the years” (lines 18-19).

Above all, through this message and the planning of the whole second unit based on ACCELA’s extended TLC (e.g., planning linguistically and culturally responsive curriculum, identifying model texts, building the field of knowledge, modeling reading to text deconstruction, etc.), Lucy expressed a unique interest in involving and connecting her students and their families in classroom-based sophisticated literacy practices, in which they could draw and/or reflect on their sociocultural and linguistics backgrounds. Specifically, compiling A book of the games in English and Spanish, even though Spanish was forbidden from classroom instruction and activities in accordance with the restrictive bilingual education polices of Question 2 in Massachusetts. Actually, it is important to acknowledge here that teacher Lucy used Spanish when speaking with parents, and also sent written communications about classroom activities in Spanish and English. Moreover, Lucy wanted to have students “Read aloud Puerto Rican playground
games,” and work on collective, family-oriented writing tasks (e.g., *Write playground games, nursery rhymes, or lullabies with parents and even illustrate them with their parents help* -lines 16-17). Indeed, this would be a unit any student would love to partake in. However, in the midst of what I see as part of the everyday pressing issues new urban teachers face, in which there is always something new or unexpected for them to work on within their teaching time, Lucy made her decisions about the unit. Among those everyday pressing issues faced by Lucy were Massachusetts’s Department of Education visitors, grant-funded project supervisors, ACCELA faculty and research assistants, meeting with parents about disciplinary as well as family issues.

In addition, there were other things she needed to deal with regarding her professional development in the ACCELA program, such as e-mail exchanges with Dr. Gebhard and I regarding our research project, the need to connect this unit with her ACCELA class work, and class-related discussions with other teachers in her cohort. Thus, above all these issues and concerns, Lucy returned to her “bag of teaching repertoire” and decided to “reuse” parts of a unit she had done the year before; in which the main reading piece was a chapter book called *My name is Maria Isabel* (1995), written by Alma Flor Ada, a well-known Cuban-American scholar and professional author. Lucy thought that the reusing of this unit would allow her to do most of the activities she had in mind, such as reading culturally relevant content, inviting parents to the classroom, as well as illustrating and publishing books. One thing was very clear to the three of us: Lucy was definitely concerned about negotiating between the mandated curriculum and her own authentic interests in connecting to her multilingual students’ linguistic and cultural funds of knowledge in her planning and teaching. She
accomplished this in her second unit by adding the book *My name is Maria Isabel* to the prescribed curriculum.

Maria Isabel’s story is full of elements of her Puerto Rican culture; which are present in almost every page of the book. Starting from the beginning of the story when we are introduced to the main character, María Isabel, we get to know the importance of the grandparents that she is named after. We learn she drinks coffee for breakfast and brings a lunch bag to school. María Isabel is sometimes in charge of fixing dinner when the mother starts working outside of their house and does not have time to cook. We also learn the family rules about make up for girls her age when, after spending the afternoon with her cousins and getting make up on, she gets home and is asked to wash her face.

Even though María Isabel resents the name her teacher gave her when she came to the school, Mary, instead of María, she is not used to speaking up for herself until she is presented with the opportunity to freely write about something important for her. This is when she takes the opportunity and writes about the importance of being called her full name, and the significance it has for her and her Puerto Rican family. Last, regarding the language of the story, we only see the use of very few Spanish colloquial words for love, “*cariño,*” father, “*papi*” and her nickname “*Belita,*” as well as the word “*papa.*”

Curricular Unit 2 in February was developed over a two weeks period, lasting one more week than the first unit in October. Lucy and the students spent the first seven days of this second unit building the field of knowledge in ACCELA’s extended TLC terms, by reading, discussing and responding in small groups to questions posed by the teacher about the different chapters of the My name is Maria Isabel book. Also, during these first days only a few parents had responded to Lucy’s invitation to participate in the project,
by coming to the school in order to be interviewed by their children (see Appendix C).
However not every student had all the information about how they were named, which
was needed to continue with the constructing a disciplinary text more independently (e.g.,
writing) phase of the project.

It seemed like the great ideas Lucy had for the writing project with the
involvement of the parents were vanishing away, as well as the high expectation Lucy,
Dr. Gebhard and I had about the exciting writings that would come out of this complex
unit. In brief, the writing project seemed to have gone out of teacher Lucy’s hands and
she acknowledged it in our group debriefing at the end of one of those days, asking us for
some more help. Indeed, Lucy needed help from a more expert other and after discussing
a few options on our drive back to the campus, Dr. Gebhard, as the more expert in our
team, wrote a long and detailed message with ideas and a list of suggestions about how
she would approach the rest of the writing project drawing on her previous teaching, as
stated in the introduction of her email: “Here is an idea based on how I used to teach
writing/reading. If you thing it might work, feel free to take these ideas and do what you
want with them” (Prof. Gebhard’s email to Lucy, February, 8, 2005).

The following excerpt from our video recordings of classroom observations
display what happen the next morning in relation to the email sent to teacher Lucy the
day before with ideas for moving her writing project forward:

**Excerpt 3: “Two or Three Pages About our Names?”**

At Rug Time, Lucy reads aloud the last chapter of the story “*My name is Maria
Isabel.*” She has placed a stack of photocopied papers in front of her, which she is
finishing stapling as she waits for her students to be ready. The class spent the next 30
minutes reading and talking about the story of Maria Isabel and stating whether they liked
the story or not and why they liked it. Then Lucy grabs the stack of papers distributing a
copy to each student and launches the second writing project (the writing task):

1 Lucy: All right, take one and pass it down! Now that we have finished the book,
you have a writing project that we are going to relate to this book and we
are going to talk about it. Does everyone have one? (Lucy asks the group
making sure they have a copy of the project description for them to follow
along her reading/presentation of it)

6 Maydelyz: we need another one!
7 Eloy: two… two other ones!
8 Karina: “Two or three pages about our names?”… (expressing her surprise after
reading the requirement for the writing assignment)

9 Ramón: What? (Ramón neither can believe what he just heard)

10 Karina: Two or three pages about our names? (reinstating what she reads)
[Lucy pauses her talk waiting for Jonathan to join the group at the rug, but
does not react to Karina’s and Ramón expression of concern]

10 Lucy: Alright, let’s see, I want everyone to follow along (Lucy asks Katty to go
and get a box of highlighters).

11 Lucy: What you are going to do is highlight the important parts of your
paper

(... ) Alright? Ok, starting at the top, eyes on the paper!

13 Students: XXX -inaudible (Lucy waits for students to be silent but they chat and
argue about the color of highlighter each wants)

14 Lucy: Alright!, you are highlighting the important parts (...) on top it says, for
this writing project, you will need to write a story (2-3 pages) about
your name. You can either, (I’m going to highlight this part) tell the story
of how you were named, describe the history of your family names,
of what Jaime just said… and explain all the different types of names you
have and what they mean to you, which we kind of did in our writing
notebooks, we are kinda ahead of this… or tell a story about a time
when you noticed how important your name or a nickname was to you.

19 Lucy: Next part. When we are finished with this project, now highlight this one!
we are going to have a party in honor of your families who have given
your names and nicknames
25 Students: (several students chat about the party idea)

26 Lucy: It would be nice to have your families here… I’m pretty sure…, I’m pretty
sure they are working, but I’m pretty sure they will come because it is a
party to honor them… At this party, now this is why I think they are going
to come. At this party you will read your stories and give your families a
final copy of your work. Remember that I said were going to publish
books… we are going to write our best
32 Students: (XXX) (students excitedly discuss what they will be doing)
We will also make a class book that we can read in the future. We’ll make a class book that we can have in the class [Lucy continues reading the details and different activities they need to complete for the writing project, such as completing their parents’ interviews if they have not done so, or simply to ask them about how they got their names. She also reminds students about the writing process they have been following, emphasizing that for the first draft they just need to write and write and not worry about the little details yet, such as spelling and punctuation, in fact, Karina recalls that they do that at the revising and editing stage, not at the first draft stage].

Dr. Gebhard and I were very surprised witnessing the classroom interaction we had in front of us. Initially the two of us were not certain about what was going on with the stack of papers. But soon we realized that, what was given as a bunch of suggestions over the email for her to consider in refocusing the project the day before, Lucy had taken it as a form of a “new script” for her to follow in mediating the instruction of her second writing project. Thus Lucy appropriated the long email from us and turned it into a two-page description of the new writing project for the second unit. We were not the only surprised people in the room, as we can see in the brief interaction between Ramon and Karina (lines 8-10 of Excerpt 3 above), sparked by some of the instructions of the project about the expected length of their writings.

During this oral interaction teacher Lucy directs her students to: “highlight the important parts of your paper” [the writing project description] (lines 10-14). For example, she asks students to highlight the prompt of the writing task (lines 14-21). She wraps up this interaction describing the other activities part of the project, such as writing multiple drafts. She also invites her students to revise their stories adding Spanish words if they want, just like the author Alma For Ada did in the story they read as a form of reflecting the author’s voice (see item 5 in Appendix D: Writing Project Description with
Karina’s highlight marks). Finally, Lucy explains that after editing their texts, they are going to illustrate and publish their stories in the form of a book, which students will share during a culminating classroom party with their parents.

Figure 9 Karina’s Interview with her Parents about her Name
Figure 10 Karina’s First Draft of a Narrative about her Name for Unit 2

Clearly, at this point in the school year Lucy seemed to have taken some distance from the mandated Scott Foresman curriculum as driving her lessons. Instead, this time, she consciously decided to appropriate the suggestions Dr. Gebhard and I provided her with, as a “new script” for her teaching. This could have been based on the notion that Dr. Gebhard and I were more expert others fully invested in her action research project related to her ACCELA professional development. Thus, the writing project continue and, as shown in Figures 9 and 10 above, Karina conducted the interview with her
parents as a departing point or pre-drafting activity for the writing project. She also wrote the first draft of her text using the information she collected about her name and family, where she recounts how her parents decided her name.

Next, the following five or six days turned into an exciting marathon where both, teacher Lucy and her multilingual students spent most of the Language Arts block completing the different tasks of the writing project. Lucy’s stated goal was to have the illustrated texts ready for the parents visit and final class party to celebrate the students’ writing projects. The celebration culminating this second writing project about the students’ names indeed happened, and most of the students proudly shared their texts orally with those parents who were able to attend this lively classroom event.

The following images displayed in Figure 11, (see below), correspond to the first four pages of Karina’s final published text produced during the second unit in May. A transcribed version of the complete final text is also provided in Figure 12 below for facilitating the reading and further generic and register analysis.

