

Close Reading in Elementary Classrooms

By

Dr. Douglas Fisher

San Diego State University

Co-Director, Center for the Advancement of Reading, California State University

*Author of Language Arts Workshop: Purposeful Reading and Writing Instruction
and Reading for Information in Elementary School*

With the adoption of the Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts & Literacy, many literacy educators have focused their attention on the practice of close reading. Close reading is the instructional practice of having students critically examine a text, especially through multiple readings. It has been utilized most commonly at the secondary and college levels, usually within the context of rhetorical reading and writing courses. Adler and Van Doren (1940/1972) explain in their seminal text *How to Read a Book* that readers should “x-ray the book” in order to find “the skeleton hidden between its covers” (p. 75). The intent in analytic reading is to identify these deep structures in order to plumb the explicit and implicit meanings of the text. Paul and Elder (2003) explain that this practice encourages students to:

- Identify their purpose for reading
- Determine the author’s purpose for writing the piece
- Develop schema
- Understand systems of thought in the disciplines



The overarching goal of close reading is to cause students to engage in critical thinking with a text. Notice how all of the above elements coincide with well-researched elements of effective reading instruction. What is lacking, however, is specific research on the effectiveness of close reading for elementary students. It is fair to say that our collective understanding of this practice will grow as empirical studies are conducted with this population. Until that occurs, it is useful to examine these elements within the context of what we

currently know about reading instruction for young children. Each element will be followed by suggestions for instruction in a close reading.

Identifying a Purpose for Reading

Even emergent readers understand that different pieces of text are used for different purposes. They see a parent consult a cookbook to locate a recipe for preparing a meal. A caregiver provides important read-aloud time as they read a well-loved picture book for the fiftieth time. Their teacher consults a map of the zoo as she

Close Reading in Elementary Classrooms

leads her class on a field trip to study African animals. In each case, the reading demand is shaped by the reader's purpose. The recipe reader is reading for details, while the bedtime story reader is reading for comfort and enjoyment. The map of the zoo requires skimming and scanning of the layout in order to locate the elephant enclosure. In each case, the reader adjusts one's reading based on purpose.

Understanding one's purpose for reading is a metacognitive process that supports a reader's comprehension of text (Paris, Wasik, & Turner, 1991). Students apply their sense of purpose for reading in order to locate information. Reading for pleasure activates a student's expectations about how she will evaluate the text. On the other hand, if her purpose is to seek technical information, she is going to judge that reading in a completely different way. Understanding one's purpose for reading allows the learner to judge goodness of fit. In other words, was this the right text for the job? Purpose plays a key factor in motivation for reading (Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000). In their study of assessing motivation for reading, Baker and Wigfield (1999) stated, "Engaged readers are motivated to read for different purposes, utilize knowledge gained from previous experience to generate new understandings, and participate in meaningful social interactions around reading" (p. 453).

Teachers can build students' understanding of purposes for reading by establishing it clearly for them. A statement of the purposes establishes a learning target for students and increases the likelihood that they will reach the target, in particular because it serves as a priming mechanism (Gagné & Briggs, 1974). These statements include the content and language (reading, writing, speaking, listening) purposes (Fisher & Frey, 2011). "We're going to read this article so we can figure out how honeybees carry the pollen from one flower to another. You'll use this information in your table groups to develop a scientific illustration of how this occurs," a fourth grade teacher tells his students. In doing so, he signals students to the content purpose (*to figure out how honeybees carry pollen*) and the language

purpose (*to create a scientific illustration*). Teachers can use a think-aloud approach (Davey, 1983) as they model metacognitive reading processes during interactive read-alouds and shared reading.

Teachers can build students' understanding of purposes for reading by establishing it clearly for them.

