Author: **Hanson, Lyndia J.**

Title: *Middle Level Contextualized Grammar Instruction: Classroom Approaches*
             & Supports

The accompanying research report is submitted to the **University of Wisconsin-Stout**, **Graduate School** in partial

completion of the requirements for the

Graduate Degree/ Major: MS Degree Technical & Professional Communications

Research Advisor: Joleen Hanson, Ph.D.

Submission Term/Year: Spring 2019

Number of Pages: 75

Style Manual Used: American Psychological Association, 6th edition

☒ **I have adhered to the Graduate School Research Guide and have proofread my work.**

☒ **I understand that this research report must be officially approved by the Graduate School.
Additionally, by signing and submitting this form, I (the author(s) or copyright owner) grant the
University of Wisconsin-Stout the non-exclusive right to reproduce, translate, and/or distribute this
submission (including abstract) worldwide in print and electronic format and in any medium,
including but not limited to audio or video. If my research includes proprietary information, an
agreement has been made between myself, the company, and the University to submit a thesis that
meets course-specific learning outcomes and CAN be published. There will be no exceptions to this
permission.**

☒ **I attest that the research report is my original work (that any copyrightable materials have been
used with the permission of the original authors), and as such, it is automatically protected by the
laws, rules, and regulations of the U.S. Copyright Office.**

☒ **My research advisor has approved the content and quality of this paper.**

STUDENT:

    NAME: Lyndia J. Hanson   **DATE: January 18, 2019**

ADVISOR: (Committee Chair if MS Plan A or EdS Thesis or Field Project/Problem):

    NAME: Joleen Hanson   **DATE: January 18, 2019**

This section for MS Plan A Thesis or EdS Thesis/Field Project papers only

Committee members (other than your advisor who is listed in the section above)

1. **CMTE MEMBER'S NAME:**   **DATE:**

2. **CMTE MEMBER'S NAME:**   **DATE:**

3. **CMTE MEMBER'S NAME:**   **DATE:**

This section to be completed by the Graduate School

This final research report has been approved by the Graduate School.

Director, Office of Graduate Studies: **DATE:**

Hanson, Lyndia J. *Middle Level Contextualized Grammar Instruction: Classroom Approaches & Supports*

Abstract

Teachers seeking to infuse contextualized grammar instruction into the middle-level English Language Arts classroom will require supportive instructional texts and resources. Understanding how to utilize these sources will be significant in student learning outcomes. This review analyzes the literature of contextualized grammar instructional support sources in order to provide teacher supports for the classroom. The results of this analysis indicate that using the table of contents to quickly access source tools can help teachers achieve instructional objectives, but that there are further areas of development recommended for the pool of sources related to visual aids, student reproducibles, opportunities to expand instruction in other subject areas, and technology infusion.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank my husband, Trevor, for supporting me during the process of this research project, and for being there to remind me I could finish the job that I began. I would like to dedicate this paper to our children, Evelyn, Autumn, Elsie, and Gunnar. You are, and always will be, my endurance.

Table of Contents

Chapter I: Introduction

Teachers deeply value what is deemed best practice in their field. It is because of my professional commitment to education and literacy that I am passionate about exploring the best techniques for grammar instruction and, thus, the best instructional resources. Considering I have expertise at the middle level, this research will apply to that learning environment.

My professional experience includes over 17 years of English Language Arts (ELA) teaching experience at the fourth, fifth, and sixth-grade levels. In addition to ELA instruction, I have taught other subjects that infuse ELA, such as math, social studies, and science. I have taught in both elementary and middle schools and have worked in various school districts in western Wisconsin between 2000 and 2018.

As I reviewed the scholarship on this issue at length, it took me back decades and even over a century. I related with many of the researchers who told their stories. I have had similar experiences and views in my ELA teaching as to the writings of Dean (2011). For example, like me, Dean (2011) was unsure of how to incorporate grammar instruction into her classroom.

When she began teaching, Dean (2011), says her district required traditional grammar instruction such as parts of speech or diagramming. She was comfortable with this type of instruction because it was how she learned as a student. This was my early teaching experience, too: I was willing to use traditional grammar instruction in my classroom, because my own teachers had done so.

When I was in elementary and middle school in the late 1980s and early 1990s, I received grammar instruction through out-of-context worksheets and textbooks. I had a good experience with this and even enjoyed it. I was an avid reader, was academically successful, went on to become an ELA middle-level teacher, and pursued a Master's degree in Technical and

Professional Communications. So, for many years I was under the impression my grammar

instruction not only contributed to, but was the direct result of, this successful ELA outcome. As

I became more aware of the literature on best practices regarding grammar instruction, and of the

potential misconception I had related to traditional grammar instruction's guaranteed success, I

decided that I needed to investigate whether or not my personal learning experience aligned with

current research and best practice. This knowledge would help me make a greater, more

authentic contribution to my profession and peers.

As I worked with my Professional Learning Community (PLC) of ELA teachers

throughout my career, I became curious about which resources were most useful. A PLC is the

learning group teachers participate in to study and implement what is learned in professional

development sessions, and our group met weekly to discuss *what* we were teaching, *how* we

taught it, and *what results* we were observing (and gathering in forms of *data*) in our classrooms.

I have always been professionally committed to using the best methods and resources to

drive my instruction. For the sake of my students, I wanted to be sure I was utilizing the best

sources and implementing them effectively. It is my belief that with this preparation and

planning (whether via PLC or by the individual teacher), student achievement will be greater.

However, my most pressing question remained: *which sources are best*? What foundational

basis do they offer, and do these foundations align with the research? What would I think of

them myself if I were to implement what these guides purport? And, finally, how would peers in

my PLC infuse these approaches (from the sources) in their classrooms? Our students are our

priority, so my research project stems from this greater purpose.

During more recent years, my PLC was not satisfied with the data we collected on learner

growth in commanding written or spoken Standard American English (SAE). Again, I wanted to

understand if our instructional resources and practices were sufficient. Our learner data suggested average or below average standardized test scores in the area of grammar application and knowledge and collectively, we agreed our student population was not effectively commanding SAE in their daily writing (this notation was concluded through anecdotal observation). Knowing there were multiple instructional grammar resources available to our PLC, I sought to find out why these texts were seemingly not helping close the gap in student learning, at least according to the data we were collecting.   My theory, discussed more in depth later in this paper, was derived, and subsequently tested, through the analysis and critical evaluation of professional PLC conversations and observations related to challenges and experiences in the realm of grammar instruction.

Before my investigation officially began, our ELA team was blending worksheets with student writing conferences and grammar mini-lessons, but we were all unsure if our instructional approaches aligned with research or had a foundational basis to them, as we had not conducted a meta-study on the literature. Specifically, I wanted to know if contextualized grammar instructional theory woven into teaching resources (instructional guides) were being applied correctly by our ELA instructors. I suspected, and later identified, a knowledge gap consisting of a breakdown of teacher effectiveness. This breakdown is due to

- overload of information within the sources;

- lack of preparation time to review the sources; and

- missing pedagogical grammar knowledge in PLCs.

This breakdown can result in PLCs that are not supportive of teachers, which can result in undesirable, de-contextualized grammar instruction (worksheets, textbooks, and other non-

valued student text learning experiences). Furthermore, this scenario contributes to low student achievement in grammar skills on standardized testing.

Statement of the Problem

The problem presented in this paper is that middle-level teachers do not fully understand how to apply the best menu of grammar resources in order to deliver effective instruction. My theory is that educators need support in selecting, familiarizing themselves with and implementing the best resources. In addition, teachers and students do not regularly make use of a grammar glossary as a resource to discuss meta-language where SAE is required. Furthermore, they are unclear on *how* to effectively deliver this instruction because their own background knowledge requires further development.

The existing research leaves educators with a space that needs to be filled through additional exploration of resources, which, for the sake of students, is the greater purpose of my paper. My work will demonstrate that earlier research does not sufficiently address current problems. For example, while many existing studies have argued a need for grammar instruction, teachers remain unsure about *how* to utilize the curricular resources to their fullest potential. Thus, my research will serve as reinforcement and support in these areas.

The value and application of grammar instruction afford a great opportunity for today's middle-level ELA learners. To support these learners, I am offering middle-level ELA teachers a critical review of grammar instruction guides. Following the guidance of Jesson and Lacey (2006), I have compared and contrasted "a range of sources of information to satisfy [my audience and have] conducted a valid and comprehensive review" (p. 140). The Literature Review in this paper concludes that the debate over whether to teach grammar has resulted in the

agreement it must take place within the context of student text. But, do teachers understand how to effectively implement the most current grammar instruction resources?

Since 1985, based on an influential review article by Patrick Hartwell, scholars have argued that traditional grammar (TG) teaching is not only useless for improving student writing but reinforces that scholars have concluded it may have a "harmful effect on improving student writing" (Braddock, Lloyd-Jones, & Schoer, 1963, p. 38). Hartwell (1985) referred to studies "concluding that formal grammar instruction has no effect on the quality of students' writing" (p. 106). Furthermore, he suggested classroom instructional time be devoted to various language activities and interactions instead of formal grammar methods. Due to this and other foundational articles, subsequent works helped teachers move away from traditional grammar instruction and toward contextual grammar instruction, which offers students an authentic, real-world experience via text, in which they find genuine value.

What exactly should grammar instruction look and sound like? Scholars suggest grammar lessons should incorporate *meaningful* student anchor text, connected with what they are reading, writing, speaking and hearing. Many instructional guides offering teaching support are available to educators; however, with the ever-pressing issue of time and information overload, do they really understand how to implement these materials effectively? Ultimately, if teachers are pressed for time or new to the resources, this paper can help guide them in the effective, efficient application, resulting in more desirable results in student grammar achievement.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to identify resources for middle school ELA teachers that will support effective grammar instruction for their students. The resources include (1) an explanation of the foundational basis in the various grammar guides, (2) a discussion of specific

resources (recommended textbooks) to help middle school ELA teachers implement grammar instruction, and (3) a list of suggested grammar glossaries for teachers and students.

This information will assist teachers in understanding the research on grammar instruction and discerning the difference between supportive guides. Teachers will then know exactly which instructional approaches to utilize in the classroom. The practical outcome of this study will be a critical analysis of grammar instructional guides application, in light of the scholarship about grammar teaching.

Assumptions of the Study

Regarding this study, I make the following assumptions about most middle-level ELA teachers:

- They have been told grammar should be taught within student reading or writing;

- They are not trained how to teach *contextualized grammar*;

- They have not received training on how to implement the most recent contextualized grammar curricular resources (teaching textbooks);

- They do not fully understand the history of grammar instruction; and

- They have not explicitly reviewed grammar foundations established by scholars, especially those aligned with the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE).

Definition of Terms

The following terms will be helpful to the readers of this paper. They relate to grammar, instruction, and language.

Common Core State Standards (CCSS). This is English Language Arts and Math standards adopted by many public school systems in the United States for the purpose of student instruction (Common Core State Standards, 2010). ELA standards relate to the areas of reading,

writing, speaking and listening. The CCSS are adopted by the majority of Wisconsin public school districts.

Contextualized grammar (CG). This refers to grammar instruction or discussion that is founded on meaningful student text. This can be achieved through reading, writing, speaking or listening. Often, a student's writing can be used as anchor text for contextualized grammar instruction.