Karina’s published text above has a format similar to a booklet because one of major classroom activities during this second unit was the illustration and decoration of the final text. All students were very engaged in this part of the writing project and used their creativity to illustrate in the best possible way their stories about their names; which they knew were going to be shared with their parents during the classroom party to celebrate their writing project. Thus, after two drafts, Karina completed her writing project for Unit 2 with a ten-page multimodal booklet which she illustrated with colorful images representing her pride about being Puerto Rican. For instance, the second page of her booklet shows the Puerto Rican flag next to her middle name surrounded by musical
Figure 11 First Four Pages of Karina’s Text at Time 2, February
notes, which also appear on page four with a drawing of the merengue music singer on a stage from which her parents took her middle name (See Figure 11 above). Indeed, she completed all the steps of the writing project proposed by teacher Lucy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>how i got MY midDle nAme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subtitle 1</td>
<td>jALINE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series of events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>I got my middle from a singer in Puerto Rico.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal comment 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>I like my middle name because it’s pretty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>and I never knew that she singed merengue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>until i interviewed my parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtitle 2</td>
<td>jAiling vs. kARIna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>My name is part of her because it’s pretty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>and that’s why</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>they decided to call me that for my middle name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>my parents told me She had curly long black hair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>She didn’t wear glasses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>and love to sing on front of the stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Karina Jayline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Karina Jayline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Karina Jayline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Karina Jayline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal comment 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>I was happy now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>because i know more about my middle name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>and how i got it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>since i know more about it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>i started to write my middle name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtitle 3</td>
<td>JEJE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When I go to Puerto Rico, they start calling me different names like jeje, juju or line. No Jayline in Spanish! I'm so angry. I hate it when they call me jailing in Spanish because it sounds like jay when they call me for a favor.

Subtitle 4
Karina Jayline to Jayline
In the future I will change my middle name to my first name. I will love to change it because jaling is prettier than karina and it’s from a Singe that singed merengue.

Subtitle 5
Karina Jayline
Jayline
when I’m grown up
I would like to be a singer just like her
it will be fun to sing on stage and be famous.

In what follows, a detailed SFL analysis of Karina’s personal narrative produced in February is presented. Similar to the SFL analysis done for Unit 1, here I use a transcribed version of Karina’s final version of her text using conventional spelling (see Figure 12 above).

Generic analysis of Karina’s narrative text 2
As shown in Excerpt 3 above (lines 16-21), Lucy introduced the prompt for the writing task for this second unit as consisting of writing a story about their names, in which students could either:

- Tell the story of how they were named
- describe the history of their family names
- Explain all the different types of names they have and their meaning
- or tell a story about a time when they noticed how important their name or a nickname was to them

(video recording and fieldnotes, February 9)
The social purpose of the expected text during this second unit on the genre of personal narratives (February) was to tell a story about each student’s name, and in addition to the teacher and classmates, Lucy added the parents as the main audiences for these texts.

When looking at the generic structure of Karina’s Text 2, we can see that it begins with a series of events giving us the impression that we are off to a good start, and that the rest of it may continue displaying textual features associated with the narrative genre. Nevertheless, we soon identify that her Text 2 is rather a hybrid genre because it displays the characteristics of a brief personal recount as well as features of an informational or expository text.

On the one hand, the brief personal recount about how she got her middle name runs from clauses 1, 2, 4, 7 and 13 (See Figure 8 below). After the title (How I got my middle name), she provides a short series of events and two personal comments (clauses 2 and 11), which is a generic stage typical of personal recounts. On the other hand, her hybrid text shifts into a cause and effect informational/expository genre providing factual information informing the reader on how she got her middle name. Starting with the title (How I got my middle name), which denotes the idea that we are going to read an explanation of it in the next few paragraphs. Then the rest of the text is organized with five subtitles accompanied by illustrations getting to the point quickly.

**Micro Register Level analysis of Karina’s text 2**

Text 2 produced during the second Unit in February of the school year is a hybrid genre combining features of a personal recount and an expository text (see Figure 11 above). At the register level, we see that the brief series of events in the personal recount
is presented using material processes in the past tense (e.g., got, interviewed, started) and the singular first-person pronoun. The personal comment 1 in the second clause is expressed in the present tense (I like my middle name because it’s pretty) as it refers to how she feels now that she knows the origin of her middle name.

The expository part of this hybrid text is lexico-grammatically achieved first, by organizing the text into subheadings which develop the theme of her first and middle name. The text under the first subtitle tells us how she learned the history about her middle name after she interviewed her parents and then deciding to start writing her middle name. The text under the following subtitles 2, 3 and 4 develops an argument between using her first or her middle name, and then Karina writes that in the future she will change her middle name to her first name explaining the reasons why (clauses 19-22). However the most salient characteristic of the expository portion of Karina’s text 2 is the fact that most of the clauses starting from 11 to 22 are written in the “timeless” present tense (e.g., “I know more about my middle name; When I go to Puerto Rico”). According to Derewianka (2002) this is a language feature that characterizes informational/expository texts (p. 53).

Finally, Karina’s expository text at Time 2 is thematically connected with the brief personal recount already discussed in the previous paragraphs. This informational or expository-like text extends longer than the brief personal recount and is a series of connected clauses written in the present tense. This expository part of her writing seems to be merely presenting the responses to the different questions students wrote for interviewing their parents about how they had been named. However, because these clauses are thematically linked to the whole writing project, Karina successfully fulfilled
the overall purpose of the writing task for the second unit of the academic year. Indeed, it could be argued that both the title of the writing project (*how I got my name*), as well as the writing prompt giving multiple options for students to choose, ended up misleading the students into switching from a personal narrative to an expository genre. Specifically, the wording of the options in the writing prompt such as asking students to “describe the history of their names,” or “explain all the different types of names they have and their meaning” could have caused the “genre confusion” or genre hybridization in the case of Karina’s text for Unit 2 in February.

**Curricular Unit 3: “In our way to expert writing” (May)**

Toward the end of the academic year, in May, Lucy designed the third and final curricular unit based on her initial lesson plan from October, with a focus on writing personal narratives. At this time in the school year, and as part of ACCELA’s sustained professional development and the implementation of the expanded Teaching and Learning Cycle (see ACCELA’s expanded TLC in chapter 3), Lucy had the opportunity to reflect on her literacy instruction based on her critical reflection over the two previous curricular units. For instance, as part of her planning linguistically and culturally responsive curriculum, identifying model texts, for building the field of knowledge, she continued to use some of the Scott Foresman’s components, especially those related to the writing process. However, she had decided to replace reading and writing activities with ones she either had identified and selected or written herself. For example, after taking a course about understanding the Puerto Rican experience through children’s literature within her ACCELA Master’s degree, Lucy began to use more readings by Puerto Rican authors. Namely, as discussed earlier, for the second unit she incorporated
the book *My Name is María Isabel* (1995), while for her third unit she decided to use Eric Velasquez’ *Grandma’s Records* (2001). This book became the epicenter of the model reading and students’ text deconstruction mediating activities that were part of Unit 3.

The book is autobiographical memoir with beautiful illustrations about young Eric spending his summers at his grandmother's apartment in Spanish Harlem, in New York, where his Grandma introduces him to Puerto Rican music and dances, and shares her stories about growing up in Puerto Rico. One summer both, Eric and his grandma experienced a live concert of one of the best bands in Puerto Rico at a big theater in the Bronx. When the lead singer dedicates his grandmother's favorite song to her, the boy is surprised to see the whole audience putting their hands over their hearts, meaning that their hearts remain in Puerto Rico even though they may be far away from the island.

In contrast with the book *My Name is María Isabel* used in Unit 2, the use of Spanish in *Grandma’s Records* is present throughout the story, where Velasquez, its Puerto Rican author, deploys full Spanish sentences and phrases with English translations in parenthesis. From the beginning of the book, we see a bilingual dedication: “*Para mi abuela Carmen Maldonado (1909-1983), esta canción es para ti*” with its corresponding translation underneath (For my Grandmother Carmen Maldonado [1909-1983], this song is for you). Then, the use of these whole phrases: “*Siempre me gusta tu selección*” (I always like your selection), “¿Cómo tu sabes?” (How do you know), “*Arroz con gandules*” (rice and pigeon peas), “*¡Ay Dios mío!*” (Oh my God) are a mixture of expressions the main character (grandma) expresses to her grandson regarding their everyday activities, like listening to music and eating traditional Puerto Rican food. The author also incorporates the original Spanish names of some of the famous songs they
listen to such as “El bombón de Elena” (Elena’s Candy). In his writing, Velasquez seems to give an elevated status to the Spanish language by presenting whole sentences in Spanish first, and then presenting their translations in parenthesis without mixing the two languages at the same sentence. However, we do not know if the use of parenthetical translation instead of translinguaging could be an editorial requirement from the publisher at that time.

Remarkably, in relation to the sociopolitical context of instruction, teacher Lucy’s selection of Grandma’s Records book under the Question 2 policy that restricted the use of Spanish in the classroom, could be considered not only as a form of resistance to the state’s mandated curriculum but as an act of transgression to the restrictive bilingual education policy in effect at that time. She deliberately chose a book that was not part of the reading package assigned by the Scott Foresman curriculum, knowing that under Question 2, teachers who use other languages than English in the classroom could potentially be sued by parents or guardians and lose their employability in public schools for up to five jobs (Massachusetts, Question #2 Ballot).

A common feature in Lucy's teaching practices throughout the whole academic year had been her daily exposing of students to exemplar texts through daily reading alouds during her “rug time” whole class activity within the modeling reading to text deconstruction stage. Another prominent feature in her teaching was the scaffolding of the writing activities she provided through her reiterative, modeling writing of expert texts (stage 5 of the expanded TLC). Even when Lucy’s instructional practices were heavily driven by the mandated curriculum during the first unit (In October) about interpreting and writing personal narratives, she incorporated some modeling with her
students. This modeling was similar to that of Rothery’s (1989, 1996) description of the joint construction of text within SFL’s teaching and Learning cycle (also part of the ACCEL’s expanded TLC). Moving from joint “on spot” construction to individual self-paced writing (cited in Wollman-Bonilla, 2000). However, the analysis of the classroom interactions on instructional scaffolding during Unit one in October show that this modeling was mostly focused on the different steps of the writing process; that is, pre-writing, writing, revising, editing, etc.

During the following two units both, at the middle and at the end of the academic year (February and May respectively), Lucy continued to model writing and provided students with drafts of personal narratives she wrote about her own family. In fact, at several times Lucy has expressed her interests in becoming a professional writer of children’s literature, and she took every opportunity she had to demonstrate how texts are written. For each of the three units Lucy sat down to write a “more expert text,” of her own, which she would not doubt to share with her emerging bilingual students. Thus, Lucy produced three rather sophisticated texts, which became extremely important mediating tools for scaffolding the genre development of her 4th grade students, especially during the third unit in May.