Determining the Author's Purpose

Think of purpose as two sides of the same coin. On one side is the reader's purpose: *Why am I reading this? What do I want to get out of this text?* On the opposite side is the author's purpose: *What does the writer want me to know?*

Why has this been written, and for whom? A reader who can ascertain the author's purpose is able to begin analyzing the text. An author's purpose typically addresses one or more of these:

- To entertain
- To persuade
- To inform

The Rand Reading Study Group (2002) identified determining the author's purpose as a key element of reading comprehension. The report notes that understanding the author's message is essential for determining the discourse structure, including

"text genre, the distinction between given (old) and new information in the discourse context, the points (main messages) that the author intends to convey, the topic structure, the pragmatic goals or plans of the communicative exchange, and the function of the speech acts (e.g., assertion, question, directive, evaluation)" (p. 98).

While this may initially sound too complex for elementary readers, in practice it is not. A durable model of promoting children's understanding of author's purpose and its relationship to discourse structures is through the use of Questioning the Author (Beck, McKeown, Hamilton, & Kucan, 1997). The researchers who developed this instructional routine advise that students query the text systematically:

Close Reading in Elementary Classrooms

- Query 1: Initiating discussion (What is the author talking about?)
- Query 2: Focusing on the message and linking information (What information has the author added that connects or fits with _____?)
- Query 3: Identify difficulties with the way the author has presented information (Did the author explain that clearly? Why or why not?)
- Query 4: Encourage students to refer to the text (Did the author give us the answer to that?)

Developing Schema

Schema theory is at the core of teaching and learning, especially in reading comprehension (Spies, Gallini, & Riggsbee, 1992). The deeper one's schema, or organized pattern or structure of knowledge about a topic, the easier it is to comprehend a text about the subject (Mannes, 1994). When one's schema on a topic has significant gaps, the reader must devote cognitive resources to constructing a mental model on which to attach this new information (Kintsch & van Dijk, 1978). This causes a delay in the comprehension of a piece of text. It is likely that you find yourself doing this all the time, perhaps even with this paper. When the information in a text is dense, and when the reader has gaps in schema, the information isn't fully understood immediately. You have to pause to figure out how this new information relates to previously understood concepts. In other words, you are actively constructing a mental model. A chief way you accomplish this is by rereading. You slow down your pace, review a previous passage, and look back to the text in order to find information.

Text-dependent questions are used in reading instruction to promote the habit of rereading text in order to build schema (Fisher & Frey, in press; Pearson & Johnson, 1978). These questions do not rely on outside sources, but rather are designed to cause students to return to the text. This is especially important when text is being used for the purpose of building knowledge. Out-of-school reading is often devoted to topics the reader already knows quite a bit about. But in classrooms, much of the text children encounter will be about topics that

are less familiar. Text-dependent questions signal to readers that the information is complex and readers are expected to linger over the details in order to build those mental models. These questions move through a progression from part to whole, from word and sentence level, to paragraph and then across the entire text. As well, these questions move from explicitly stated information to those that require inferential and critical reading. These include (Fisher & Frey, in press):

- *General understanding questions* that draw on the overall view of the piece, especially the main ideas.
- *Key detail questions* are the who/what/when/where/why/how questions that are essential to understanding the meaning of the passage.
- *Vocabulary and text structure questions* bridge explicit with implicit meanings, especially in focusing on words and phrases, as well as the way the author has organized the information. Text structure questions may include text features, and discourse structures (problem/solution, cause/effect, compare/contrast, etc).
- *Author's purpose questions* draw the reader's attention to genre, point of view, multiple perspectives, and critical literacies, such as speculating on alternative accounts of the same event.
- *Inferential questions* challenge students to examine the implicitly stated ideas, arguments, or key details in the text.
- *Opinion and intertextual questions* allow students to use their foundational knowledge of one text to assert their opinions or to make connections to other texts, using the target text to support their claims.