Edited American English (EAE). This is the variety of English usage that is widely accepted as the norm for public writing. Kolln et al. (2016) refer to Edited American English as "the version of our language that has come to be the standard for written public discourse—for newspapers and books and for most of the writing you do in school and on the job. It is the version of our language… of the status dialect as it has evolved through the centuries and continues to evolve" (p. 11).

National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE). This is a national assembly aiming to improve the teaching of English at all levels of schooling, promoting communication and collaboration among professionals such as teachers, researchers, and administrators (NCTE, 2018).

Professional development (PD). This refers to the process and practice of educators to further their understanding and instructional delivery skills, often in the particular subject area they teach. This practice is overseen by district administrators for public school teachers.

Professional learning community (PLC). This is the professional learning group teachers take part in to study and implement what is learned in professional development sessions. This is often a time to review student data (formative: as they learn the unit, and summative: at the end of the unit), to plan for future instruction, and to research current teaching

resources and practices. The PLC is managed at a school district level and is held in the various schools (elementary, middle, and high school).

Traditional grammar (TG). This is grammar instruction based off long lists of repetitive questions and answers. This instruction is delivered through worksheets or textbooks and is out-of-context from student reading or writing. TG is rule-bound and considered right or wrong.

Limitations of the Study

A *perceived* limitation for this project is that some of the most recent and relatable research I located was conducted by scholars from outside the United States. Jones et al. (2012) are from the United Kingdom (UK). However, I concluded their research is extremely valuable to my project because their conclusions, although conducted in a different educational environment, can be applied to the setting I teach in, the United States (US). Also, I confirmed the language and grammar, as well as many instructional strategies, are either similar or the same. Furthermore, the UK scholars frequently cite the US scholars in their work, and vice versa, thus, confirming these scholars conclude there is value in each other's findings. For example, the works of Jones et al. (2013) (from the UK) are some of the most insightful and recent sources I have found, and they frequently cite landmark sources from the US, such as Hillocks (1963), Kolln (1996), and Micciche (2004). Finally, Jones et al. (2012) cite the Common Core State Standards, which are precisely what I use to direct my instruction in a US learning environment.

Methodology

The methodology of this paper is a critical analysis of middle-level instructional grammar guides. In it I analyze selected teaching resources according to specific characteristics:

instructional purpose and *teacher need*. For example, *instructional purpose and fidelity* includes best practices, contextualized grammar instruction, allowing students to present learning needs, and allowing teachers to respond to student needs accordingly (through the support the of instructional source). Likewise, *teacher need* includes how to apply the source in a time-efficient manner and how to effectively implement the source during instruction. Once sources were identified using the above criteria, I then selected those offering historical reviews of grammar instruction (for the user), foundational grammar principles and goals (on which to base PLC teaching commitments), and source tools (table of contents, grammar glossaries, and a scope and sequence). The following sections of this paper include a Literature Review, Methodology, Results & Discussion, and Conclusion.

Chapter II: Literature Review

This literature review will provide background information to the reader in order to understand the resulting critical analysis of my paper and to advance the understanding of what is already known. Specifically, the purpose is to provide a "systematic review to inform evidence-based practice" (Jesson & Lacey, 2006, p. 140) related to grammar instruction. It should be noted that a variety of sources on this issue were consulted to prevent bias. The problem at hand is that middle-level ELA teachers do not understand how to implement the current menu of grammar resources effectively, for the purpose of delivering contextualized grammar instruction. Instructors are confused about the approaches of grammar instruction and, thus, may not effectively address grammar in their classroom at all (Jones, Myhill, & Bailey, 2013).

This literature review will address the scholarship related to the issue of teaching grammar at the middle level. It will provide various perspectives on the grammar debate: scholarship for and against grammar instruction. I will evaluate the literature against grammar instruction in a context that I believe was not considered by the authors, providing an original analysis of that information as it relates to middle school ELA instruction. This literature review assesses work that has already been performed: organizational recommendations on the importance of teaching grammar in the ELA classroom. I will offer a reappraisal of defensible strategies for teaching grammar and, in turn, discuss teacher beliefs on grammar in PLCs. Finally, I will discuss how the literature indicates that pre-service and current teachers need reinforcement in the area of grammar knowledge in order to teach it effectively.

Throughout my analysis, the literature pointed in common directions (grammar can be defined in many ways), as well as those that differed (to teach or not to teach grammar).

Similarities include that instruction in grammar and its usage have existed in the educational setting for over a century and have been highly valued by many levels of society. To carry this out, educators have sought to effectively teach or infuse grammar into the ELA classroom. Another common theme surfacing from the literature is that strong examples of classical literature present exemplary samples of grammar usage for teachers and learners to use as discussion points in the ELA classroom. As I drew up an analytical framework using a key set of issues related to grammar instruction, I compared and categorized the literature in the following manner:

- grammar instruction debate

- arguments against formal grammar instruction

- defensible strategies for grammar instruction

- grammar instruction established as best practice

- teacher beliefs about grammar instruction while working in PLCs

- lack of pre-service and current teacher grammar knowledge

Finally, the existing literature cannot thoroughly answer my research question, as specific literature on how to implement current grammar instructional guides does not appear to exist. I was unable to locate research that solely reviewed current instructional grammar guides as a body of literature. There are many articles discussing the debate over grammar instruction, the need for grammar instruction, and types of grammar instructional strategies, but not an overview of the best teaching resources (and how they are connected to each other in a useful manner). However, I was thoroughly able to infer which instructional strategies are currently viewed as a best practice, and, thus, found validity in conducting a comprehensive analysis of the best sources for teachers.

The Grammar Instruction Debate

The grammar instruction debate has existed since the early 1960s. Some scholars have argued against formal grammar instruction (Braddock et al., 1963), or against grammar instruction at all, as the benefits, in their estimation, were not substantiated through research (Hartwell, 1985). Although formal grammar instruction was generally agreed upon as conflicting with best practice, other scholars vehemently argued that grammar instruction must still take place in other forms (Jones et al., 2012; Kolln, 1981; Micciche, 2004; Patterson, 2001). Through this discussion of opposing theoretical stances, instructional approaches developed and became referred to as contextual or rhetorical grammar. Both would go on to be examined and evaluated for their instructional value throughout the continuing years.

Arguments against formal grammar instruction. Published articles against formal grammar instruction have suggested it does not improve writing skills and may even be detrimental in developing student writing (Braddock et al., 1963; Hartwell, 1985). Hillocks (1984), another scholar in the field, declared that teachers who use traditional or formal grammar to teach writing do students a "gross disservice which should not be tolerated," and said the instruction of writing should be done with "minimal grammar" (p. 249). This argument was against formal grammar instruction, or TG, whereas other scholars countered that grammar instruction should still occur in ELA classrooms in a new, more modern manner (Jones et al., 2012; Kolln, 1981; Micciche, 2004; Patterson, 2001).

Hartwell's (1985) article argued against grammar instruction to a larger audience that teachers should no longer use traditional grammar methods. He reiterated that "formal grammar instruction has no effect on the quality of student's writing" (Hartwell, 1985, p. 106), and that

other writing activities would better serve students. Other early findings on TG suggest similar negative outcomes (DeBoer, 1959; Hoyt, 1906; Strom, 1960).

Hartwell (1985) argued that many previous experiments on grammar instruction did not help conclude its value or effectiveness. He stated it is not probable that "further experimental research …will resolve the grammar issue" (Hartwell, 1985, p. 107). My analysis of Hartwell's (1985) work does not overwhelmingly convince me that all grammar instruction should cease. As an ELA professional who is held responsible for grammar results on student standardized test scores, I still see the need for some type of explicit grammar instruction, or at the very least, grammar conversations in the classroom. In addition, Hartwell's goal of completely ending the discussion of grammar teaching has not been achieved, as scholars continue to come back to the issue. Specifically, Kolln, never doubted the need for grammar teaching as subsequent research and present-day instructional resources suggest the need for continued discussion and exploration on the matter.

Traditional grammar instruction is described as teaching grammar through the use of worksheets and textbooks. This type of learning is rule-bound, using text, not in the context of student learning or student life. Scholars have decidedly written about the negative impacts of formal grammar instruction (Hartwell, 1985; Kolln, 1981). The foundational scholarship of Hartwell (1985) and Kolln (1981) is frequently referred to by others in subsequent research (Jones et al., 2012; Micciche, 2004; Patterson, 2001), where they build a case for rhetorical or contextual grammar instruction. This contextual grammar instruction is what current instructional resources (critically analyzed in the Discussion & Results chapter of this paper) suggest is the best way to teach grammar in today's middle-level ELA classrooms.

Teachers must be able to recognize traditional grammar instruction so as not to inadvertently implement it with de-contextualized worksheets and textbooks. It is important that middle-level teachers truly understand the background of this field, the analysis that has been done, which practices previous scholars have discredited, and how its direction has decidedly changed over the decades. This information is valuable to teachers and should be noted in instructional resources in order to clearly direct educators towards contextualized methods.

As noted, scholars have established that TG instruction is useless in improving student writing (Braddock et al., 1963; Hartwell, 1985; Hillocks, 1984). Teachers themselves most likely received TG instruction (Jones et al., 2012) and should understand the evidence and resulting shift away from this teaching style. Teachers who learned through TG methods and then became successful as ELA instructors might misinterpret or even reject the conclusions Hartwell (1985) and Kolln (1996) presented. An analysis of the literature reveals the need for ELA teachers to review the history and past scholarship regarding grammar instruction.

Today's middle-level ELA teachers can gain significant understanding by reviewing past research on TG. They must understand how it is defined in order to avoid using the methods of de-contextualized instruction. They must also understand why and how the movement was developed. Only then can teachers truly understand the value of contextualized grammar instruction and move towards those methods with full awareness of its purpose and value.

After identifying and studying the literature from a broad, comprehensive angle, I conclude Hartwell's (1985) work set the stage for subsequent arguments in support of teaching grammar (Jones et al., 2012; Micciche, 2004). Common themes identified in the literature include past instructional practices deemed negative (Braddock et al., 1963) as well as today's value of language in a democracy (Micciche, 2004). The evidence suggests TG instruction was

not deemed valuable, but that many scholars continued to argue grammar instruction should take place in some form (based on contextualized student writing, speaking, listening and reading).

      Scholars present defensible strategies for teaching grammar. We now turn to the matter that scholars have presented defensible strategies for teaching grammar in the ELA middle-level classroom, many of which align with National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) principles. Articles providing history on the argument over grammar instruction can help direct teachers who wish to teach it in what has been established as the most effective manner (Kolln, 1996; Patterson, 2001). Specifically, scholars have presented defensible strategies in which to teach grammar, suggesting the methods must be contextualized, providing a purpose for students (Jones et al., 2012; Kolln, 1981, 1996; Micciche, 2004; Patterson, 2001).

      Kolln (1996) made strong points against Hartwell's conclusion that grammar instruction "had harmful effects on learners" (Hartwell, 1985, p. 105). She stated it was "unfortunate that the loaded phrase *harmful effect* was a part...of the…report. *Harmful* implies a threat…that students who understand grammar, the structure of their language, are somehow at risk [and that] having no conscious knowledge of grammar is somehow safer than having learned it in a formal way" (Kolln 1996, p. 27). Kolln's (1996) argument for grammar instruction persuaded me toward the argument for teaching grammar in ways other than traditional and, as she suggests, in "a wider range of methods and content" (p. 30). She cautioned educators to not abandon grammar instruction entirely, as Hartwell (1985) suggested. As an ELA educator held responsible for student standardized grammar test results, I agree with Kolln's theory that students who understand grammar and its structure are better served than those who have never had instruction on such structures at all.