In addition to planning more linguistically and culturally responsive curricular units and modeling writing, Lucy explicitly scaffolded and modeled reading to text deconstruction (stage 4 of ACCEL’s Extended TLC). She guided students to analyze and appropriate the language practices used by more expert authors, such as Velazquez, herself and a school paraprofessional. For example, the first day of the unit Lucy read aloud Grandma’s Records story, while covering the book illustrations so that students
would pay attention to understanding the story through the language without relying too much on the images. She promised to show them the illustrations later. Then she asked students to write a summary of its setting and series of events in their notebooks. Next, she had students to retell Velasquez’ story based on the illustrations only.

Lucy typed the text of Velazquez’ Grandma’s Records story and the next morning at “rug time,” she started the lesson by distributing copies of the written text to the students as an scaffolding tool for text deconstruction and analysis. She asked students to work individually reading, noticing and highlighting keywords related to the setting of Velasquez’ story, and they all share what they found at the end of the activity. The next two lessons, teacher Lucy continued modeling the text analysis, this time, by having her students working in pairs on identifying the characters and the sequence of events in the story. As shown on Figure 13 below, based on Lucy’s mediating activity, Karina completed this text analysis task. After about twenty minutes, Lucy asked students to share with the whole class what they had found, and made a list of those keywords on a class chart.

It was evident that at this time in the school year, Lucy had clearly moved away from the scripted and prescriptive curriculum to a more textually-based and genre focused literacy instruction. These genre-based teaching practices are illustrated in the following transcript excerpt, in which she leads students in a discussion of how Eric Velasquez (author of Grandma’s Records) used words to develop the plot sequence of events in his narrative.
Figure 13 Lucy’s Typed text of Grandma’s Records with Karina’s analysis of Characters

Excerpt 4: “Developing the sequence of events in narratives”

As in the classroom event described previously in Excerpt 3, Lucy and the students are seated at the rug, a very typical literacy event in this fourth-grade classroom. Lucy is leading a discussion while explicitly scaffolding students’ understanding of the use of specific different genre features made by one of the authors the students had read in class in order to develop the sequence of events in his story. Specifically, how this
professional author used temporal connectives, and the different genre features of a narrative to develop the sequence of events in his story:

1 Lucy: Here Eric Velasquez use these words to move [ ] the sequences of events along, to tell us that there are [ ] there were many events that happened throughout the summer ok?: (T reads aloud from a list on the board she just finished writing, some students join her) every year, other times, sometimes, next, whenever, then, one day, while, after, the next day, all day, all of the sudden

2 Eloy: Suddenly,

3 Lucy: Suddenly, OK/ over the next days and weeks, and as I got older, or even now.

4 Jaime: even now.

5 Lucy: Now the story, as the story goes on, (T writes on the board) Eric Velasquez wrote about the setting [ ] He introduced us to the setting when we first read it, throughout the book he talks about characters.

6 Brian: He kinds of goes back to (XXXXX inaudible)

7 Lucy: (starts writing on the board and flips over paper) But it starts with every year, every year this is how the story’s going: sometimes [ ] other times we danced [ ] OK? one day they got a visitor,

8 Brian: and it was (XXXX)

9 Lucy: one day they got a visitor and while they were eating dessert, they got two tickets, ok? now they’re on their way to the concert [ ] Then suddenly [ ] boom!, the concert went off.

10 Student: //over and over//

11 Lucy: //so that is like our climax, they are at a concert [ ]

12 Brain: //Everybody got (XXXX)//

13 Lucy: when the grandma got [ ] sung to [ ]Ok,

14 Eloy: //did you write suddenly right?//

15 Lucy: that’s just my messy writing. do you guys not understand that that’s suddenly?

16 Students: NO!

17 Benny: That looks like sudidy (making up a word based on the letters the teacher wrote)

18 Lucy: = like sudidy

19 Students: (laughs).

20 Lucy: (T corrects her handwriting) ok? suddenly.

21 Ramon: there we go!

22 Lucy: Boom our climax [ ] Then it starts to calm down, then we’re like after the show,

23 Brian: =The same day

24 Lucy: = He found out [ ] over the weeks [ ] as I got older [ ]and even now [ ]

25 Students: Notice how that happen.
In excerpt 4 above, we can see that the discussion began with a focus on getting students' attention to language choices that realize different moves or stages within the narrative genre. In Lines 1-9, for instance, Lucy reads from a list on a chart containing words the students have previously identified as indicating moment in time throughout the story. As Lucy reads the words aloud, most of the students read aloud with her. Immediately, Lucy continues her linguistic scaffolding moving from language choices to specific genre features. Using an adequate metalanguage, Lucy explicitly signals how the author builds up his story from a setting introducing the characters, and how the story reaches a climax after a series of events, always moving the story along by using specific language choices (Lines 10-43).

The Unit continue the following day with teacher Lucy sharing her own authored story for this third unit, entitled “A day full of adventure.” Students read her story, then they discussed and analyzed the personal narrative features while also noticing the language of the text. The next day, Teacher Lucy continued scaffolding her students in doing the same kind of textual analysis and text deconstruction by using a locally produced family story entitled “My First Communion” which was written by a school paraprofessional. The whole class discussed and analyzed this third expert text identifying the language used by this author.

Above and beyond having more focused language-based mediating tasks and discussions, such as the one illustrated in Excerpt 4, Lucy explicitly scaffolded her multilingual students’ conceptual development of the different genre features by creating
a concrete mediating tool that she called “Are you on your way to expert writing”

Drawing on the work the teacher and her multilingual students had been doing over the last few days, teacher Lucy tells students, while holding in her hands the worksheet with the tool she created: "using this table, we are going to focus on identifying the setting and character of your stories. This is a writing tool to help you write better... write like an expert." (Video recording, May 10, 2005 -See also figure 14, below).

This textual analytical tool was designed by Lucy to further review and draw students’ attention to how “more expert writers” – including Velazquez, Lucy, and the class paraprofessional - made linguistic choices to convey aspects of setting, character, plot, and theme. This mediating tool concretely supported students' conceptual understanding of the narrative genre. For example, by analyzing both the generic specific moves of the genre, and the language features that linguistically help realize the written narratives of both experts and the students' own texts. The “Are you on your way to expert writing” tool also supported students in the task of constructing a disciplinary text more independently (stage 6 of ACCELA’s expanded TLC) and revising their own texts during the unit in May. As teacher Lucy put it:

This time around was a breeze for them [the students]. They really had a great grasp of the features of a narrative. For example a story starts with a setting, then it introduces characters, and a story has a problem and a solution (Teacher Lucy, personal reflection, May 2005).

Specifically, the tool helped students to analyze their own writing vis-a-vis the three expert texts they had read and analyzed in class. It also helped them in making sure they were on the right track to complete their writing projects; which is illustrated by Karina’s work displayed above.
Consequently, through a sophisticated design and use of concrete mediating tools, such as the one displayed in figure 14 above, Lucy’s evolving teaching practices mediated and supported her emerging multilingual students’ conceptual understanding of the genre of personal narratives, and consequently their academic writing development.

After a few days of read alouds and the deconstruction and linguistic analysis of three expert texts, teacher Lucy introduced the writing project for Unit 3 as follows:

“Today we are going to free write a family story in your life. Something that you can
Karina’s second draft of Text 3 with Edits
remember the setting, characters, events, plot. We read three stories so far. They all are family stories” (Fieldnotes, May 9, 2005). Notice the specific use of genre-based pedagogical metalanguage in her announcement of the writing prompt (e.g., setting, characters, events, plot); which is totally different from the description of a personal narrative as having beginning, middle and end presented in the Scott Foresman mandated curriculum. Similar to the writing prompt for Text 1 produced at the beginning of the school year in October, the social purpose of the expected text was to write a story about an important event in the student’s life. Thus, the expected text type for this writing assignment was also a personal narrative.

Figure 15 above, displays the drafts of the texts produced by Karina during her participation in the unit developed towards the end of the academic year (May). The handwritten text on top of the image (yellow) is the second draft, while Figure 16 below displays Karina’s typed final version of her text for Unit 3. Both texts have handwritten marks and words on the text, which are changes suggested as feedback through peer editing sections.

Throughout the academic year and her continued involvement in ACCELA’s professional development, it is evident in the excerpts of data analysis presented throughout the findings in this chapter that Lucy’s teaching practices went through significant modifications. For instance, she was increasingly able to negotiate the commercial curriculum she was required to follow as part of the school’s implementation of state and federal mandates. Through this negotiation, Lucy was able to make the curriculum more “permeable” (Dyson, 1993), accessible and even more meaningful to
her mostly Puerto Rican emerging bilinguals. Moreover, Lucy made greater use of multilingual, multicultural literature in designing and implementing Language Arts Instruction by including texts such as *My Name is Maria Isabel, Come on Rain, and Grandma’s Records*, besides the texts she wrote on her own to mediate her literacy instruction.

Additionally, Lucy was also able to make and maintain a strong home-school connection by having students interview their parents about the family and culturally
related topics, thus enriching her curricular units by drawing on the students and families’ “funds of knowledge” (Gonzalez, Moll & Amanti, 2006). Furthermore, Lucy extended the audiences for the students’ writings by including their parents and students in other grades (e.g., second graders). Thus, in the last two units of February and May, students wrote real texts, for real audiences and with specific communicative purposes that went beyond common approaches to language teaching, in which the writing is mostly done to display knowledge and where the main audience is the teacher for the purpose of performing a students’ assessment.

These changes in students’ and classroom literacy practices were more evident when at the end of each unit she had the parents come to the classroom to hear their children’s stories and to celebrate their writing accomplishments by communally enjoying home-made dishes, dancing to the lively rhythms of Caribbean and Latino music, and singing their poetically written and touching lyrics, such the songs described in the Grandma’s Records story. Indeed, the parents in Lucy’s class brought the Velazquez story alive, for instance when I played “My Old San Juan” song for the whole class, all the parents at the same time, as Eric’s Grandma in Velazquez story, put their right hand over their hearts, singing along, and even sobbing in front of the classroom. For a few of these mostly Puerto Rican children, this was probably the first time they realized the meaning of that “Old San Juan” song, the same song pedestrians typically hear being played in the background of the old, ruined buildings while walking the rather empty streets of Milltown.
**Generic analysis of Karina’s narrative Text 3**

Figure 17 below corresponds to the final draft of Karina’s Text at time 3, transcribed using conventional writing and divided up into stages and clauses. A generic analysis of Karina’s narrative produced at the end of the academic year corroborates the idea that her narrative Text 3 realizes both the generic stages and the features of a more ‘narrative-like’ text. In other words, through the use of different lexico-grammatical features in her text, Karina realizes both obligatory and optional generic moves of the genre of written narratives as we will see in the following detailed analysis. Starting from the use of a specific and attention catching title (Clown attack), the text continues with a more elaborated orientation in comparison to the two previous texts. She uses being processes (existential) to introduce participants (herself, her parents and a clown), and specific places or setting (the highway and a circus), as well as an indication of when the events took place (time).