Text-dependent questions are used in reading instruction to promote the habit of re-reading text in order to build schema

Understanding Systems of Thought in the Disciplines

A final element of analytical reading is in understanding that each discipline

has unique characteristics, especially in its systems of thought, that inform the texts of the discipline. For example, narrative structures, primarily fictional, dominate English language arts content. On the other



Education

Close Reading in Elementary Classrooms

hand, science texts use an explanatory text structure that contains a high number of technical vocabulary words. Moreover, these texts assume a tremendous level of background knowledge in order to understand new information. Paul and Elder (2003) call this text structure a “map of knowledge” and define these as the primary and secondary ideas that help us understand a system of thought. “When we understand core historical ideas, we can begin to think historically. When we understand core scientific ideas, we can begin to think scientifically. Core or primary ideas are the key to every system of knowledge. They are the key to truly learning any subject. They are the key to retaining what we learn for lifelong use” (Paul & Elder, 2008, p. 3).

These core and secondary ideas are evidenced at the grammatical level. Fang and Schleppegrell (2011, pp. 588-589) describe each:

- *Science texts* contain “technical vocabulary and dense sentences that require the reader to draw on multiple concepts simultaneously.”
- *Social studies* texts contain “nominalizations (nouns derived from adjectives and verbs) that reference abstract ideas, and the presence of evaluative judgments.”
- *Mathematics texts* “switch between both natural language and mathematical language and symbols, requiring readers to make similar shifts in the grammars of both.”

While these informational texts utilize narrative structures more frequently at the elementary level to explain concepts and events, they can still tax a young reader’s understanding. Consider this opening passage from Gibbons’s (1996) *Recycle! A Handbook for Kids*:

More and more garbage! Every day people throw more trash away. As the world population increases, more people throw trash away. Garbage trucks come to pick it up, but where does all this trash go? (p. 1)

Both the vocabulary demand and the conceptual understandings that go along with it are high. The Lexile level, a quantitative measure of text complexity,

is 840L, suggesting that this picture book requires adult direction rather than independent reading. However, selecting which vocabulary will need direct teaching, and which can be learned through multiple readings of the text, can be challenging. It is useful to have a selection criteria (Frey & Fisher, 2010; Graves, 2006; Marzano & Pickering, 2005; Nagy, 1988). The first step is to identify worthy words:

- *Representative*: Is it critical to understanding?
- *Repeatability*: Will it be used again?
- *Transportable*: Is it needed for discussions or writing?

The next two questions narrow the list further, identifying words that students can figure out:

- *Contextual analysis*: Can they use context to figure it out?
- *Structural analysis*: Can they use structure (affixes, root, base) to figure it out?

Once these words are eliminated, what remains are the general academic and content-specific words and phrases that require direct instruction. The final question concerns the number:

- *Cognitive load*: Have I exceeded the number they can learn?

Considerations for Developing a Close Reading

There are several considerations useful in engaging students in a close reading. First, select short, worthy passages. Because close readings can be time-consuming, it is often best to select shorter pieces of text for instruction. If the selection is too long, students will not have time to reread and respond to questions that guide their thinking and they will not have opportunities to interact

with others about the content. Second, close-reading lessons should be designed so students reread the text. Rereading to develop a depth of understanding is one of the key features of a close reading. Anyone who has ever read a text for the second or third time knows that understanding is improved when you know

If the selection is too long, students will not have time to re-read and respond to questions that guide their thinking and they will not have opportunities to interact with others about the content.

Close Reading in Elementary Classrooms

the basic outline of the text (Rasinski, 1990). One of the ways to ensure that students reread the text is to establish different purposes for each reading and to teach students to look for evidence for their responses to text-dependent questions. As noted previously, text-dependent questions should be used to guide students back to the text and provide them an opportunity to analyze the text more deeply. Third, students should learn to “read with a pencil.” They don’t literally have to use a pencil, but they do need to learn to annotate or make notes as they read. They must become detectives while reading, learning to look for clues as they uncover the structure and meaning of a text. Fourth, students should learn to note the parts that were confusing. This is helpful for several reasons, including the metacognitive awareness that comes from recognizing when meaning is lost. Also, noting confusing parts can guide teacher actions, modeling, and reteaching so that students have opportunities to apply what they learn in future close readings or extended readings. Finally, as part of close reading, students should interact with their peers and the teacher in discussions about the text. In these discussions, students should practice their skills in argumentation, making claims, offering counterclaims, providing evidence, and agreeing and disagreeing. Interacting with others to determine the meaning of the text is an important aspect of close readings.