Through my investigation, I also discovered Kolln knew grammar thoroughly enough to understand its educational value. Her theory of grammar's importance is experienced by speakers of any language, as a "conscious knowledge of grammar" (Kolln, 1996) affords people the ability to express ideas more thoroughly. Also, Kolln (1996) encouraged teachers to instruct grammar so students have tools to "select effective structures for a given rhetorical context," also known as rhetorical grammar (p. 29). Kolln (1996) offered readers definitions of grammar and, with this vision, argued against others, who, in her view, devalued it. Kolln (1996) called for a more modern, positive approach to teaching grammar and, thus, sought to empower students. I believe that the methods suggested by Kolln can provide students with a useful learning experience, equipping them with linguistic tools to communicate the messages they seek to share, whether for persuasive, informative, or entertainment purposes. To conclude, this is the new, modern approach of contextualized grammar instruction which also ties in well with the CCSS (2010).

Teachers deliver lessons related to the writing process in today's middle-level classroom, as those adopting the CCSS (2010) are required to do so. Kolln (1996) argued that grammar still "had a place in the writing process" (p. 30) and in the classroom. I wholly agree with this, as all of the instructional sources reviewed in the Results and Discussion section align with her argument valuing grammar as a way to help writers make "effective choices" (Kolln, 1996, p. 29). After reviewing the literature, it is clear teachers seeking to infuse contextualized grammar should select sources with the characteristics of *instructional purpose* and meeting *teacher needs*.

Once again referring to the writing process, Kolln (1981) pointed out that not all formal or traditional grammar need be considered harmful or detrimental to learners, as she reiterated

"not only can we teach grammar- the internalized system of rules that the speakers of a language share—we can do so in a functional way, in connection with composition" (p. 141). This is contextualized grammar instruction, which can be taught with the sources critically reviewed in the Results & Discussion chapter. In my estimation, these sources fit well with Kolln's (1981) suggestion to bring "conscious awareness [to] those subconscious rules" (p. 141), because they incorporate grammar instruction through meaningful student texts and writing. Further, my professional experience in ELA grammar instruction aligns with Kolln's (1981; 1996) scholarship, as many of my successful grammar lessons (as well as those in my PLC) have been achieved through composition lessons, discussions, practice, demonstration, and peer review.

Patterson (2001), a former middle school teacher, discussed that educators seeking to teach grammar should do so "within the context of larger lessons and experiences with written and spoken language" (p. 54-55). Notably, this article reviewed the history of grammar instruction which is what much of the literature does in order to inform its audience of ELA instructors. Patterson's (2001) findings on context reaffirmed my professional experience, as she reiterated similar messages as Kolln (1981; 1996) that contextualized grammar instruction was achievable in the ELA middle-level classroom. As stated, I have taught grammar in this manner, and Patterson's (2001) work suggested my instructional methods are research-based, providing effective classroom instruction. The sources selected for critical review in Chapter 4 also align with Patterson (2001) and Kolln (1981; 1996).

Like Hartwell (1985) and Kolln (1996), Patterson (2001) encouraged teachers to move beyond traditional views of grammar instruction. She reminded those seeking to teach contextualized grammar that they must not see it as "a set of rules and code of correctness" (Patterson, 2001, p. 55), which is what I see as the first step in teaching contextually.

Furthermore, in her work Patterson (2001) argued "comprehensive knowledge of grammar terminology and rules [does not] translate into knowledge of linguistic structure or into an ability to write well" (p. 55). I conclude this message is crucial for teachers seeking to teach grammar: memorization of rules or terms will not make their students better writers. Rather, it is meaningful practice and conversation, along with supportive resources (including grammar foundations and guidelines) that will help students achieve meaningful writing skills, reinforced with grammar principles.

Patterson (2001) goes on to discuss that classrooms must be places of engaging literary exploration, where students can interact with and investigate meaningful pieces of text. She referred to this as the "grammar of discovery" (p. 55), and purported this contextualized grammar instruction will best meet ELA student needs. To that end, sources encouraging teachers to present lessons in this way will best support teachers implementing contextualized grammar. Patterson (2001) demonstrated value in student experiences and encouraged teachers to make grammar meaningful to their lives and connected with their world. Patterson's (2001) empirical findings and theory have been tested in the context of the ELA middle-level classroom, as she wrote about her vast ELA teaching experiences and instructional strategies, thus, making her work particularly significant to my research.

Work by another author, Micciche (2004), establishes her paper's purpose as "grounds for teaching grammar rhetorically" (p. 717). In my view, Micciche (2004) builds upon Kolln's (1996) argument that grammar instruction does have a purpose and that it is the manner in which we teach that needs evaluation. For all teachers seeking to teach middle-level grammar, I recommend examining the arguments Micciche (2004) makes about delivering grammar instruction rhetorically. She refers to the old views on grammar which are "decidedly not sexy

but school-marmish, not empowering but disempowering, not rhetorical but de-contextualized, [and] not progressive but remedial" (Micciche, 2004, p. 718). What Micciche (2004) stated here refers to the previous problems or perceptions of grammar instruction, and she suggested a newer, rhetorical approach. By no means does Micciche (2004) suggest grammar instruction be abandoned but, instead, much the opposite.

After reviewing Micciche's (2004) argument, the necessity for grammar instruction once again was apparent to me, not only for the purpose of academic progress but also in a social sense. Micciche (2004) stated, "grammar competency has always been linked with social power or the lack thereof" (p. 733). As a teacher, it has always been my commitment to support students in all areas of life, including acceptance in various social circles. For example, job interviews and college entrance essays often require command of SAE, often viewed as a distinguished level of communication and language. Through the evaluation of Micciche's (2004) essay addressing college-level instructors, my own ideas of middle-level instruction became refined, as I pinpointed the value in implementing grammar teaching sources effectively. This value contributes to the greater grammar instructional purpose: positively impacting student lives in the areas of social power and acceptance.

Micciche's (2004) message reinforces Kolln's (1996) notation on the 1984 NCTE resolution regarding language awareness. Here, Kolln (1996) reiterated the NCTE placed emphasis on how "language varies in a range of social and cultural settings; examining how people's attitudes vary toward language across culture, class, gender, and generation… examining how 'correctness' in language reflects social-political-economic values" (p. 30). Kolln's (1996) and Micciche's (2004) awareness of grammar as social acceptance in specific settings brings significance to how grammar instruction should be carried out. The vehicle for

this implementation is useful instructional sources. McClure (2007) also stated, "many people gauge social acceptance based on usage of the grammar we call Standard or Academic English" (p. 1). In short, teachers seeking to teach grammar should proceed with an understanding of grammar's societal impacts and should consider the value grammar knowledge affords their students. I conclude the literature directly suggests that the selection and application of effective teaching sources can alter this impact in a positive or negative way. In other words, the presence of effective teaching sources (and subsequent application of them) can socially advance students, where the absence of them can cause a hindrance.

Grammar Instruction Established as Best Practice

Professional organizations in the United States have taken stances, or policies, in a sense, on grammar, describing modern methods recommended as best-practice for ELA instruction. In 1985, the NCTE published a resolution on grammar exercises to teach speaking and writing. Here, they unequivocally stated that traditional grammar instruction, or isolated instruction, is not recommended in ELA classrooms.

In my estimation, this long-standing guideline specifically recommends ELA instruction that does not teach grammar in isolation, but that values student reading, writing, speaking, and listening in practice. As a long-time teacher, I conclude this suggests that long lists of de-contextualized questions in worksheet packets are not endorsed by the NCTE. The resolution goes on to remind educators that any implementation should be research-based in order to avoid practices that deter learning. As a professional educator, I find this part of the resolution to be significant, as research of instructional practice in all content areas is what drives educational best practices. Finally, NCTE purported class time must be spent on more meaningful interactions for students. Based on this existing theory, I interpret these meaningful interactions

to be student-based, contextualized activities in the ELA arena. This finding influenced my final selection of sources reviewed in Chapter 4 of this paper, as they each state professional affiliation with the NCTE.

Several years later in 2002, this same authoritative source went on to publish a grammar instruction guideline concluding:

Grammar is important because it is the language that makes it possible for us to talk about language. Grammar names the types of words and word groups that make up sentences not only in English but in any language. As human beings, we can put sentences together even as children – we can all *do* grammar. But to be able to talk about how sentences are built, about the types of words and word groups that make up sentences – that is knowing about grammar. (NCTE, 2002)

Considering this guideline in the same context as the original authors meant it, I purport the sources reviewed in Chapter 4 also reinforce NCTE (2002). This resolution suggests meta-language is relevant in classroom discussions, and, thus, teachers and students should have access to grammatical terms and definitions. Students must be able to articulate how sentences are constructed, and, therefore, I view NCTE (2002) as endorsing sources with which to do this. To this end, the experts have suggested value in students having access to grammar glossaries, and, as a result, several of the instructional sources analyzed in this paper include comprehensive examples of such.

Educators adopting the CCSS (2010) as a curriculum for ELA instruction must consider what the national, authoritative source, the NCTE, recognizes as the best instructional methods of grammar. The CCSS (2010) was first developed at the federal level in order to provide the States with a common, streamlined set of math and ELA standards. Public schools in each state

may opt in or out of CCSS (2010) adoption, and I purport those who opt-in should consider what

the NCTE says about the specific manner in which these ELA standards be taught. As an

experienced educator, my PLC has never discussed explicit NCTE guidelines, but only

connected beliefs (which were not reinforced with the literature) on grammar instruction related

to such guidelines and resolutions. For this reason, I conclude the literature supports value in

PLCs reviewing this specific information, with the intent of staying connected with established

foundational and organizational values (NCTE, 1985; 2002). I find that reviewing the source

itself, not only the concept (an idea with no source cited) presents great value to the PLC

process, ensuring teachers have the full background knowledge necessary when proceeding with

the selection of instructional sources and professional development on CG application.

Teacher Beliefs About Grammar Instruction While Participating in a PLC

In an effort to infuse classrooms with the best grammar instruction, an organizational

consideration must be made about teacher understandings, PLC participation, and the need for

instructional supports. Teachers who are most effective with instruction must have a

comprehensive understanding of recent grammar instructional resources, and, often,

organizations place teachers in groups (PLCs) to support learning new teaching methods. Work

completed by the graduate student, McClure (2007), revealed that teachers benefit greatly from

participating in PLCs to review instructional grammar material.

As I spent extensive time reading and analyzing the literature, I was influenced by

McClure's (2007) work, which took a closer look at how middle school teachers define grammar

as it relates to ELA instruction. This analysis developed my awareness of the current state of

teacher grammar knowledge in PLCs. I believe this is where the organizational grammar

instruction investigation must begin, as teachers have great influence over their instruction

through their own understandings and beliefs. McClure (2007) reinforced this idea, as she examined teacher beliefs about grammar and the teaching of it and explored what they report to be sources of their own grammar knowledge. For example, she noted students with the ability to use standard grammar gain the "societal power of academic English" (McClure, 2007, p. 4), also what Micciche (2004) and Kolln (1996) argued for. McClure (2007) concluded teachers "define grammar as syntax, rhetoric, prescriptive rules, usage, structure, parts of speech and mechanics" (p. 2). Finally, she considered how grammar instruction professional development (PD) "is conducted, and what the resulting influences have on teacher beliefs" (McClure, 2007, p. 1). A synthesis of the strengths in McClure's (2007) research reveals that societal impacts, teacher definitions of grammar, and instructor beliefs must all be considered by organizations utilizing PLCs to plan instruction. This finding directly influenced the selection of sources for review, as I found it most useful to analyze texts that presented what was already deemed significant in McClure's (2007) work. Thus, the sources all touch on societal impact, grammar definitions, and teacher beliefs.