Next, Karina provides us with a fast-paced series of events using mostly “doing verbs” (material processes) and some mental processes (*I would always think..., I saw a clown*). Then, and as a characteristic of most well written narratives, the series of events leads quickly to a problem or Complication stage: the lights went off but suddenly came back on and a clown, which she was afraid of, was sitting next to her. Karina uses this hanging moment in her text to present us with an orientation 2 stage, in which she elaborates a very detailed description of the clown. A few lines down we find a positive resolution to the main problem presented in the story when the main characters left the circus and went to another place where she “was safe from clowns”. Her narrative text ends with an optional evaluation stage where she explains that she feels safe because she
Title
Clown Attack

Orientation 1
(1) When I was 2 year old,
(2) I went to a circus with my parents.
(3) When we were in the Highway
(4) I would always think of the circus.
(5) When we got to the circus
(6) I saw a clown.

Series of events
(7) I started to cry and jump on the seats
(8) because I was scared of the clown.
(9) when they gave our tickets to our seats
(10) all the lights came off.

Complication or problem
(11) Suddenly they came back on.
(12) Then a clown was sitting next to me.

Orientation 2
(13) The clown looked scary with black eye” Shaddow
(14) he had white makeup to disguise his own face.
(15) He had a hudge red nose and rotten teeth.
(16) His clothes, were yellow, red, blue, green, and black.
(17) His makeup smelled like an old shoe.
(18) the clown had giant feet and curly wormy hair.

Resolution
(19) At first I saw the clown sitting next to me
(20) I started to cry so much
(21) the clown left my side.
(22) Then we went to onther place
(23) were I was safe from clowns.

Evaluation
(24) I was safe from clowns
(25) because I left the circus.

Figure 17 Karina’s Text 3 by Genre Moves and Clauses (conventional writing)
left the circus. Interestingly and according to Bloome, D., Katz, L., Solsken, J., Willett, J., & Wilson-Keenan, J.A. (2000), the fast pace in the series of events and the description of the clown in Karina’s story resembles the prominent characteristic of the genre of tall tales. A tall tale is a uniquely American story form that features (1) a larger-than-life, or superhuman, main character with a specific task, (2) a problem that is solved in a humorous or outrageous way, (3) exaggerated details that describe things larger than they really are, and (4) characters who use everyday language. Many tall tales are based on actual people or on a composite of actual people. Based on the analysis presented here, I cannot claim that this is what Karina is trying to accomplish with her narrative Test 3. However, it is interesting to notice such similarities between her text and a tall tale.

**Micro Register Level analysis of Karina’s text 3**

As discussed in the generic analysis above, Karina’s text at time 3 contains the generic and optional stages typical of a personal narrative. A micro register analysis at the clause level reinforces these findings. Karina’s text starts with an Orientation stage using different processes in the past tense. The first clause introduces herself as the main character using a relational process, and gives us an idea of the time of the story (*when I was 2 years old*). Then, clauses 2–6 present the secondary characters (her parents, a clown) and a circus as the main setting. This orientation stage is further developed in the middle of her text. Specifically, clauses 12 to 18 provides the audience with a very detailed description of the clown as the antagonist in her story, enhancing the later development of the narration. She employs relational processes (*the clown was sitting next to me, he had a huge red nose and rotten teeth*). Next, in the series of events Karina uses mostly material processes (doing irregular verbs) and some mental processes (*I*
would always think of the circus, I saw a clown) written in past tense (went, got, was scared, gave, came off, left).

It is worth noticing that the complication stage is introduced using the adverb of manner suddenly (clause 11), which shifts the flow of the story to focus the reader’s attention to how the clown appeared next to the main character (Karina) terrifying her when the lights came back on. This part of the story reinforces the thematic progression of the text introduced by its title: Clown attack. Then, the resolution to the main problem of the story runs from clauses 19 to 23 when Karina starts to cry, the clown leaves her side and the family decides to go to another place. Furthermore, in Text 3 we can see that Karina provides us with an optional move of the narrative genre -the evaluation- expressed through an evaluative comment about the emotional state of the narrator, using a relational process (I was safe from clowns). Finally, Karina’s Text 3 features characteristics of written narrative texts by using a variety of temporal connectives throughout her story (e.g., when, then, at first, suddenly) instead of the connective “and” which is more associated as a marker of oral discourse. Indeed, both the generic and register analysis of Karina’s Text 3 indicates that this is a more sophisticated personal narrative.

To conclude the findings of this chapter it is important to revisit the guiding questions of the present study. The first question focused on how Lucy modified her teaching practices over time by implementing SFL genre-based pedagogies in designing literacy instruction for culturally and linguistically diverse students, while participating in the ACCELA Alliance professional development?
It could be argued that through ACCELA’s sustained professional development and the reiterative use of its expanded TLC, Lucy’s teaching practices had a significant evolution. Her own conceptual development about writing, teaching, and curriculum development, and her growth as a professional, are demonstrated through the greater understanding of the genre of written narratives and of genre-based pedagogy throughout the unit she designed and taught at the end of the school year in comparison with the first two units. For instance, she explicitly guided, modeled and thus mediated her emerging bilingual students in analyzing and appropriating the language used by “more expert others” in their reading and writing practices. Doing so, Lucy afforded her students to develop their academic writing. This claim is supported by research showing that even early writers develop their writing when they “experience instructional conditions that help them learn in socio-culturally valued ways” (Wollman-Bonilla, 2001). Moreover, the analysis of the development and changes in the socio-cultural context for learning to write in Lucy’s classroom are indeed illustrated by the whole process of how she explored, negotiated and altered her approach for the teaching of narrative writing from the beginning to the end of the school year. Clearly, Lucy’s teaching practices have moved from the kind of show, tell and do writing strategies (Watkins, 1997, 1999 cited in Knapp, p. & Watkins, M. 2005) to a more task-focused, scaffolded writing instruction, in which writing is seen as an iterative performance to achieve competence, through a teacher-student interaction and explicit instruction on the lexico-grammatical resources of language (Knapp, p. & Watkins, M. 2005, p. 81). That is, an increasingly more genre-based instruction.
One aspect to consider for Lucy’s further development of her writing instruction is that, for some reason, she did not provide students with individual feedback on initial drafts of their writing. Even though Lucy clearly adopted the writing process approach in her instruction. However, at some points throughout the different units it appeared that the different strategies of this approach have become just a set of formulaic procedures (Patthey-Chavez, et al. 2004). For instance, with regards to feedback, most of the feedback received by the students' writers was done by peers through peer conferencing.

It is also understandable that trying to provide every student with detailed content and surface level feedback, while dealing with the chaotic reality of an underperforming school and the challenges posed by NCLB reform, may seem to be an unrealistic endeavor in a large class such Lucy’s. A suggestion to Lucy was made regarding these issues of providing feedback and assessment as she continues striving for improving her writing instruction.

The second research question focused on looking at How did the academic writing in English of a multilingual student change over time as she participated in the teacher’s exploration and negotiation with genre-based pedagogies and state mandated curriculum? It could be argued here that the growth in Lucy’s teaching practices also reflected a significant improvement in the overall quality of Karina writing during the academic year. It is evident that Karina’s texts increasingly displayed development and control over the genre of personal narratives. For instance, there is a greater use of different relational, material and mental processes (verbs) and circumstances (adverbs such as suddenly) that signal the genre moves found in written narratives along with greater use of the narrative past. She also increased the use of temporal connectives such
as “when,” “then,” “at first,” and “suddenly.” Moreover, there was a clear shift from a more oral to a written register by using fewer instances of clauses initiated with “and” or “so,” which were common lexical choices in her Text 1 produced at the beginning of the school year. Finally, Text 3 displayed greater use of conventional spelling, punctuation and paragraphing to convey separate ideas and the thematic development of her narrative.

In sum, when comparing the discursive features of Karina’s narratives at time 1, 2 and 3, one can see that the text she produced during the third unit at the end of the school year is more sophisticated, displaying the different obligatory and optional genre moves and register features of a personal narrative. Thus, it could be argued that indeed there is evidence that Karina is developing her writing by demonstrating greater control over the genre features of her text. These findings support previous research suggesting genre development in academic writing as a developmental continuum (Newkirk, 1989; Donovan, 2000; Kamberelys, 1999).

**Summary**

This chapter presented the findings of this study according to the two interrelated levels of analysis of the instructional process looking at ethnographic data alongside the focal emerging bilingual’s written texts as the product data. First, an analysis and discussion of the instructional context for Karina’s texts production were presented at each of the three units during the academic year. This included a discussion of the readings and mediating tools Lucy used in her instruction, Second, a detailed analysis of the text produced by the focal student at each of these units was performed looking at the generic stages and the lexico-grammatical features that realized the stages and the overall characteristics of personal narratives.
Finally, a comparison of the instructor’s teaching practices during the three curricular units demonstrated that Lucy moved from tell and do writing strategies to a more task-focused scaffolded and multicultural sensible writing instruction through her use of the ACCELA’s expanded TLC. Such growth in teaching practices also represented a considerable growth in the focal student's literacy practices regarding her developing control over the genre of personal narratives, thus demonstrating her writing development.
CHAPTER 6 CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

This final chapter revisits the background, the problem and the main purpose of this dissertation as framed within a socioculturally-informed and ethnographic case study of L2 literacy instruction and the writing development of multilingual learners in K-12 settings in the United States. Then, it summarizes and discusses the main findings regarding changes in a multilingual teacher’s instructional practices with a focus on genre-based pedagogy, made possible through a sustained professional development with the ACCELA Alliance. The chapter continues with a discussion of the writing development of one fourth grade focal multilingual student Karina, in connection with the teacher’s implementation of this pedagogy. Finally, some implications for practice and for further research are presented.