Analytic Reading is Worth the Effort

The practice of close reading invites students to read repeatedly and is guided by discussion of text-dependent questions. When practices such as close reading are consistently implemented, students become better equipped to handle increasingly difficult texts. Over time, and with practice, they will apply the approaches used in close readings to the extended readings that they do independently. Close reading is a practice that deserves increased attention in elementary school classrooms as students are expected to read and understand increasingly complex texts.

References

- Adler, M. J., & Van Doren, C. (1940/1972). *How to read a book*. New York: Touchstone.
- Baker, L., & Wigfield, A. (1999). Dimensions of Children’s Motivation for Reading and Their Relations to Reading Activity and Reading Achievement. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 34, 452-477.
- Beck, I. L., McKeown, M. G., Hamilton, R. L., & Kucan, L. (1997). *Questioning the Author: An Approach for Enhancing Student Engagement with Text*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Davey, B. (1983). Think-aloud: Modeling the Cognitive Processes of Reading Comprehension. *Journal of Reading*, 27(1), 44-47.
- Fisher, D., & Frey, N. (2011). *The Purposeful Classroom: How to Structure Lessons with Learning Goals in Mind*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Fisher, D., & Frey, N. (in press). *Common Core Language Arts in a PLC at Work: Grades 3-5*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.
- Frey, N., & Fisher, D. (2009). *Learning Words Inside and Out: Vocabulary Instruction That Boosts Achievement in All Subject Areas*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Gagné, R. M., & Briggs, L. J. (1974). *Principles of Instructional Design*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Gibbons, G. (1996). *Recycle! A Handbook for kids*. New York: Little, Brown.
- Graves, M. F. (2006). *The Vocabulary Book: Learning and Instruction*. New York: Teachers College.
- Guthrie, J.T., & Wigfield, A. (2000). Engagement and Motivation in Reading. In M.L. Kamil, P.B. Mosenthal, P.D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of Reading Research: Volume III* (pp. 403-422). New York: Erlbaum.
- Kintsch, W., & van Dijk, T.A. (1978). Toward a Model of Text Comprehension and Production. *Psychological Review*, 85, 363-394.
- Mannes, S. (1994). Strategic Processing of Text. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 86(4), 577-588.



Education

Close Reading in Elementary Classrooms

- Marzano, R. J., & Pickering, D. J. (2005). *Building Academic Vocabulary: Teacher's Manual*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Nagy, W. E. (1988). *Teaching Vocabulary to Improve Reading Comprehension*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Paris, S. G., Wasik, B. A., & Turner, J. C. (1991). The Development of Strategic Readers. In R. Barr, M. L. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, & P. D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of Reading Research* (pp. 609-640). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Paul, R., & Elder, L. (2003). Critical Thinking . . . and the Art of Close Reading (Part 1). *Journal of Developmental Education*, 27(2), 36-37, 39.
- Paul, R., & Elder, L. (2008). *The thinker's guide to how to read a paragraph: The art of close reading*. Dillon Beach, CA: The Foundation for Critical Thinking. Retrieved at www.criticalthinking.org/files/How%20to%20Read%208.11.08.pdf
- Pearson, P. D., & Johnson, D. D. (1978). *Teaching Reading Comprehension*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- RAND Reading Study Group. (2002). *Reading for Understanding: Toward an R&D Program in Reading Comprehension*. Retrieved from <http://www.rand.org/multi/achievementforall/reading/readreport.html>
- Rasinski, T.V. (1990). Effects of Repeated Reading and Listening-while-reading on Reading Fluency. *Journal of Educational Research*, 83, 147-150.
- Spires, H. A., Gallini, J., & Riggsbee, J. (1992). Effects of Schema-based and Structure-based Cues on Expository Prose Comprehension of Fourth Graders. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 60(4), 307-320.