Once again, McClure's (2007) research was at the center of what I was investigating, and, along with my professional experience, I recognized the great impact teacher foundational beliefs have on organizations seeking to teach grammar. School districts need to know what teachers think of grammar, how they define it, and whether they value it or not. I also suspect that schools who hire teachers with no interest or knowledge of contextualized grammar instruction will not be satisfied with their teaching performance. There must be existing commitment and skill, along with effective teaching materials and resources. McClure (2007) stated similar findings that "beliefs are important to student learning," and that PD "may have some effect on teacher beliefs" (p. 33). Without this background information, subsequent

planning for implementing instructional sources will be less effective because the preparation must start with understanding the individuals who deliver the instruction. McClure's (2007) findings revealed to me that teachers with exceptional knowledge, expertise, or desire to teach contextualized grammar will make greater instructional gains than those who do not. Once established, organizations can use this background knowledge to inform themselves as they plan PD on specific grammar sources. For example, if a PLC has limited knowledge, but a strong desire to learn, certain instructional resources designed to inform (teach) teachers will be most useful. On the other hand, if teachers already possess vast grammar knowledge, but need help with contextualized delivery, sources with lists of teaching strategies would be more beneficial. In short, without knowing the PLC beliefs or investing in teacher buy-in, instructional strategies and implementation will be less effective or not effective at all.

In her dissertation, McClure (2007) notes that some scholars believe no SAE grammar instruction should take place in classrooms, whereas others believe it is important (p. 1). During professional conversations I have had with other ELA teachers I have noted some teachers do not support any grammar instruction. Similar to Kolln (1985; 1996), I found this troubling. For example, teachers are concerned with student performance on standardized testing, which typically is a prerequisite for admission to higher education. Generally speaking, teachers strive to prepare their students for future life experiences, including entrance into work programs, technical schools, universities, or colleges. If a command of grammar is linked to future life opportunities and higher education admission, teachers would want their students to be best prepared, which is what McClure (2007) reinforced in her work.

As stated above, McClure's (2007) research identified how teachers define grammar. This information was helpful to me during my research, because, as I selected sources for the

critical analysis, I was able to align them with how teachers define grammar. In other words, the sources I reviewed can be used successfully with the way many teachers define grammar.

McClure's (2007) research examined teacher PD courses that informed their teaching. I found this insightful because if teachers are participating in PD sessions, they could easily select the sources in this critical review for their own study. With a personalized or specialized PD session, teachers will have a greater likelihood of implementing the source successfully. Subsequently, in McClure's (2007) findings, she noted teachers were motivated to participate in PD sessions in order to develop innovative approaches to grammar instruction. Again, this suggests teachers desire to learn new strategies, find new sources, and implement them with accuracy, and a PD session on these sources could prove beneficial. In PLCs I have participated in, teacher choice has greatly impacted the team's motivation and engagement in the process. Finally, McClure (2007) stated teachers sought easier internet sources for teaching grammar, which could easily be infused into PD sessions developed for the sources under review. This teacher interest in online sources is logical, as I have used various Google Applications for Education (a suite of productivity tools to help students and teachers interact across devices) to deliver instruction. Thus, the teaching sources are more useful to many teachers in digital forms.

Future teachers, or pre-service teachers, as well as current educators, must be well-prepared and equipped to instruct grammar in today's ELA middle-level classrooms. Requisite knowledge and skills are necessary to instruct students, and much of the research suggests a need to prepare pre-service teachers in colleges and universities (Hadjioannou & Hutchinson, 2010). Additional scholars have written about a teacher's need for foundational knowledge of language in order to best teach it (Jones et al., 2012).

Lack of pre-service and current teacher grammar knowledge. Research shows a considerable lack of pre-service and current teacher grammatical knowledge (Jones et al., 2012). I agree that if our teachers do not possess strong grammatical knowledge, they will not be proficient when teaching grammar. There has been an "absence of explicit grammar teaching in the US for nearly 50 years, which has resulted in many present English teachers not having the grammatical subject knowledge needed to teach grammar confidently" (Jones et al., 2012, p. 5). Along with Jones et al. (2012), my experience has shown me that ELA teachers are insecure about student questions, as they do not have the grammar background knowledge required to confidently guide and instruct lessons.

Hadjioannou and Hutchinson (2010) purport teachers must experience "long-term theoretical coursework" (p. 92) in order to be prepared with grammar knowledge. Professionally, I have found that my most knowledgeable teaching cohorts are those who received long-term traditional grammar instruction themselves and have practiced in the ELA area for fifteen or more years. Further, Hadjioannou and Hutchinson 2010 suggest teachers must desire to explore "language, and need to know how to observe it, as well as know where to look for answers" (p. 91). If teachers are committed to teaching grammar accurately and effectively, there is a likelihood students will receive quality instruction. To this end, the sources I have selected for critical review will greatly support teachers who are investigating grammar and seeking answers. These sources can give guidance and support to teachers who seek to develop their grammar instruction and curriculum, as they are designed for active teacher-learners, even those who need reinforcement in grammar knowledge, as the literature suggests is the case.

Administrator support and involvement. Administrators leading ELA PLCs can influence middle-level grammar instruction, teacher meta-knowledge, and effective instructional

materials. Jones et al. (2012) have pointed out that if "our society values grammar, policy-makers and professionals need to generate practices in the teaching of writing which are genuinely pedagogically powerful" (p. 26), meaning grammar instruction must be made clear and understandable for today's middle-level teachers. Administrators and policy-makers play a large role in this educational foundation and potential for academic growth.

This literature review includes the most significant and credible sources on the issue of middle-level grammar instruction and the need for teachers to have a comprehensive understanding of the most current teaching resources. I have conducted a considerable amount of searching and reading to identify existing information for this review and have offered my perspective on how the scholars have shaped my understanding of the grammar teaching issue. Furthermore, I have presented connections to this literature stemming from my own professional experience and knowledge. My findings present the rationale for my research problem, as the review addressed the issue of whether or not teachers have the best resources at hand to teach grammar and whether or not they understand how to apply them. This information has influenced the selection of resources under critical review in the Results & Discussion chapter.

I have identified various scholars and literature both for and against grammar instruction to avoid bias. I have analyzed the NCTE resolution and guideline related to grammar instruction and identified scholars who deem best practice as contextualized grammar instruction. I have reviewed the importance of PLC teacher beliefs and understandings as they relate to grammar instruction and have also identified the current lack of pre-service and current teacher grammar knowledge and need for support in this area. All of these concepts have contributed to how the literature fits into the wider context of my research problem related to teacher use of instructional sources.

Much of the research I am providing in this literature review validates the need for further investigation of grammatical instructional resources and the application of them. The literature points toward the need for this critical analysis in order to support teachers in acquiring and applying instructional resources to effectively implement contextualized grammar approaches in the middle-level ELA classroom.

Chapter III: Methodology

The purpose of this paper is to identify the most useful grammar instruction resources for middle-level ELA teachers and to ensure teachers can effectively apply them. This critical analysis includes a Source Selection, Framework Selection and Design, Data Collection Procedures, Data Analysis, and Limitations.

Source Selection

I began by finding potential instructional guides for ELA middle-level teachers through a broad approach of examining my professional collection as well as online guides available for purchase. In order to narrow down my sources, I categorized them by identifying characteristics of sources in the areas of *instructional purpose* (presenting contextualized grammar best practices, allowing students to present their learning needs, and encouraging teachers to respond accordingly) and *teacher need* (features source application in a time-efficient, instructionally effective manner). Next, I examined the pool for those that featured grammar instruction history, philosophy (foundations, definitions, goals, and principles), and application tools (table of contents, grammar glossaries, and a scope and sequence). Lastly, I conducted the analysis itself.

The instructional guide source selection derived from a specific framework I developed for this critical review. I identified the hallmarks of these guides, which are explained in the following section. I did not select theoretical articles or research articles but did use such sources in the literature review to help explain the purpose and significance of my project. The literature frequently cited several landmark articles. As I reviewed the bibliography of one of the first scholarly articles, I compared it to the bibliographies in subsequent works. When I discovered the same source was listed in multiple references, I knew it was a fundamental, credible source to aid my review. Ultimately, this process helped me develop a framework for a

critical review, aiding my evaluation of the instructional grammar guides. The final research

subjects selected for the analysis were sources by Benjamin and Oliva (2006), Crovitz and

Devereaux (2016), Haussamen (2003), and Kolln et al. (2016).

As I analyzed my topic for the critical analysis, I used the search terms in Table 1 as a

tool to locate and finalize instructional sources. Table 1 pinpoints exactly where my search for

terms began and where it concluded. This process resulted in a data analysis being the

observations I made about the texts.

Table 1

Research Data Collection Search Terms & Findings

Search terms	Explanation	Subsequent research located
1. rhetorical grammar and instruction	I began with this search term as it had been introduced to me in previous research for a related MS level project.	Kolln, 1996; Micciche, 2004
2. traditional grammar and instruction	I searched *traditional grammar instruction* next, as I received this type of instruction when I was in middle school and was successful with this learning style. I wanted to learn research revealed that *traditional grammar instruction* does not improve student writing ability.	Braddock et al., 1963; Hartwell, 1985; Hillocks, 1984; Kolln, 1981
3. middle-level grammar instruction	I searched for any other types of research-based grammar instructional methods, as I had become satisfied with the research against traditional grammar. I searched the phrase *middle level grammar instruction*.	Jones et al., 2012
4. contextual grammar and instruction	I recalled that, in previous research, I read grammar instruction is best achieved in student writing. I searched the terms *contextualized grammar instruction*.	Jones et al., 2012
5. linguistic grammar and instruction	Once I began to investigate instructional sources for my review, I discovered the search term *linguistic grammar instruction*. This type of grammar instruction is grounded in English, not Latin, and relies on the underlying principle that students are language experts.	Benjamin & Oliva, 2006

Note. The use of a dash indicates a cell could not be filled because data was not obtained or no subsequent research was located as a result.

Framework Selection and Design

The framework for my critical analysis followed the method of Jesson and Lacey (2006): theory, conceptual variations, and policy. One of the major theories in the literature, as well as throughout the sources under critical review is that contextualized grammar instruction is best practice, as it is student-valued, relevant to learners, and provides purposeful experiences related to grammar.

Conceptual variations that were noted during the research include specific ways authors have operationalized (used) key concepts (Jesson & Lacey, 2006). For example, the terms *traditional* or *formal* grammar were used to convey outdated instructional methods, whereas *contextualized* or *rhetorical* grammar was used to convey modern methods (this was true in sources used for Chapters 2 and 4 of this paper). In addition, the sources by Kolln et al. (2016), Haussamen (2004), and Benjamin and Oliva (2007) based their work respectively on the grammar terms *foundations*, *goals*, and *principles*.