The socio-political context of education reform of the last two decades in the United States (e.g., The No Child Left Behind Act, Race to the Top, anti-bilingual education laws in several states, The Common Core State Standards, and the Every Student Succeeds Act) has limited the capacity of urban public schools to address the academic L2 literacy needs of the increasingly growing population of emerging bilinguals in this country; which as of fall of 2019 represented 10.4% (5.1 million students) (NCES, 2022). This educational problem was exacerbated when large numbers of multilingual learners were placed in mainstream classrooms “with inadequately prepared teachers” (Robinson, 2012, Gebhard, 2010; Schleppegrell, 2004, de Oliveira 2023), in which this multicultural and diverse student population is expected to develop their second language (L2) literacy as well as disciplinary literacies in English, while receiving increasingly less support in the students’ first language.
A related issue connected with the area of emerging bilinguals L2 literacy has been the scarcity of research focusing on the L2 writing in K-12 settings up to the turn of the century (Silva and Brice, 2004). Fortunately, there has been an increased interest in researching the writing instruction and development of multilingual learners, especially studies drawing on genre-based pedagogies carried out over the last decade. In addition to the limited research on Latine emerging bilinguals identified in our review of the literature chapter, it is evident that we need to explore or extend the use of other methods in order to better define and trace L2 writing development over time. Namely, the literature review identified important methodological concerns with regards to data collection and analysis of some of the past studies.

This ethnographic case study originated within the ACCELA Alliance which was established in 2002 after receiving Title III federal funding. ACCELA created a partnership with underperforming schools in nearby districts in order to address the needs of the high population of emergent bilinguals in Western Massachusetts (Lozano Lenis, 2016). The partnership included school administrators, teachers, paraprofessionals, university professors as well as doctoral students, whose purpose was to engage in a system-wide dialogue, and action program that would support quality teaching and equitable learning outcomes for linguistically diverse students (Willet et al, 2013).

As a doctoral student in the Language, Literacy and Culture program in the School of Education, I became a member of the team of graduate fellows supporting ACCELA’s professional development programs. Because of our shared interest with professor Meg Gebhard in the study of second language academic literacy, we entered
into an action-research partnership along with fourth grade teacher Mrs. Lucy Rivera. Lucy was one of the 65 in-service teachers participating in the ACCELA’s federally funded Master’s degree in Education with a license in ESL. The focus of this action-research partnership was to explore and analyze the complex connections among changes in teachers’ approaches to designing and implementing instruction for linguistically and culturally diverse students and changes in Puerto Rican emerging bilinguals’ abilities to interpret and produce academic texts in elementary school (Gebhard, et al., 2011).

Using ethnographic and discourse analytic methods, specifically SFL’s genre-based concepts and criteria, the purpose of this ethnographic case study was to document the academic writing development of one focal multilingual learner (Karina) as evidenced in her written texts. This, in relation to her multilingual teacher’s implementation of SFL genre-based pedagogies in a fourth-grade classroom over the course of one academic year, as part of her participation in the ACCELA Alliance professional development initiative. In trying to understand how genre-based pedagogies may be used in the L2 writing instruction of predominantly diverse learners in urban public schools, this study addressed two main research questions: 1) How did a multilingual teacher participating in the ACCELA Alliance professional development implement SFL genre-based pedagogies in designing literacy instruction for culturally and linguistically diverse students?; 2) How did the academic writing in English of a multilingual student change over time as she participated in the teacher’s exploration and negotiation with genre-based pedagogies and state mandated curriculum?

In the analysis of the data, I first described and compared the instructor’s teaching and scaffolding practices during three curricular units she designed and implemented
about reading, understanding and writing the genre of personal narratives during the academic year. Next, and alongside the analysis of the teachers’ teaching practices, while drawing on the SFL genre-based framework, the second part of the analysis focused on how this fourth-grade focal multilingual student developed her ability to write “expert-like” personal stories, in which she would include the obligatory and optional moves of the genre of personal narratives at the macro textual structure. This also included the analysis of the language features associated with each of the generic moves of the focal student’s text at the micro register level.

**Summary of the Findings and Discussion**

The results of this study could be summarized according to each of its two research questions: The first question focused on how did a multilingual teacher participating in the ACCELA Alliance professional development implement SFL genre-based pedagogies in designing literacy instruction for culturally and linguistically diverse students?

**The Multilingual Teacher’s Developing Understanding of SFL Genre-Based Pedagogies in her L2 Literacy Instruction over One Academic Year**

The findings of this ethnographic case study show that throughout the academic year Lucy increasingly incorporated the different steps of SFL’s Teaching and Learning Cycle (TLC), and, by extension, the ACCELLA expanded TLC, in her genre-based instruction. For example, in negotiating the field or developing content knowledge phases of the TLC, Lucy scaffolded her students’ reading and writing by exposing them to exemplar texts through daily read alouds during her “rug time ” whole class activity at the beginning of her lessons. She consciously modified her curriculum to include more
culturally diverse texts that were connected with the lives and experiences of Latine students. In addition, Lucy exposed her multilingual students to modeling of expert writings and mediated the deconstruction of those mentor texts at the macro and micro structural discourse levels (e.g., genre moves and lexico-grammar) using SFL criteria. Even during the first unit at the beginning of the school year, when Lucy’s instructional practices were mostly driven by the mandated curriculum, she incorporated some model writing with her students. Such modeling resembles Rothery’s (1989, 1996) description of the joint construction of text within SFL’s Teaching and Learning Cycle, which entails moving from joint (“on spot”) construction to individual self-paced writing. However, in the students’ independent construction of texts phase during the first unit in October, a drawback was identified through the analysis of the classroom interactions on instructional scaffolding. Specifically, it was observed that Lucy’s modeling was mainly focused on the different steps of the writing process, such as pre-writing, writing, revising and editing. A possible explanation of this is the fact that she was expected to use the writing process approach according to the recently adopted mandated curriculum, which she actually seemed very comfortable using it.

Nevertheless, Lucy’s scaffolding and mediating activities became more elaborate and specific during the following two units both in February and May. For instance, she continued to model writing by providing students with drafts of her own personal narratives about her own family. That is, for each of the three units Lucy wrote a “more expert text,” which she shared with her emerging multilingual students to demonstrate to them how more expert authors write their texts. Indeed, Lucy produced three very sophisticated texts, which she incorporated as mediating tools for scaffolding the
understanding of genre towards the writing development of her 4th grade multilingual learners. Teacher Lucy’s work is actually aligned with previous prominent SFL authors' assertion that “good teaching of writing” requires a context where students are guided to compose specific texts through teacher modeling followed by independent practice (Christie, 1998, 2012; Martin, 1998).

In addition to reading texts that were more culturally diverse and connected with Latine students and modeling academic writing, Lucy explicitly taught students to analyze and appropriate the language practices used by more expert authors, such as Velazquez and herself. For example, as part of the repertoire of teaching materials she developed for her third unit in May, Lucy typed the text of Velazquez’ *Grandma’s Records* story and distributed copies to the students. She asked students to read and highlight key words that students found helpful in moving Velasquez’ story along. Next, the teacher guided the students to make a list of those keywords on a chart, which was made available to the whole class as one more mediating tool for their writing. Lucy repeated this text deconstruction and analysis with her students, using two more expert texts. This type of instructional and scaffolding activities demonstrate that Lucy clearly moved away from the scripted curriculum implemented at the beginning of the school year to a more textually-based and genre focused writing instruction as informed by SFL’s Teaching and Learning Cycle. In fact, the TLC approach was developed based on the notion that effective writing instruction entails providing students with explicit knowledge about language, as well as the principle of “guidance through interaction [and scaffolding] in the context of shared experience” (Martin & Rose, 2005, p. 253). In other words, the guidance provided by teachers like Lucy in talking, reading and writing while
students write about something that they share as an activity or experience. Similarly, Brisk (2014) asserts that the TLC helps teachers to develop a metalanguage to talk about the genre and the language features of expert texts and students' writing. According to this author “this SFL-based metalanguage labels with greater precision and function the resources students need to use to carry out their writing” (p. 9-10). For instance, when talking about a personal narrative, using the SFL labels of orientation, sequence of events, complication, resolution, and evaluation is more descriptive and precise of the content of each generic move than using the typical terms beginning, middle and end, which are usually presented in teachers’ manuals and even the Massachusetts Language Arts Standards for grade fourth.

Through the analysis presented in this investigation, we can see that teacher Lucy’s own conceptual development about writing, teaching, and curriculum development, as well as her growth as a professional is demonstrated through the greater understanding of the genre of written narratives and of genre-based pedagogy throughout the unit she designed and taught at the end of the school year in comparison with the first two units. It could be argued here that Lucy’s professional growth is evidenced by how she explicitly guided, modeled and mediated her emerging bilingual students in analyzing and appropriating the language used by “more expert others” in their reading and writing practices. Moreover, by doing so, Lucy afforded opportunities for her multilingual students to develop their academic writing in meaningful ways. This claim is supported by previous research asserting that even early writers develop their writing when they “experience instructional conditions that help them learn in socio-culturally valued ways” (Wollman-Bonilla, 2001).
In addition, the modifications in the socio-cultural context for learning to write in Lucy’s classroom are exemplified by the whole process of how she explored, negotiated and altered her approach for the teaching of narrative writing from the beginning to the end of the school year. Lucy did not disregard the state’s mandated curriculum adopted by the school, but rather managed to design units that drew on it, while at the same time resisting it by incorporating other materials and activities that were more meaningful to her Latine multilingual learners. For instance, Lucy’s use of Grandma’s Records book could be considered not only as a form of resistance to the mandated curriculum, but as an act of transgression to the restrictive bilingual education policy of Question # 2, which was in effect at that time. Thus, Lucy’s constant negotiation with the mandated curriculum, her implementation of new approaches to instruction (e.g., ACCELA’s expanded TLC) from her professional development, while also drawing on her previous experience resembles as a sort of “Strategic Alignment” (Ramirez, 2008), described as a critical pedagogic framework that regulates and aligns the kind of official or non-official knowledge a teacher chooses to foreground and when.

Certainly, Lucy’s L2 writing instructional practices shifted from the typical show, tell and do writing strategies to a more task-focused scaffolded writing instruction, in which writing is considered as an iterative performance to achieve competence, through a teacher-student interaction and explicit instruction on the lexico-grammatical resources of language (Knapp and Watkins, 2005). In other words, her literacy instruction became more increasingly a genre-based methodology.

The findings in regards to the first research question of this study (how did a multilingual teacher participating in the ACCELA Alliance professional development
implement SFL genre-based pedagogies in designing literacy instruction for culturally and linguistically diverse students?) show how throughout the academic year, Lucy’s teaching practices went through a significant growth. Namely, she was increasingly able to negotiate the commercial curriculum she was required to follow as part of the school’s implementation of state and federal mandates. Through this negotiation, Lucy made the curriculum more “permeable” (Dyson, 1993; see also Harman, 2013), accessible and even more meaningful to her mostly Puerto Rican emerging bilinguals. Also, Lucy incorporated the use of multilingual, multicultural literature in addition to her own written texts in designing and implementing her L2 literacy instruction. Furthermore, Lucy made a strong home-school connection when she had students interview their parents about family and culturally related topics. These scaffolding activities only helped enrich the curricular units by drawing on the students and families’ “funds of knowledge” (Gonzalez, Moll & Amanti, 2006).

Additionally, by including their parents and students in other grades Lucy extended the audiences for her students’ writings. As a result of this, in the last two units of February and May, students wrote real texts that mattered to them, for real audiences and with specific communicative purposes that went beyond common approaches to language teaching; in which the writing is mostly done to display knowledge, and where the main audience is the teacher for the purpose of performing a students’ assessment and assigning a final grade. These results extend and support previous findings by Gebhard, Willet, Jiménez-Caicedo and Piedra’s (2011) regarding teacher’s growth through their participation in ACCELAs professional development focused on genre-based pedagogy. Specifically, these authors claim that the teacher gained a deeper understanding of the
structural, lexical and grammatical features of narratives and “developed a more sophisticated understanding of how to incorporate SFL-based pedagogy in her work with ELLs [multilingual learners] as a way of teaching them disciplinary knowledge and supporting their academic literacy development” (p. 107).

In spite of the documented growth in Lucy’s L2 teaching practices, one aspect that may be considered for Lucy’s further development of her writing instruction is that even though she adopted the writing process as one of the approaches to her instruction, she did not provide students with enough individual feedback on initial drafts of their writing. At times during the different units, it appeared that the different steps of this approach have become only a set of formulaic procedures in the classroom (Patthey-Chavez, et al. 2004). For instance, most of the feedback received by the students' writers was done by peers through peer conferencing and focused on surface level issues. However, it may be understandable that trying to provide all students with detailed content and surface level feedback, while dealing with the pressing educational reforms and the reality of an underperforming school, may seem like an unrealistic task for any urban teacher in current times.

**Changes in Karina’s Literacy Practices over Time**

The second research question of this study, looked at how did the academic writing in English of a multilingual student change over time as she participated in the teacher’s exploration and negotiation with genre-based pedagogies and state mandated curriculum? The analysis of Karina’s textual practices over the course of the academic year focused first on identifying whether and how she developed her ability to write “expert-like” personal stories containing the obligatory and optional moves of the genre
of personal narratives at the macro textual structure. Second, on analyzing the language features associated with the realization of each of the generic moves at the micro register level.

**Karina’s Textual Practices During Curricular Unit 1**

On one hand, at the macro textual structure, the writing task and the social purpose for the first unit in October was to narrate a specific event in the life of the student, with the teacher and the classmates as the main audiences. From a generic analysis, Karina’s text may be described as an emerging narrative because her text type reflects more closely the moves of a recount of Karina’s first day in the United States. Her text includes several of the required generic moves typical of recounts and narratives: A title, a brief orientation with no elaboration of characters or a description of the time and place of the actions. Then, a series of events follows with a detailed record of the different actions the narrator and the main subjects performed during that day. Two minor complications are presented and later resolved. Karina’s text ends with an optional evaluation generic stage stating how the main characters felt at the end of her story. Therefore, the generic analysis of Karina’s text at Time 1 indicates that it is as an emerging personal narrative and not only a long recount, because the text displays several required and optional narrative discursive moves (Derewianka, 2002). Previous research has indicated that recounting experience is a step toward writing complex narratives (Christie, 1997), as well as an important feature for writing expository texts like science reports or recounts of historical events (Schleppegrell & Go, 2007).

On the other hand, at the micro register level, we can see that in Karina’s Text 1 the major participants are humans (Karina -the narrator-, her mom, her little sister and her
grandparents). Also, Karina used several kinds of processes mainly in the past tense: Material, behavioral, verbal and relational at the different genre stages of the text. According to Eggings (2004), shifts in transitivity choices within a given text (movement from one type of processes over another) reflects realization of generic structure of the text, in addition to textual cohesiveness. Karina’s transitivity choices are typical of recounts and narrative texts, which are considered the primary marker of narrative discourse (Biber, 1988).

In sum, at the register level, Karina’s Text 1 indeed shows several developing features of the genre of personal narratives. Her story is written using the first singular and plural personal pronouns (I, we), the main participants are human and she used mainly action verbs (material processes) with some verbal, relational and behavioral processes referring to what human participants said, felt, or how they behaved. These processes draw on a variety of irregular verbs written in the past tense, though with a few spelling mistakes. Karina even attempted to include dialogue between participants or characters as a prominent characteristic of narratives (Derewianka, 2002); but instead, she used indirect speech reporting what the characters said instead of quoting the actual words expressed by them. Nevertheless, Karina’s text 1 relies on informal spoken English reflected by her over-using of the connectors ‘and’ (8 times) “so” (2 times). Previous research has suggested that this is quite typical of young children who have a tendency to rely on spoken patterns of language thus organizing their texts around people’s actions rather than around passive generic participants or objects (Halliday & Martin, 1993; Kamberelis, 1999; Wollman-Bonilla, 2000, Reynolds, 2002).
Karina’s Textual Practices During Curricular Unit 2

The social purpose of the expected text for the second unit in February was to tell a story about how each student was named and, in addition to the teacher and classmates, Lucy added the parents as the main audiences for these texts. Karina produced a ten-page multimodal booklet, illustrated with colorful images about herself. She included aspects of her Puerto Rican culture such as the flag next to her middle name with musical notes. She also drew a representation of the merengue music singer from whom her parents took her middle name.

The generic structure of Karina’s Text 2, began with a series of events, however her text rather turned into a hybrid genre as it displays features of a brief personal recount and those of an informational/expository text. The brief personal recount about how she got her middle name runs after her expository title (How I got my middle name). Then she provides two personal comments, which is a generic stage typical of personal recounts. Next, Karina’s hybrid text shifts into a cause and effect informational and expository genre informing the reader on how she got her middle name. For instance, by using the word “how” in the title, it implies that in the next few lines of her texts we are going to read an explanation for it. The rest of the text is organized with five subtitles accompanied by more illustrations developing the theme of her name. These subtitles seem to be originated from the different questions included in the interview Karina conducted to her parents as part of the writing project for Unit 2.

At the register level, the series of events in the initial personal recount uses material processes in the past tense and the singular first-person pronoun. The first personal comment is expressed in the present tense (I like my middle name because it’s
pretty) as it refers to how she feels now that she knows the origin of her middle name.

Next, the expository part of this hybrid text is lexico-grammatically achieved first, by organizing the text into subheadings which develop the theme of Karina’s first and middle name. However, the most salient characteristic of the expository portion of her text produced during Unit 2 is the fact that most of the clauses are written in the “timeless” present tense, which is a language feature typical of informational/expository texts (Derewianka 2002, p. 53). Moreover, this expository-like portion of Karina’s text appears to be merely responding to the different questions students asked their parents when they interviewed them about how they had been named. It could be argued that the interview scaffolding activity during the second unit got in the way of the students’ writing, thus creating a sort of “genre confusion” which ended up misleading students to write expository texts instead of the expected personal narrative.

A related and possible explanation for this could be linked to the fact that, for the second unit, the teacher expanded the audience for the students’ writing by including their parents to whom students read the text during a celebration on the last day of the writing project, and they could have been implicitly focusing their writing towards the oral presentation of their projects. Previous research (e.g., Willett et al. 2013) has argued that students need to understand that genres are both structured and dynamic so that the specific audience and context of a text directly influence its generic structure.

In classrooms with large numbers of emerging bilinguals like Lucy’s, by creating texts for authentic purposes with audiences larger than their own teachers or classmates, students may begin to understand the functional and meaningful interconnections of text and context; which may also result in helping them to understand genre as a plastic entity
that changes according to its audience and context. Nevertheless, because the expository part of Karina’s text is thematically linked to the whole writing project, one could say that indeed she was able to fulfill the overall purpose of the writing task for the second unit.

**Karina’s Textual Practices During Curricular Unit 3**

Similar to Texts 1 and 2 produced at the beginning and middle of the school respectively, the social purpose of the expected text for curricular unit 3 was to write a story about an important event in the student’s life. A generic analysis of Karina’s Text 3 indicates that she realized both obligatory and optional moves of the genre of written narratives. Her text 3 starts with an attention-grabbing title (*Clown attack*), and continues with a more elaborated orientation in comparison to the two previous texts. A series of events follows using mostly “doing verbs” leading to the complication stage. Then we find a positive resolution to the main problem presented in the story, and Karina’s personal narrative ends with an optional evaluation stage.

A micro register analysis shows that Karina's Orientation stage introduces the characters, time and the main setting of her story using relational processes. This orientation continues in the middle of her text by providing a very detailed description of the clown (the antagonist) employing also relational processes. The series of events includes a complication stage, introduced using the adverb of manner suddenly, focusing the reader’s attention to how the clown mysteriously appeared next to the main character (Karina). The resolution is achieved when the family decides to leave the circus.

Additionally, Karina’s Text 3 contains an evaluation stage with an evaluative comment about the emotional state of the narrator (*I was safe from clowns*). Furthermore,
Karina used a variety of temporal connectives (e.g., when, then, at first, suddenly) instead of the connective “and” used repeatedly in her previous texts in October and February. Indeed, one can see that the text Karina produced during the third unit is more fluent and the different genre moves fit together in a more or less seamlessly way closer to the purpose and conventions related to the genre and register of personal narratives (Derewianka, 2002).

Finally, based on the overall findings of this study summarized above, it could be claimed that the documented growth in Lucy’s L2 literacy instruction also reflected a significant improvement in the overall quality of Karina writing over the academic year. Brisk (2016) maintains that from an SFL orientation, the choices students make when writing are related to the resources available to them in the immediate context, and teachers help build these resources through instruction. In other words, changes in individual ELL students (ontogenesis) over time is best understood as a social–sociogenetic- phenomenon, in which interaction with the immediate and larger contexts (e.g., classroom, school, society) critically influence what kind of linguistic resources these multilingual learners develop and how they develop them (Achugar & Colombi, 2008). Our analysis indicates that Karina’s texts displayed development and an increasing control over the genre of personal narratives. Namely, a comparison of the discursive features of Karina’s texts at units 1, 2 and 3, shows that the text she produced during the third unit at the end of the school year is more sophisticated, displaying the different obligatory and optional genre moves and register features of a personal narrative. Thus, it could be argued that there is evidence that Karina is developing her writing by demonstrating greater control over the genre features of her text. These findings are
supported by previous research suggesting genre development in academic writing as a developmental continuum and is manifested as an expansion and or refinement of aspects of language use in context such as gaining control over genre features (Achugar & Colombia, 2008; see also Newkirk, 1989; Donovan & Smolkin, 2008; Kamberelys, 1999), and by studies indicating that explicit instruction using a Functional Grammar approach (SFL) can support students’ writing development (Gebhard et al., 2011; Aguirre-Muñoz, Chang & Sanders, 2015).