Policy related to my framework for critical analysis relates to NCTE (1985; 2002) resolution and guideline alignment and CCSS (2010) ELA adoption in the public school setting. Policy intention, implementation, and outcome were discussed in the literature review. Subsequently, the sources selected aligned with the NCTE in order to best support educators seeking to teach contextualized grammar. Finally, the CCSS (2010) ELA is policy adopted by a school district's Board of Education via the State of Wisconsin.

Ultimately, the final sources were selected due to recent publication dates and comprehensive offerings of contextualized grammar instructional strategies and teacher supports. As a whole, the sources suggest teaching strategies for college-level students, but with my evaluation and experience, I have found relevance in applying them at the middle level too. The

source by Kolln, et al. (2016) stood out as being the most substantial due to its longitude of 11

editions, for the comprehensive grammar research conducted by the authors, and for having the

most thorough collection of grammatical concepts. Other sources, Benjamin & Oliva (2006),

Crovitz and Devereaux (2016), and Haussamen (2003), were published by the NCTE and align

with their 1985 and 2002 resolutions and guidelines on grammar. Finally, this same source

group possessed frequent citation by other scholars, which was another criterion I used in

narrowing my selection.

To locate scholarly articles with contextualized grammar instruction strategies to support

teachers, I searched online databases, including Google Scholar and University of Wisconsin-

Stout Interlibrary Loan and Document Delivery system (*ILLiad)*; key journals such as

Composition Studies, the NCTE's *The English Journal* and *Voices from the Middle*; and

bibliographies of relevant articles. In addition to searching online databases and journals, four

other sources were used for the search: printed books by Benjamin and Oliva (2006), Crovitz and

Devereaux (2016), Haussamen (2003), Kolln et al. (2016). Various terminology related to

grammar instruction was identified within the sources as keywords included: middle-level

grammar instruction, contextualized grammar, traditional grammar, rhetorical grammar,

descriptive grammar, prescriptive grammar, and linguistic grammar (see Table 1).

In addition to the description above, I sought to delineate the authenticity and validity of

each grammar instructional guide according to how the literature explained the history of

grammar instruction and past methodologies (Hartwell, 1985; Hillocks, 1984; Kolln, 1981),

defined grammar (Hartwell, 1985; Kolln, 1981, 1996; Patterson, 2001), and described the

movement toward modern, contextualized grammar instruction (Kolln, 1996; Micciche, 2004;

Patterson, 2001). Using the body of literature as a guide, I classified the instructional sources,

seeking shared qualities or characteristics, such as how thoroughly (pre-service and current) ELA teachers are equipped to teach middle level grammar (Jones et al., 2012; Hadjioannou & Hutchinson, 2010) and what types of PD experiences they have in PLCs (McClure, 2007). I then compared all of these findings with my own professional knowledge and experience.

Data Analysis

The critical review of instructional guides for middle school teachers was conducted through intensive text analysis and annotation process where I read and studied each source, drew out connections among them, and searched for similarities and differences. As I examined them, I recorded theoretical questions I had for each source. I determined the important text within each source and analyzed vocabulary terms, definitions, and section headings. Toward the conclusion of the examination, I synthesized each source into a coherent whole in order to make inferences about contextualized grammar instruction. Comprehending and processing these conclusions then led me to outline what I wanted to analyze in the sources individually and as a whole. My final analysis centered on

- exemplar middle-level instructional guides;
- foundational launching points for grammar instruction; and
- instructional tools provided for effective application and delivery.

In addition, I systematically observed and annotated as I examined the sources. I actively investigated what the texts presented and recorded the findings in an organized manner. This data was qualitative; as I sought the absence or presence of a characteristic in each source (criteria described above). I did not collect quantitative observations of numerical values through counting or measuring. As I studied, I tracked the data according to the source, author, source features (usability), and grammar instruction strategy (CG methods only).

Limitations

One limitation to my methodology was my inability to locate another critical analysis of the literature for middle-level ELA instructional grammar guides, making my project particularly challenging; there was no other apparent peer research for comparison. Throughout my research and analysis of the sources, I had to select analytical methods and criterion, based off my professional knowledge and experiences from the past seventeen years, versus having guides from previous scholars from which to glean support.

Chapter IV: Results and Discussion

Research from past decades reveals a debate over the value of grammar instruction in the middle-level classroom (Hartwell, 1985; Kolln, 1981). Educators who still seek to infuse grammar in ELA have created a market for supportive instructional resources. As a result, instructional guides, some which are published by the NCTE, support teachers when infusing grammar in the classroom. Martha Kolln, a respected scholar in the field of rhetorical grammar instruction purports the results of grammar instruction should develop student command of Edited American English (EAE) (Kolln et al., 2016). Other key points by Kolln et al. (2016) reiterate that literature is a useful source with which to examine language structure, as well as how the situation or time period can influence language. In order to best achieve this understanding and application, teachers need resources to help them teach grammar concepts effectively and efficiently. Moreover, they need guidance in utilizing such sources.

The research question posed for this project is: "Which middle level ELA grammar teaching resources provide teachers with instructional guidance, and how should these sources be implemented?" I have conducted an in-depth content analysis and drew out key issues and findings related to the group of sources at hand. I found it necessary to identify useful characteristics of contextualized grammar instruction materials. In doing so, I drilled down, seeking sources with instructional purpose (best practices) in conjunction with supporting teacher needs. Together, these items resulted in a group of useful and effective middle level contextualized grammar instructional materials.

In the lengthy debate over the value of grammar instruction, scholars such as Hartwell (1985) and Kolln (1981) argued vigorously against and for it, respectively. This critical analysis does not discuss whether or not grammar instruction should take place but dissects and examines

samples of instructional guides that value this practice. The next section includes an overview of exemplary middle-level teaching guides doing just that.

Exemplary Middle-Level Guides that Value Grammar Instruction

The results of the critical analysis indicate the sources reviewed are exemplary instructional grammar guides that can offer teachers a great amount of support in the classroom (see Table 2). Several of them stood out to me because the authors are experienced ELA teachers at the middle, high school, and university level. Further, these professionals not only have researched grammar instruction extensively but have successfully aligned grammar foundations with instructional methods reported to be effective and resulting in student growth. The authors take significant time describing grammar's historical background. They also employ established research as a framework for their own CG foundations, strategies, and tools. This signifies a source's usefulness, as professional expertise, along with a publication aligned with present instructional practices, deemed its value.

Table 2

Exemplary Middle-Level Guides that Value Grammar Instruction

Author, Publication Date	Title	Historical Background	CG Emphasis	Useful TOC	Sample Scope and Sequence	Sample Grammar Glossary
Haussamen, 2003	*Grammar Alive! A Guide for Teachers*	X	X	X		X
Benjamin & Oliva, 2006	*Engaging Grammar: Practical Advice for Real Classrooms*	X	X	X	X	X
Kolln et al., 2016	*Understanding English Grammar*	X	X	X	X	X
Crovitz & Devereaux, 2016	*Grammar to Get Things Done: A Practical Guide for Teaching Anchored in Real Word Usage*	X	X	X		X

Note. An 'X' in the table indicates the presence of specific characteristics within each source.

In addition, the results indicate the sources present shared themes on foundational launching points and contextualized implementation of grammar instruction. Thus, the sources were selected because as an educator I found supportive instructional value in them individually and as a whole. For example, they reinforce each other by noting similar CG instructional methods, align with the literature that values grammar instruction, and can easily be used by educators seeking to reinforce ELA principles and standards. The specific themes I have

analyzed include foundational launching points for grammar instruction, properly adopting CG instruction, and fully utilizing the source tools.

Foundational Launching Points for Grammar Instruction

My professional ELA teaching experience of seventeen years has revealed to me that when teams of teachers seeking to implement grammar instruction in the classroom share a foundational launching point, they can better align their organizational vision by working from the same list of beliefs and commitments. PLCs must establish goals that are reinforced with shared pedagogical beliefs in order to help them achieve identified initiatives. When a team has a common mission or vision they can assure all stakeholders have a uniform understanding of the instructional philosophy and methods. The foundational launching points discovered in the sources include grammar definitions and goals. Each source justifies establishing a foundational launching point for grammar instruction because their content aligns with NCTE recommendations (NCTE, 1985; 2002). Further, the NCTE published the works by Haussamen (2003), Benjamin and Oliva (2006), and Crovitz and Devereaux (2016).

The foundational launching points presented can streamline the instructional practice from teacher to teacher, which is a common goal for educational departments. PLCs seek to select common essential standards, identify common learning targets, design similar lessons and collect data through common assessments. When groups start out believing in a shared grammar foundation, the team's objectives will be more easily met as all stakeholders base their involvement off the same set of ideals. Furthermore, when teams gather to share the student data they have collected, the foundational commitments can be revisited and reaffirmed. Each source analyzed in this section offers a way for teachers to coordinate instructional planning and design through their commitment to grammar definitions and goals.

My analysis revealed that each source offered a brief history of grammar instruction. This knowledge can help PLCs seeking to base their instruction on similar foundations. For example, when teachers fully understand grammar instruction's history and various types, they can then adopt an instructional plan that is knowledgeable and informed. I suggest that PLCs take time to review the history of grammar instruction in the US in order to bring their team awareness of the political and social implications that grammar skills have had in the society their students live and learn in.

Readers of these sources are rewarded with the knowledge of where grammar instruction has come from over centuries, which can better gauge how it should be taught today. This type of informative overview aids teachers in understanding past practices, beliefs, and controversies of grammar instruction such as who valued or dictated it, how it was taught, and which populations were or were not allowed to receive it. Specifically, when teachers have an understanding of past grammar instructional methods they can be sure to adopt new, modern techniques, versus inadvertently using out-dated methods such as out-of-context worksheets or textbooks. Outdated teaching methods typically have not reinforced the value of students and their texts.

Best ways to parse out foundations. After PLCs have a foundational understanding of grammar instruction's history, they can then decide as a team which definitions and/or goals to adopt. My interpretation of the sources is that the best instructional guides for grammar infusion will offer useful foundations for a PLC to adopt and support their learning and planning. The sources that I found which do this are Haussamen (2003), Benjamin and Oliva (2006), Kolln et al. (2016), and Crovitz and Devereaux (2016). This inclusion promotes buy-in and understanding of stakeholders such as teachers, administrators, board members, students, and

families. Types of grammar foundations that stood out in these sources include *definitions of grammar* and *grammar goals*.

There is no denying the subject knowledge of Kolln et al. (2016) as they offer a definition of grammar for teachers as they plan how to infuse CG lessons. The authors specifically define grammar, which helps teachers visualize and instruct within a relevant context. Based on reasoning, I argue that when teachers have an established definition of grammar, their instruction will be more focused and direct. Kolln et al. (2016) purport the value of grammar ownership for *every* learner, regardless of social class or background. In my experience, I find grammar ownership to be ownership of the grammar that students use in their everyday speaking and writing. The perspectives these authors take when defining grammar remind all teachers that every student has the right to learn about their personal grammar, and should own it. The definitions are written from the viewpoint of any student and apply to the grammar knowledge they are born with and also what they can learn. This type of foundational grammar definition sets the instructional tone that grammar is not controlled by any single person or group, but rather, that all people who use language own their grammar.

In my estimation, these grammar definitions can be easily applied to any student's personal writing. My recommendation for teachers seeking to infuse the working definitions of grammar for students is to post them in the classroom and refer back to them frequently during class discussions. The teacher should guide the students as they read and process the definitions, which develops ownership. During student-teacher writing conferences on grammar use, teachers should refer to these definitions, reminding all writers, especially tentative ones, that they possess power and ownership over their written and spoken expression.

As an ELA teacher, I advocate for all learners, regardless of home speech or background. The literature review overwhelmingly revealed that students need to command SAE in order to be accepted in various social hierarchies and circles, including acceptance into higher education institutions, political office, and private business employment. When teachers set grammar goals for instruction, students have a greater chance of developing the skills necessary to command SAE by the time they complete their public school education. In turn, this allows students the option of moving on to the highest level of social acceptance they wish to pursue.

Haussamen (2003) wisely provides "Grammar Goals A, B, and C" (p. 4) for teachers to implement as they develop grammar foundations. I personally endorse Haussamen's goals because through my many years in the ELA middle-level classroom, I can see how they are beneficial for learners. I analyzed the first two goals for this review as they related to my professional experience the most.

Goal A specifically points out that "all learners should end their schooling with the ability to communicate with others" (Haussamen, 2003, p. 4). Haussamen (2003) explains these goals can support learners throughout their "learning years, up to the end of high school" (p. 3) which suggests the goal is intended to be scaffolded throughout the grade levels. If grade-level teams plan to use this goal in a vertically-aligned manner, they should work toward it continually until the student leaves the middle-level building. Any student data gathered should be forwarded to the high school ELA teachers who can then continue to reinforce the goal with the student. I recommend this goal be tracked by individual student and that teachers pass the tracking document along each year. This process would assure Goal A is practiced until the learner ends their schooling, as Haussamen (2003) suggests. Further, a specific tracking form that includes the skills students need to practice or be assessed on could be used to record the progress of each

learner. I suggest this document be filled out by the teacher and student to promote self-reflection, awareness, partnership, and ownership.

Goal A includes speaking and writing in SAE and is particularly valuable because it validates that learners of any social status or ethnic background must be taught this skill (regardless of dialect). I highly suggest this grammar vision as it promotes equality for all students. English has a wide variety of dialects as students come to the classroom from various places with different types of grammatical knowledge, as well as from different ethnic backgrounds. These differences result in a variety of learner needs which is why Haussamen's (2003) Goal A is foundational in establishing SAE understanding for each student. In other words, all learners deserve the opportunity to understand and know how to effectively apply SAE in appropriate settings (formal or informal), and Haussamen's (2003) Goal A supports every student in this quest.

Promoting grammar instruction and equality for all students is crucial as scholars have indicated social power and acceptance are linked with grammar use and skill (Kolln, 1996; McClure, 2007; and Micciche, 2004). Some students grow up speaking SAE while others grow up having learned a different dialect of English in their home. As a result, learning SAE is easier for some students than others. However, this circumstance does not negate the importance that all students should have access to grammar instruction and the achievement towards Goal A (Haussamen, 2003). This instruction, when guaranteed for every learner, can produce more equipped users of grammar, supporting students of every background in gaining the level of social acceptance they seek.

Haussamen's (2003) Goal B points out that grammar instruction "affords *all* students the opportunity to develop the skill of analyzing grammar sentence structures in SAE, using

terminology correctly" (p. 4). Haussamen's claim indicates great value to this goal, as once again, it embraces learners of all backgrounds and strives to teach all students to analyze grammar structure. Further, it points out that students should be able to use correct terminology when analyzing sentence structures in SAE. Here, Haussamen (2003) clearly does not say that students must *memorize* terminology but rather, they should develop the skill of critically thinking and using correct terminology. This source also provides a grammar glossary in the appendix as a teacher and student resource. I believe that the practice of correct terminology application will result in a more advanced understanding of SAE when it comes to text analysis of literature, writing various genres (such as to persuade, entertain, or inform), and speaking to audiences with a specific rhetorical intention. My professional experience reveals that the better students command SAE, the more enhanced their overall learning experience and ability will be. In brief, when students experience set grammar foundations such as Haussamen's (2003) Goals A and B, they will more fully understand the purpose and outcomes of their grammar instruction and be more empowered by their learning experience. To clarify, Haussamen's (2003) grammar Goals A and B contribute to a framework (or foundation) of grammar instruction and its social affordances for all students.

If an organization were to adapt grammar goals recommended by Haussamen (2003) or grammar definitions recommended by Kolln et al. (2016), I suggest PLCs deconstruct these foundations to understand them fully and identify their relevance to the organization's grammar mission and vision. Adoption of both foundations may not be necessary, and teams may find only selecting one area is sufficient for their needs. However, my review indicates it may be advantageous to review both foundational areas examined here. Revisiting such items regularly through professional discussions will strengthen teaching commitments to grammar instruction

and result in more effective classroom instruction. Opportunities to reflect on classroom experiences, along with the purpose for doing such activities, can also reinvigorate PLC commitments.

My analysis concludes the sources by Benjamin and Oliva (2006), Crovitz and Devereaux (2016), Haussamen (2003), and Kolln et al. (2016) can be easily used in conjunction with CCSS (2010), adopted by most Wisconsin public school districts. As of 2018, the CCSS (2010) encompass ELA standards for learning and the results indicate no significant problems with the sources detracting from districts seeking implementation. In short, the grammar foundations available in these sources will provide PLCs with the support they need to align CCSS (2010) with their instructional scope and sequence.

Properly Adopt Contextualized Grammar Instruction

Educators who use the resources I've reviewed must properly adopt what the guides say effective CG instruction is. Crovitz and Devereaux (2016) stress that contextualized grammar instruction should come from student experiences such as life, speech, common writing, or observations, and is not "just anything that happens to be showing up in the curriculum" (p. 24). I highly suggest that grammar examples and practice come from the lives of learners, such as in a daily writing journal. Teachers should encourage students to select a writing topic of their choice which provides them with an engaging, contextualized experience. I liken this to making grammar a personal experience for the student so they can more deeply engage in their learning. Peer editing is an activity that provides this engagement. Here, students review each other's writing to make suggestions, ask clarifying questions on word choice, or add figurative language to enhance the author's message. Without this personalization grammar can be "distant and

perplexing to learners and thus, difficult for teachers to teach" (Crovitz & Devereaux, 2016, p. 24), but when teachers involve students in the process, the experience stays engaging.

Adequate adoption of what the guides recommend for CG instruction will be significant in the resulting student outcomes. To do this, teachers must review and understand the approach of linguistic grammar instruction (Benjamin & Oliva, 2006). This method requires an instructional infusion of grammar principles and characteristics. Specifically, linguistic grammar principles recommend teachers "recognize that students are experts of their own language," along with the understanding that "linguistic grammar is grounded in English, not Latin" (Benjamin & Oliva, 2006, p. 4-5). In other words, students come to class with an innate understanding and ability to use the grammar they began learning at birth, and educators must consider this when teaching. The expertise a student brings to class should be the launching point for instruction. Teachers must take what students present and use that formative data to plan and implement instruction. These sources can assist teachers in doing so effectively.

Regarding linguistic grammar instruction, Benjamin and Oliva (2006) explain that grammar should be categorized as word classes (a new approach) instead of the eight parts of speech (the old approach). When considering linguistic grammar instructional word classes, teachers have the option to present the "*form, function* and *use* approach" (Benjamin & Oliva, 2006, p. 5). *Form* refers to the shape of the word, which can be categorized and is *what* the word is. The *function* of a word explains *how* it is used in a sentence and what its job is (use).

After reviewing Benjamin and Oliva's suggestion to infuse linguistic grammar principles, I cannot conclude if it is the best approach. I would say it might be good for some but not as good for others (teachers or students), and think teachers should make the judgment call to apply the form, function, use approach only if they feel confident with the method. Teachers

themselves were most likely not taught in this manner and it may result in confusion if they cannot apply the method accurately. For teachers seeking to try it, I recommend showing it to students and letting them expand with the approach if it makes sense to them. I also recommend that teachers thoroughly prepare before attempting this implementation as well as reflect afterward.

If using the approach suggested by Benjamin and Oliva (2006), I recommend teachers and students take simple sentences and dissect them to understand what the form, function, and use of various words are. Creating anchor charts, or large posters, and visual aids of class findings are recommended when tracking learning together in the classroom. My findings reveal the sources did not provide such supports or discussion.

If implementing Benjamin and Oliva's (2006) approach, teachers should guide students with simple sentences and work their way toward more complex sentences. This process, referred to as gradual release, is when teachers begin by demonstrating for students, then work together on low-complexity tasks (related to the specific skill), and finally, gradually releasing the students to perform the skill independently and proficiently. The gradual release method can prove useful for hesitant teachers seeking to try the form, function, and use approach, as they will not feel like time was wasted if they take small steps when first applying the method. If the mini-lesson is successful, teachers can proceed the next time with deeper incorporation of the method.

Collectively, the findings indicate the sources recommend CG instruction. The analysis concludes that linguistic grammar instruction is a focal point for effective instructional guides, as several from the collection offer strategies and information on implementation. The sources that do this are Benjamin and Oliva (2006), Crovitz and Devereaux (2016), Haussamen (2003), and

Kolln et al. (2016). There are slight variations between them, such as Crovitz and Devereaux (2016) who recommend teachers experiment with grammar instruction as it takes place. I recommend teachers present grammar instruction as an authentic process to their students. Authenticity refers to examining and dissecting contextualized examples of grammar in order to draw conclusions, identify patterns, and develop understanding. Authenticity also refers to using valuable text, not out-of-context worksheets or grammar textbooks. Further, in order to authenticate grammar learning, teachers and students must take chances in writing together even when there is apprehension.

Authentic, student-valued text will help drive grammar lessons in a meaningful way. This text can serve as examples for examination and discussions of grammar. For example, valuable student texts include journal entries, persuasive essays, or informational reports, to name a few. Another helpful strategy is to examine texts used in other subjects such as math, science, and social studies. Story problems in math textbooks demonstrate SAE and can serve as a grammatical reinforcement for students. Likewise, an article used in science class to teach a lesson on motion and force deliver SAE grammar samples. In a similar fashion, a website used to study ancient civilizations exposes students to CG. This type of contextualized grammar evaluation of text is also valuable in demonstrating audience, purpose, and format. Even subjects such as art, music, physical education, computers, family and consumer education, and health present authentic and valuable texts where students and teachers can examine grammar.

Another important finding indicates the value of classroom grammar discussions. Benjamin and Oliva (2006) include an excerpt from a teacher's journal where they "opened the lesson with some questions about language… [and found] the students eager to discuss how they speak and write in different situations depending on audience" (p. 85). Students are often

motivated to share their own writing which can be powerful in discussions because it provides

relevant examples to the entire group. Teachers should also demonstrate grammatical choices

during discussions and reveal their thinking process while writing. This can be done through a

think aloud where teachers literally verbalize what they are thinking as they demonstrate a

grammatical choice in composition. In this setting, a document camera is very useful as teachers

think aloud while they compose pieces. Verbalized teacher thoughts accompanied by teacher

writing provide a student visuals of the SAE composition process. I also recommend teachers

ask students which grammatical choices are best for SAE. For example, a teacher could ask,

"Should I write, *The girl saw her kitten on the sidewalk* or *The girl saw hers kitten on the*

sidewalk?" Allowing students to help decide on the best grammatical choice reinforces that they

can successfully apply grammar. Students can then replicate this process in their own writing

and speaking.