**Significance and implications of the Study**

Grounded on a sociocultural perspective on teaching and learning, this ethnographic case study of L2 literacy instruction and writing development in a fourth-grade classroom illustrates a “thick description” (Geertz, 1973) of “not only how writing is used and learned in schools, but also how school writing is located in larger and deeper currents of socio-cultural practice (Prior, 2006, p. 60).” From this perspective and, as seen through our analysis, L2 writing instruction goes much further than just following straightforward the different steps of the highly adopted Process Writing (Graves, 1983); which most language teachers has understood as “a very controlled process in which students slowly learn how to write individual sentences using correct grammar and vocabulary” (Valdés, 1999, p.149). The argument here is not to completely dismiss the writing process, but to use it as a complementary scaffolding tool to more sophisticated L2 literacy instructional methods, such as SFL’s genre-based pedagogy, within a sociocultural theory based approach to teaching and learning as exemplified through this study. In fact, Brisk (2014) asserts that while “Process writing focuses on the process of creating a piece of writing, which entails planning, drafting, revising, editing and
publishing, SFL provides the content of what to teach during each of these activities” (p.11).

In addition, this ethnographic case study clearly illustrates the integration of sociocultural theory and the Systemic Functional Linguistics pedagogical frameworks in L2 literacy teaching and writing development within a teachers’ professional development program. Thus, it extends the body of research showing that the integration of this frameworks has had a positive impact on developing teacher’s knowledge about language, their ability to instruct students by focusing on language and literacy development, and their focus on critical components of language for diverse learners (e.g., Achugar et al., 2007; Brisk & Zisselsberger, 2010; Brisk, 2014; de Oliveira, 2010; de Oliveira & Smith, 2019, Fang, 2008; Gebhard, 2019; Gebhard & Harman, 2011; Gebhard et al., 2011; Schleppegrell & de Oliveira, 2006; Ramirez, 2008; 2014). As a result, some schools where the SFL framework has been used systematically and over time have shown significant improvement based on state test scores. For example, Russell School in Boston, one of the lowest performing schools in the city, which was designated as a “failing school” (Level 5) in 2007 became a “high performing” school (Level 1) a decade later (Brisk (2016).

As discussed in the review of the literature, the SFL pedagogical framework impact on teacher education with a focus on L2 literacy instruction and development for multilingual learners has been well documented over the last decade through research originated from the now well-known SFL-based teachers’ professional development initiatives in California (The California History Project), Michigan (The Language and
Meaning Project), and Massachusetts (The Russell Elementary school project and The ACCELA Alliance).

In its twelve years of existence, The ACCELA Alliance focused on creating groundbreaking hybrid pedagogical spaces simultaneously supporting multilingualism, students’ L2 literacy practices, and the professional development of in-service and preservice teachers. This was done through action research projects requiring “teams of teachers and literacy researchers to use SFL tools and the TLC to identify content objectives, disciplinary literacy objectives, and social justice objectives” (Gebhard, 2019, p. 98). In fact, several years later the ACCELA’s expanded TLC came out of the reflection based on the work done through those projects, including the action research from which this study originated, as one of the initial projects.

Research on ACCELA’s professional development and the use of its expanded TCL has shown that teachers developed their capacity to design linguistically and culturally responsive curriculum, by including the students’ funds of knowledge and needs, while aligning it to state and national standards and assessment systems.

Regarding literacy instruction from a sociocultural perspective, ACCELA teachers learned how to scaffold students by modeling the deconstruction, joint construction and independent construction of texts in the target genres. In their writing projects, teachers made efforts to provide students with the experience of having an expanded and real audience for their writing (Gebhard, Harman and Seger, 2007; Gebhard et al., 2011; Gebhard, Shin & Seger 2011; Harman, 2013; Ramírez, 2008; 2014; Willet et al., 2013). Moreover, drawing on Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1993), the ACCELA’s expanded TLC not only prepared teachers to work with multilingual learners,
but also positioned them as action researchers in their own classrooms who could positively “contribute to the knowledge base of teaching and learning from their own perspective” (Gebhard, 2019, p. 111). More significantly, as Gebhard (2022) maintains, ACCELA’s inquiry-based action research has been done with the teachers not on teachers (GRADNASFLA, 2022 panel discussion). As a result, teachers presented their work to their peers, schools administrators, at local and national conferences and even co-published journal articles and chapters in the field of language and literacy development (Ibid, p. 111).

The ACCELA Alliance legacy continues to influence cutting edge teacher education programs in the United States and Canada, and it has even expanded to and originated research in several new fronts. For instance, Harman’s work on critical and sustainable SFL pedagogies in Georgia (Harman, 2018), Ramirez on bilingual reading to learn in Florida (Ramirez, 2020), Accurso’s work on antiracist genre pedagogy in British Columbia (Accurso, 2020), and Gebhard’s continue scholarship on critical SFL pedagogy in Massachusetts (Gebhard & Accurso, 2023).

As an example of an ACCELA related investigation, this study aims to contribute to expanding the body of research on SFL’s genre-based pedagogy in the United States, or to the “American [USA] SFL/genre dialect” as Christie (2016) called it to refer to a localized appropriation of the Australian SFL framework in the context of K-12 public schools in this country. More specifically, this ethnographic case study attempts to provide teachers and teacher educators with concrete examples of how, within a sociocultural theory orientation to language education, students’ learn academic language and cultural concepts (e.g., academic genres) through their teacher’s mediation in oral
interactions and with the use of scaffolding tools focusing on the SFL genre-based framework. As Wells (1994) concludes, when initially discussing the connection between sociocultural theory and SFL:

A comprehensive language-based theory of learning should not only explain how language is learned and how cultural knowledge is learned through language. It should also show how this knowledge arises out of collaborative practical and intellectual activities and, in turn, mediates the actions and operations by means of which these activities are carried out, in the light of the conditions and exigencies that obtain in particular situations (Well, 1994, p. 84).

Thus the findings of this study show how changes in the focal student’s individual writing development (internalization) happens through the multilingual teacher’s linguistic and tool-based mediation and modification of her instruction, which is later externalized in the student’s writing and classroom interactions.

In addition, because the widely adopted Common Core State Standards (CCSS) considers three broad text types (narratives, informational/explanatory, and arguments), and treats language as a separate category, teachers could draw on the Sociocultural theory and SFL frameworks in guiding the implementation of CCSS in their literacy instructions of multilingual learners (Brisk, 2014). As demonstrated in this study, and supported by extensive research, SFL methodologies link together register choices (vocabulary and grammar) to macro-textual features (generic moves) of different text types in the development of multilingual learners’ academic literacy in K-12 public schools in this country.

Finally, with regard to methodology, it could be argued that sociocultural theory-based ethnographic case studies like the one presented here indeed strengthen studies based on SFL textual analysis, by providing very detailed descriptions of the mediational context of text’s interpretation and production. When these two methods are used in
combination, a detailed SFL text analysis may further provide concrete evidence supporting qualitative descriptions and claims in ethnographic studies of academic literacy development.

**Postscript**

It is important to acknowledge the recent debate about raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education (e.g., Flores & Rosa, 2015; Flores, 2020). According to Flores and Rosa (2015), a raciolinguistic perspective links the white speaking and listening subject with monoglossic “language ideologies through which different racialized bodies [e.g., commonly described as people of color] come to be constructed as engaging in appropriately academic linguistic practices” (p. 150), or as deviating from what is considered the standard variety of language (e.g., standard English).

In this regard, the ethnographic case study presented here is not only about appropriateness-based approaches to language diversity in education, but more importantly about advocating for additive approaches (Cummins, 2000) promoting the explicit awareness, knowledge of, and access to standardized language practices in K-12 public schools (e.g., formal academic registers and academic genres). This, while advocating for all teachers to validate and encourage their students to maintain their home and community linguistic (including regional and social dialectical variety) and cultural practices that they possess as multilingual learners.

A critical distinction between register and dialect needs to be made here. On the one hand, register indicates the level of formality in the use of language based on the communicative context and situation, and it ranges from the informal (or colloquial) language of everyday activities to formal (or academic) language typical of school and
disciplinary texts. On the other hand, the term dialect is used to denote variation in language use based on geographic location or social groups (e.g., Puerto Rican Spanish, African American English -AAE).

In addition, it needs to be acknowledged that SFL Genre-based pedagogy originated from a monoglot (however not monoglossic because SFL conceives language as context-dependent) perspective of the study of English, and with the goal of teaching English to minority students in Australia. An important clarification here, is that even though there has been SFL pedagogical projects in other languages such as Spanish (e.g., Troyan, 2016;) and Chinese texts (e.g., Cheng & Chiu, 2018) yet these were not used, because ACCELA use of the SFL framework occurred during a restrictive language policy era thus limited to English in Massachusetts.

Consequently, in the ACCELA professional development from which this study originated, genre-based pedagogy is rather conceived as an enabling or access-based pedagogy with the purpose of providing explicit access to the historical hegemonic formal language and textual practices (e.g., academic registers and academic genres) required from multilingual learners in order to academically succeed in public schools in the United States. The goal was for students to not only be aware of, but also to appropriate and add such as standardized linguistic practices and the academic registers of schooling to their already strong multilingual linguistic repertoire, in order for them to hopefully assume a critical position in their education, professional and social lives. In fact, Flores (2020) writing is a very good example of such awareness and appropriation and explicit subversion of the genre and the register of an academic article as an standardized linguistic practices. It could be argued that such explicitly subversive
linguistic practices such those of Flores could be considered as one of the goals of critical pedagogical approaches to the literacy instruction of multilingual learners drawing on the sociocultural theory and SFL frameworks.

A final and pertinent reminder is the fact that the ACCELA professional development was conceived to provide access to critical content and academic English language practices (e.g., academic genres and registers of schooling) for multilingual learners, as purposefully expressed in its acronym (Access to Critical Content and English Language Acquisition).