     As an ELA teacher, I know we are often uncomfortable with dissecting grammar with

students *in the moment,* but this is the authenticity that makes the instruction valuable for

learners. Teachers seek accuracy in their instruction and do not wish to show their students they

too can err in grammatical use, but conversely, the experts in this collection recommend

experimentation and taking reasonable instructional risks (Crovitz & Devereaux, 2016). If

teachers are apprehensive they can experiment through co-teaching, where two teachers instruct

a lesson together, or instructional coaching, where a coach observes a teacher's lesson and meets

with them afterward to strategize adjustments for the next lesson. Overall, I see value in taking

chances, or showing some vulnerability to one's students, because often times they also are

feeling vulnerable as they learn grammar. This shared uncertainty can encourage middle-level

students to bravely apply various grammatical approaches in their writing, resulting in better, more purposefully written pieces.

In any case, teachers need to know they have the support of their PLCs even when they make errors during contextualized grammar instruction. This support includes peer teachers, instructional coaches, and administrators who can assist teachers in developing and strengthening their instructional techniques. Having the best instructional resources to guide this risk-taking is one of the most reassuring tools a teacher can use as a guide along the way. When teachers have this support in place and try CG approaches the result will be student grammar knowledge and growth.

Fully Utilize the Source Tools

The sources under review each provide effective tools such as the table of contents (TOC), grammar glossaries, and a scope and sequence for teachers to utilize during grammar instruction. The sources which do this are Benjamin and Oliva (2006), Crovitz and Devereaux (2016), Haussamen (2003), and Kolln et al. (2016). These tools should be used by teachers to guide themselves as they use the sources; however, it would be best to only implement one or two sources at a time. Attempting to use each source at one time would be counterproductive, as it would be too many resources at once. My conclusion is that teachers should utilize the sources separately, meaning they should select only one (or two at the most) for implementation. Once they have selected the best source for their teaching needs (which is driven by student need and interest as well as by teacher knowledge, skill level, and interest), teachers should look deeper into the source(s) in order to be aware of the tools offered within.

To reiterate, I recommend teachers implement portions of the sources that best meet the needs of their students. In order to do this, they should make use of the resource's tools as this

application will develop teacher instructional proficiency and ensure students are receiving the lessons they need. Students must present their needs as teachers collect fresh data in order to drive the instruction process.

Table of contents. Teachers utilizing grammar teaching resources should make use of the table of contents (TOC) offered in the guide. Benjamin and Oliva (2006), Crovitz and Devereaux (2016), Haussamen (2003), and Kolln et al. (2016) each provide a useful TOC for teachers seeking to quickly find the tools they need. I personally recommend this practice as my professional experience has presented me with hundreds of professional texts over the years, and without first considering what is available in the TOC, important chunks of the instructional methodology can be missed. In an effort to save time, teachers may be tempted to jump to chapters that look most helpful and then unintentionally miss other content. Instead, I suggest they first review the TOC in order to get a full understanding of what the source can offer them. This practice ensures the teaching approach and grammar instruction meets valuable foundations PLCs have committed to, such as definitions and goals.

Within the TOC, teachers can quickly locate a history of grammar instruction and grammar foundations. Additionally, the TOC list insightful acknowledgments, such as forwards written by one author for another. Interestingly, the sources recommend and affirm each other's textbooks. For example, Benjamin and Oliva (2006) advise their readers to refer to Haussamen (2003). This demonstrates the significance of the sources as a collection of effective grammar instruction resources as the authors and foundations are linked. This connectedness between sources indicates the authors rightly conclude that CG instruction is the recommended method for those seeking to teach grammar. It reveals that over multiple years various scholars have

made similar recommendations. For instance, the concept of CG is presented in a thorough

fashion in the early parts of the sources, providing essential background information for teachers.

    Scope and sequence. The results of my analysis confirm teachers should utilize the TOC

to find a yearly overview, or scope and sequence. Benjamin and Oliva (2006) explain that "most

K-12 school districts do have a curriculum guide that lays out what should be taught and when

(scope and sequence)" (p. 120). They go on to present a scope and sequence for teachers to

adopt. This provides the depth and breadth of content a teacher must teach, referring specifically

to the grade level and development of the content and a suggested order to teach it in. My

analysis finds that teachers using Benjamin and Oliva's (2006) scope and sequence will provide

a more thorough learning experience for students because the instructional continuity provides

teachers with strings of lessons without content gaps or repetitions. CG construction is a broad

topic to cover, and a scope and sequence will help teachers to stay organized versus guessing at

what to infuse next into lessons. Further, a scope and sequence lends its hand to vertical

alignment among middle level ELA curricular planning.

    A sample scope and sequence provided by Benjamin and Oliva (2006) recommends the

incorporation of a "grade level range" and "four parts" into the document (p. 121). The grade

level ranges include "grades 4–5, 6–7, 8–9, and 10–11" (p. 120), and the four parts include

"content and application, suggested pedagogy, terminology, and summary" (p. 121). In fact, a

detailed sample of the scope and sequence can be found within the source itself and would be

highly useful for a PLC or entire ELA department. To summarize, when teachers adopt a scope

and sequence such as the one suggested, it can help avoid the problem of "not teaching enough

grammar or the right parts of it" (Haussamen, 2003, p. 3).

In addition to ensuring comprehensive lesson roll-out, a scope and sequence allows teachers to track specific grammar concepts they are able to cover over the course of a school year. Benjamin and Oliva (2006) and Crovitz and Devereaux (2016) specifically offer scope and sequence support for teachers in the TOC. Crovitz and Devereaux (2016) provide a section on teaching grammar *intentionally,* or with a plan in place, which provides sample units and planning for grammar integration, the contextualized teaching of grammar within writing lessons or other subject areas (math, science, social studies). Scope and sequence support can also redirect teachers who are unintentionally using traditional grammar instruction such as decontextualized worksheets and textbooks. Educators who use a scope and sequence can forward a list of completed instruction from one grade level to the next. I suggest this process of scaffolding curriculum be used for planning purposes. Much like gradual release, scaffolding includes instructional methods used by teachers to support them in developing higher level skills. This development moves students to a stronger understanding and desired skill level. This, along with formative student data, should be used by teachers to drive the next stages of instruction.

Grammar glossary. Teachers should choose a grammar glossary from within these sources to provide a metalinguistic tool for themselves and their students. Benjamin and Oliva (2006), Crovitz and Devereaux (2016), Haussamen (2003), and Kolln et al. (2016) provide useful options for teachers to choose from. The suggestions made by the authors provide glossaries with comprehensive lists of grammar terminology. Upon conducting my review of each source, one glossary does not stand out as more advantageous than the others. Considering each source provides a glossary, I suggest the instructor select the option that best fits the needs of the particular group of students they currently have. When considering all of the samples provided, I conclude if there is a specific glossary term the teacher knows her students need exposure in, she

should use that glossary. In other words, the glossary that best meets the needs of the current group of students should be selected. Specifically, teachers should search for terms their students need support with. They should investigate what one glossary offers and have a class discussion about those terms. This is an example of gathering data through a pre-assessment. If students have a very limited understanding of the terms assessed, that glossary may be too advanced. If there are some known terms and some unknown terms, that glossary would most likely best meet student needs. Ultimately, teachers must find out what these needs are. Grammar needs are different in various places, due to dialect and level of grammatical knowledge. This varies by town, county, region, and state. Teachers should look through the options of glossaries and select what they know is best for their student population.

I strongly recommend teachers become informed and knowledgeable with grammar terminology in order to explain it accurately to their students, to manage class discussions on word choice, and to help students edit their writing. Teachers should not only use a grammar glossary as a tool for their own purposes but should teach learners how to look up concepts and apply them accurately in SAE composition. This demonstration instruction helps students see the value of such a tool, and provides them gradual release in applying correct grammar terminology not only to their work but also when editing for peers, which is a useful ELA CG activity. Furthermore, selection of a useful grammar glossary will help teachers achieve Haussamen's (2003) Goal B.

My overall analysis supports the use of grammar glossaries in the ELA classroom. I recommend that teachers show students how to utilize a grammar glossary to strengthen their writing. With this tool, students should track and check their grammar meta-language for accuracy. This data can be gathered through standardized tests, common assessments created by

a PLC, or even by students in their grammar journal. This affords them the skill of recognizing the meaning of grammar terms, identifying them in their writing, and reviewing their own work for grammatical consistency and accuracy. The growth students will demonstrate will be age and developmentally appropriate. This simple exposure to the glossary can help develop knowledge and provide consistency for the student, opposed to having no exposure to glossary contents at all. Furthermore, much like a dictionary it is helpful for students to know grammar glossaries are available to them as a writing resource.

Areas Identified for Future Development

Authors, Benjamin and Oliva (2006), Crovitz and Devereaux (2016), Haussamen (2003), and Kolln et al. (2016), present the value of grammatical foundations as well as the utilization of resource tools. By understanding and utilizing specific aspects of the sources, these sources can greatly assist teachers seeking to implement CG instruction. However, the results of this analysis identified several areas for future development and growth. These sources may be more relevant to teachers had they provided anchor charts, student grammar journal reproducibles, presentation of the concept of infusing CG in subject areas beyond the ELA classroom, and technological suggestions in aiding CG lessons. The outcomes of such addendums in the sources could prove evidential in greater student grammar growth and learning.

The sources do not provide anchor charts for teachers to enlarge and present in the classroom. This rhetorically visual support would reinforce CG discussions as they progress throughout the school year. This resource can greatly enhance the learning of students as they have a constant reminder of what has already been discussed and learned in previous lessons. This type of tracking offers each student a fast way to recall what they already know, identify the learning target at hand, and prepare to deepen their learning with the next lesson. My

recommendation is that sources such as the ones under review prepare reproducible anchor charts founded in the methods they present in their text. These instructional supports could then be copied, enlarged, and infused in the classroom to support instruction.

This analysis identified a second recommended area for further development in the collection of sources. These sources do not provide students with grammar journals available for reproduction to support CG instruction. As an ELA teacher I can confirm PLCs frequently seek out such supports in appendices, wanting to see exactly how the experts recommend CG be carried out with students. Instructional materials are critical in lesson implementation and I purport that a reproducible student grammar journal, prepared by the experts, would greatly support teachers seeking to infuse their recommendations. Similar to anchor charts, a student grammar journal is a hard copy journal for students to practice writing skills on a daily basis. This is also a place for student writing to be organized and then discussed during student-teacher writing conferences. Next, a student grammar journal provides a means to track grammar learning and helps hold learners accountable for their engagement during lessons. All of the data organized in a student journal is valuable, as teachers can use it to drive instruction. Here, they review student journals regularly to see what needs learners present and then plan the next lessons accordingly. The authors do not seem to take into consideration that providing student grammar journal reproducibles would greatly assist teachers seeking to infuse their CG resources.