**Limitations of the study**

This study is primarily an ethnographic case study using qualitative data collection and analytical methods for documenting the writing development of one multilingual student over time. Some of the limitations are related to data collection as it was a very challenging and complex process. The participants in this classroom-based research were elementary multilingual students whose writing productions occurred during regular literacy events, as opposed to elicited data collected mainly for research purposes (e.g., see Reynolds, 2002 for an example of this type of data). For instance, students writing samples constitute their regular handwritten compositions from their personal notebooks. Most of these compositions were scanned onsite and later manually typed into a text editing software for later analysis. This constraint also explains the relatively small size of focal students and product data.

Regardless of the thick description and detailed analysis and findings presented in this investigation, I refrain myself from making broad generalizations based on my observations of Lucy’s instruction and Karina’s literacy practices. It needs to be
considered that this is the ethnographic case study of one multilingual teacher and one of her fourth-grade students in an urban elementary school in Western Massachusetts, therefore any of my arguments or claims are best interpreted based on my observations during my prolonged engagement in the life of this particular classroom and the participants. As Geertz (1973) maintained “what one finds in small towns and villages is (alas) small-town and village life” (1973, p. 320).

Suggestions for Further Research

The Common Core State Standards (CCSS) have been adapted in most states and territories of the United States and the teaching and assessment of writing continues to play an important role in these standards, and therefore in the lives of all culturally and linguistically diverse students in the USA. With a focus on the three broad text types of narratives, informational/explanatory, and arguments, the CCSS standards will indeed continue to impact the education and English literacy development of the increasingly growing population of multilingual learners attending public schools in this country. Therefore, and aligned with Genesee, Lindholm-Leary, Saunders and Christian, (2005), further theory-driven research examining the longitudinal development of and influences of instruction on the literacy development of diverse groups of emerging bilinguals across in K-12 settings should be done. This may involve research using a combination of both, ethnographic case studies and the SFL pedagogical framework in K-12 classrooms to inform and analyze the implementation of the CCSS. Finally, this future research may include a larger number of participants and it could be done at different educational levels to further validate the findings of this and similar investigations within this line of research. All this with the goal of informing practice research and theory, and hopefully
participate in the current and future policy making debates in public education in this country.
APPENDIX A

TEACHER’S LESSON PLAN FOR THE THREE UNITS

Understanding by Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title: Reading 1st</th>
<th>Subject/Course: Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topic: Personal Narrative</td>
<td>Grade(s): 4 Teacher(s): Rivera</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stage 1 – Desired Results

Established Goal(s) / Content Standard(s):
Students will write a personal narrative of an event or experience in their life that has a clear focus, have a beginning, middle, and end, and supporting details.

Language Arts Curriculum Standards
Reading and Literature Strand

Standard 8: Understanding a Text
8.12: Identify sensory details and figurative language.
8.14: Make judgments about setting, character, and events and support them with details.

Composition Strand

Standard 15: Writing
15.9: Write stories that have a beginning, middle, and end.
Standard 16: Revising
21.2: Revise writing to improve level of details after determining what could be added or deleted.
21.3: Improve word choice by using dictionaries.

Standard 22: Standard English Conventions
22.3 Write legibly in cursive, leaving space between letters in a word and between words in a sentence.
22.4 Use knowledge of correct mechanics (end marks, commas for series, capitalization), usage (subject and verb agreement in a simple sentence), and sentence structure (elimination of fragments) when writing and editing.
22.5 Use knowledge of letter sounds, word parts, word segmentation, and syllabication to monitor and correct spelling.

Standard 23: Organizing Ideas in Writing
23.5 Organize ideas for an account of personal experience in a way that makes sense.

ELL Benchmarks and Outcomes

R.4 Literary Elements and Techniques: Students will identify and analyze text elements and techniques of written English as used in various literary genres.

R.5 Informational/Expository Text: Students will identify and analyze purposes, structures, and elements of nonfiction English texts.

W.1 Prewriting: Students will plan for writing in English by building on prior knowledge, generating words, and organizing ideas for a particular audience and purpose.

W.2 Writing: Students will write in English for a variety of purposes with clear focus, coherent organization, and sufficient detail.

W.3 Revising: Students will evaluate and revise word choice, sentence variety, and organization of ideas when writing in English for a particular audience and purpose.

W.4 Editing: Students will understand and apply knowledge of standard English grammar, spelling, and conventions to improve their writing.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Understanding(s):</th>
<th>Essential Question(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is a personal narrative?</td>
<td>What is a way to express a past experience in your life?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why do people write personal narratives?</td>
<td>Would you express a past experience differently if you were telling it to a teacher, friend, or parent?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How descriptive wording can make a personal narrative more vivid.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students will know:</th>
<th>Students will be able to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What key features are in a personal narrative.</td>
<td>Identify the structure of a personal narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-drafting strategies to begin their personal narratives.</td>
<td>How to use their five senses to make their personal narrative more descriptive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to take their time to revise and edit.</td>
<td>Revise and Edit their discovery drafts using the writing process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be more descriptive in their writing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Stage 2 – Assessment Evidence

**Performance Tasks:**
Write a personal narrative using Pre-draft strategies, descriptive words strategies, and having a beginning, middle, and end.
Accomplish the writing process, pre-draft writing, discovery writing, revision, and editing.

**Key Criteria:**

**Other Evidence:**
### Stage 3 – Learning Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Activities: Consider the W.H.E.R.E.T.O. elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W- Introduce the essential question: What is a personal narrative?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- List the key features of a personal narrative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Interact in Pre-Draft strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Present scoring rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H- Start with a Read Aloud <em>Come on, Rain</em> which leads into a discussion about personal narratives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E- Students can share their experiences (during the pre-writing strategy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Pre-writing strategies for discovery draft, revision (for descriptive writing), and editing will equip students for their final draft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R- Pre-writing strategies will help them reflect and rethink their discovery draft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Peer-revision will help them reflect their work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Revision and Editing checklist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E- Final drafts will show some key features of a personal narrative. Students will peer-evaluate using the editing checklist and scoring rubrics.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX B

KARINA’S NARRATIVE FIRST DRAFT (OCTOBER)

On my first day coming to the United States, we got in a airplane when we got to the New York airport, my grandpa and grandpa were going to pick us up. We took out our backpacks from the backpack and put them on. We Barry King, we all played in the snow we had seen. After that, we went to Burger King and eat. We stayed there until we all used the bathroom. We went to my grandpa’s house at nine in the morning. We got there and we started to see some movies and ate some food. After we went to sleep, when we woke up there in the cold ground there was some white stuff. I told my...
• grandpa what would and he
told me that it was snowing
my mom went outside and see's
it was red she came in with a red
rose and pine cone we all got
dread and went to play in the
back_yard we went around so we could
The backyard could see a little
and we by the house we
stopped to by bread white
toot in the snow some more part
were we live we went to a store
could see things to buy others we got
E first and went home and rest a little
When we woke up my little sister said

That Santa left presents in the living room. We opened it and we all felt happy.
Enero 28 de 2005

Estimados padres,

A partir del primero de febrero, comenzaremos un proyecto de escritura que se centra en el significado y la historia del nombre de su hijo o hija. Para este proyecto NECESITAMOS LA AYUDA DE USTEDES. Su hijo o hija los entrevistará con el objetivo de aprender sobre el origen del nombre que ustedes le dieron y descubrir lo especial que éste es para ellos. La entrevista será gran parte del proyecto de escritura para este mes.

Trataremos de realizar estas entrevistas en horas convenientes para ustedes y por esto hemos programado un horario flexible para que ustedes escojan la hora más conveniente para que ustedes puede entrevistarse con con su hijo o hija. Estos son los días en los que podríamos tener la entrevista:

Martes, febrero 1 de 9:00 am a 4:00 pm  
Miércoles, febrero 2 de 9:00 am a 1:00 pm  
Jueves, febrero 3 de 2:00 pm a 5:00 pm.

Si ninguna de estas horas les es conveniente, y si ustedes lo prefieren, podríamos hacer la entrevista en su casa o en la biblioteca pública de Milltown, el día y la hora que acordemos. Por favor déjenos saber si ustedes están interesados en participar en las entrevistas, y escriban el día, la hora y el lugar que ustedes prefieren.

¡Los estudiantes y yo estamos muy emocinados con el proyecto!

Cordialmente,

Teacher Lucy

Y, _________, SI ___ NO___ estoy interesado (a) en participar.  
Puedo tener la entrevista el ______________ a las _______ en la escuela ____  
____ en mi casa ____  
____ en la biblioteca ____
APPENDIX D

UNIT 2 WRITING PROJECT DESCRIPTION WITH KARINA’S HIGHLIGHTS

For this writing project, you will need to write a story (2-3 pages) about your name. You can either tell the story of how you were named, describe the history of your family names, explain all the different names you have and what they mean to you, or tell a story about a time when you noticed how important your name or nickname is to you.

When we are finished with this project, we are going to have a party in honor of your families who have given you all of your names and nicknames. At this party, you will read your stories and give your families a final copy of your work. We will also make a class book that we can read in the future.

To complete this project you will:

1. Continue to collect information about your name (interview your families, jot down notes in your writer’s notebook, talk with your friends about your name and nicknames). The goal of this work is to get lots of ideas in order before we start to write.

2. Write a first draft where you begin to pull your ideas together.

3. Review your first draft and think about how you can make it better. This does not mean fixing the little things like spelling, punctuations, but getting your story to make sense and to be really interesting to read.
   a. What the main idea are you trying to communicate? Do you have too many ideas? Do you need more information? Do you need more details?
   b. Cut information that seems like it is extra and add information where you need it.

4. Peer conference: this means to REALLY read your partners work and help them make it better. You could ask the following questions:
a. Does this story make sense or does it go all over the place in ways that makes it hard to understand (we all do this when we are writing a first or even a second draft)

b. Where is the story really interesting?

c. Talk about what to add and what to delete. Be Specific

5. Write your next draft. After you do this, your story should be about 2-3 pages long and have a beginning, middle, and end, just like the story My Name is Maria Isabel.

Let's make them fun to read and have it reflect your VOICE. To do this, you can include dialogue, using parenthesis, or adding details. If you want to use Spanish words in your story, that might be a good idea. We see Alma Amor Ada 'voice' in her story; she included Spanish words in her story.

6. Editing: Now we need to work on the little things like spelling and punctuation. Read your paper to yourself and with your pencil stop and fix things you notice, especially things I have talked about in class. In addition, we are going to talk about the past tense and how most stories are told in the past tense, we will spend some time looking back at My Name is Maria Isabel and notice the way she used past tense in her writing.

7. Peer-editing: Have a partner read your work and help them catch a few more mistakes, especially past tense mistakes.

8. Publishing: Once you have the text or the writing done, think about how you want to illustrate the cover of your story (family picture, time-lines, maps, drawings). While you are doing this, we will help you with your final edits.
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