The third area of growth discovered during the analysis of the literature indicates each source could expand on their support to infuse CG into subjects other than ELA. The sources do not explicitly discuss the valuable opportunity to teach CG in math, science, and social studies. For instance, the CCSS (2010) require that each of these subjects teach students to present text

evidence within content areas in written or verbal forms. Thus, the need for grammar instruction will often present itself if students are to infuse text evidence using proper SAE citations and grammatical structure. Furthermore, they do not extend the concept of supporting math, science, and social studies teachers who wish to infuse CG in their lessons. A common topic in my PLC includes the idea of ELA teachers supporting other subject area teachers with grammar lessons, as they often feel unsure of how to teach this concept explicitly because their expertise is in another content area.

The expansion of CG instruction into other subject areas and the subsequent support instructional guides presents to teachers offers the opportunity for schools to raise student standardized grammar test scores on an annual basis. Theoretically, it would be reasonable for the subjects of math, science, and social studies to infuse CG into their instruction. To reiterate, the CCSS (2010), or other district-adopted standards, provide guidelines for instruction in each area, and ELA standards easily transfer into them.

The final area of growth identified for the CG instructional sources relates to the lack of technology-supported suggestions for teachers. As a whole, the sources do not present ideas on infusing technology into the classroom. To illustrate, a document camera would greatly serve teachers as they carry out CG demonstrations during whole class instruction. Students can watch a teacher write, think aloud, revise, and consider various grammatical applications in all types of audience, purpose, and formats in writing. With the aid of this technology students can see CG in action, and can easily replicate a text analysis demonstration by copying notes onto their own paper exactly as the teacher has done. This note-taking process of writing as it happens can later be a student resource when they attempt the skill independently. I myself have used such technology tools and demonstrations in the ELA classroom and often show my hand-written

document to students through the camera multiple times throughout a unit. Revisiting old

writing samples or documents via the camera reminds students of what they already learned and

are presently trying to apply in their own writing. In fact, students can even develop their

writing skills enough to volunteer to present their writing through the document camera,

explaining their rhetorical choices of grammar on a particular piece. This exemplar type of CG

writing lesson not only develops student confidence and overall classroom climate, but initiates

gradual release where students begin to demonstrate skills proficiently.

Chapter V: Conclusion and Recommendation

The question posed at the beginning of this study was *which resources are most helpful to middle school teachers seeking to implement grammar instruction?* It is now possible to state that a pool of exemplary CG instructional guides is readily available to teachers and this research provides assistance in selecting and using them.

This chapter of the research presents an overview of the findings. I will discuss the issues at hand once again and then offer my final conclusions and recommendations. This analysis of the literature on CG instruction answers the research question asked, and is designed for the audience of ELA educators seeking to infuse grammar instruction with the support of instructional resources.

The most important issue related to this research project is which sources best support teachers infusing CG instruction at the middle level. To this end, teachers need a quick and easy strategy for selecting the best source for their students and then to use that source to drive instruction. The analysis has identified seven areas of results as it relates to CG instructional source implementation.

Summary of the Seven Major Findings

The Results and Discussion chapter presented seven important findings through the analysis of CG instructional resources. When I drilled down to discover the most important aspects of a CG source, I discovered that *instructional purpose* (contextualized learning opportunities, student presentation of learning needs, teacher opportunities to respond to student learning needs) and *teacher needs* (directions on how to use the source efficiently) were two characteristics necessary in selecting exemplar sources. This information resulted in a pool of sources that I consider to be superior instructional grammar guides, offering teachers a high level

of support in CG infusion. In fact, the results of my analysis indicate the sources in the collection provide rigorous support for teachers seeking to implement CG, as they are highly informative in nature. Overall, the sources I have collected provide an analytical look at the field by explaining background knowledge to teachers and presenting essential tools for instructional delivery.

The collection of exemplary grammar instructional guides for middle-level teachers consists of works by Benjamin and Oliva (2006), Crovitz and Devereaux (2016), Haussamen (2003), and Kolln et al. (2016). These sources offer valuable theoretical insights on grammar instruction, grammar foundations, the need for thorough teacher understanding of CG, and linguistic grammar instruction. Furthermore, the results point toward the utilization of TOCs which outline pedagogical contributions through the framework of an established scope and sequence and grammar glossaries. Additionally, my analysis concludes that the sources under review can be easily used in conjunction with CCSS (2010), adopted by most Wisconsin public school districts. Researchers of CG with an interest in developing the field will want to review these sources and consider the areas I recommend for further development in this research.

Theoretical connections among the sources. The evidence from this study indicates value in noting the CG connections these instructional guides have, and then in selecting one or two that best meets their teaching situation. This is the information they need to fully understand the foundations they have committed to in PLCs, as well as what they need to refine their personal grammar instruction (specific approaches and techniques).

Foundational launching points. In addition, I have noted that the sources present shared themes on foundational launching points and contextualized implementation of grammar instruction. The foundational launching points presented can streamline the instructional

practice from teacher to teacher, which is a common goal for educational departments. PLCs seek to select common essential standards, identify common learning targets, design similar lessons and collect data through common assessments.

Types of grammar foundations that stood out in the sources include *definitions of grammar* and *grammar goals*. I suggest PLCs deconstruct these foundations to understand them fully and identify their relevance to the organization's grammar mission and vision. The analysis also revealed that each source provided a brief history of grammar instruction. This knowledge can help PLCs seeking to base their instruction on similar foundations. For example, when teachers fully understand grammar instruction's history and various types, they can then adopt an instructional plan that is knowledgeable and informed.

Thorough teacher knowledge of CG. In addition to fully understanding the PLC foundations teams have committed to, I conclude teachers must thoroughly understand how to effectively implement CG instruction, and, thus, the sources driving their instruction. These findings add to a growing body of literature on CG instruction, and as previously discussed, my analysis shows teachers should only attempt to implement one or two of the CG sources at a time. Further, the analysis indicates teachers should be highly aware of the inaccurate implementation of the sources in order to avoid this. For instance, depending on student need, teachers should not teach every page in the source as they will not always need to cover everything presented. They should avoid attempts of printing off student worksheets related to the concepts in the sources in order to deliver instruction. Conversely, they must infuse the CG topics into lessons, discussion, and activities in a meaningful, student-centered manner. This can often be successfully achieved through valuable student anchor texts.

Linguistic grammar instruction. In spite of the fact that not all teachers will want to implement linguistic grammar instruction, my work on this type of implementation could be a starting point for those seeking to teach CG. Although this method of CG instruction could not be verified as a best practice for all teachers and students in all regular classroom settings, it was identified as a useful option teachers should consider. This method requires an instructional infusion of grammar principles and characteristics that view students as language experts and the concept that linguistic grammar is founded in English, not Latin. Further, during instruction words can be categorized as word classes (instead of the eight parts of speech). To this end, linguistic grammar instructional methods include the *form*, *function* and *use* approach.

TOC utilization. This work has revealed teachers utilizing the grammar teaching resources should make use of the guide's TOC. This tool saves teachers time to quickly find the information they need. The body of literature reveals that the TOC is a fast, efficient way to find all of this information and to streamline instructional planning whether teaching individually or on teams.

Scope and sequence implementation. The results present that an excellent initial step toward CG instruction is the use of a scope and sequence, or yearly overview, which can be found within the sources. An example of a useful scope and sequence will incorporate various ranges of grade levels (i.e. 4–5, 6–7, 8–9, and 10–11). Furthermore, it will include the four valuable parts of content and application, suggested pedagogy, terminology, and summary. An organized and detailed PLC scope and sequence will assist CG infusion and planning among grade levels. This tool allows teachers to track what students have been taught and can demonstrate proficiency on. Further, this innovative implementation could eventually lead to an entire secondary ELA department to teach CG.

Grammar glossary selection. This research helps solve the difficulty teachers and students experience related to lacking metalinguistic knowledge. The results of the analysis indicate a benefit in teachers and students utilizing a grammar glossary from within these sources. The texts provide useful options for teachers to choose from, including comprehensive lists of grammar terminology. The findings indicate a need for teachers to be informed and knowledgeable with grammar terminology in order to explain it accurately to their students, to facilitate class discussions, and to guide students through self-editing. Finally, teachers should not only use a grammar glossary as a tool for their own purposes but should teach learners how to look up concepts and apply them accurately in SAE composition.

The recommendation is that teachers and students have regular access to grammar glossaries so they can monitor whether they have a comprehensive grasp and command of SAE. This resource will also assist in identifying and correcting grammatical errors for genre-specific grammar expectations. Further, the resource will build background and foundational knowledge resulting in skill-development. This ensures teachers can provide meaningful CG instruction and classroom experiences.

Suggested Source Addendums

The results of this analysis identified four areas for future development and growth for the collection of sources. I stress that these texts may be more relevant to teachers had they provided anchor charts, a student grammar journal available for reproduction, presentation of the concept of CG infusion in subject areas beyond the ELA classroom, and technological suggestions in aiding CG lessons. Taken together, these findings suggest the outcome of such addendums to the sources could prove evidential in student growth and learning. Furthermore, this study could provide a springboard to new advancements and teaching methods in CG.

Conclusions

The research project conducted and subsequent results will help middle-level ELA teachers seeking to implement CG instructional sources. One or two texts at a time will be a useful classroom aid, but not more. Specific guidance on how to use the sources efficiently can save teacher time, support them with effective instructional delivery, contribute to an organized PLC CG implementation, and result in student grammar knowledge and growth. This growth will be evident on daily assignments, formative and summative assessments, and standardized testing. Decision-makers and administrators who support PLCs will want to review this research because it will streamline instructional planning.

The high points of the findings indicate seven major areas of consideration. My study correlates with previous research stating that CG is the best practice for teachers seeking to teach grammar. CG can be aligned with CCSS (2010) and NCTE (1985; 2002) guidelines. Teachers participating in PLCs can develop and strengthen their CG knowledge and instructional skills through the use of the sources under review. Reasons for implementing the sources are as follows:

- Theoretical connections among the sources indicate they align with the literature and effectively lead PLCs toward CG implementation.

- Foundational launching points in the sources assist PLCs seeking to properly infuse CG instruction.

- Thorough teacher knowledge of CG results in greater PLC and student learning outcomes.

- Linguistic grammar instruction is an optional CG approach for teachers to implement.

- Utilizing the TOC assists teachers seeking to infuse CG lessons efficiently.

- A CG scope and sequence provides a PLC with an organized framework addressing grade level needs while outlining content and application, pedagogy, terminology, and summary.

- Proper grammar glossary selection and classroom infusion assist teachers and students seeking to command SAE terminology within the context of speaking and writing.

In addition to the seven findings listed above, the results of this analysis identified four areas for future development and growth for the collection of sources.

Recommendations

My research suggests that school administrators should encourage PLCs to infuse CG and provide them with the professional development and instructional sources to implement it effectively. Professional development can address how to use the sources effectively, as well as which CG strategies to infuse. Professional development should identify the specific needs of the PLC, as instructional planning should be driven by student data and progress monitoring. Professional development should also be designed for teachers to try new techniques in order to advance the curriculum toward new CG designs.

Future work should concentrate on enhancing the quality of CG instructional guides and infusion into the ELA classroom. Future studies should target the areas of suggested growth this project has identified. The four areas include:

1. Addend appendices to provide teachers with anchor charts that can assist in tracking classroom discussions and learning.

2. Addend appendices to provide teachers with reproducible student grammar journals in order to guide teachers, save planning time, and promote daily grammar practice and ownership for students.

3. Present CG infusion into subject areas beyond the ELA classroom, reiterating the value of writing across all disciplines.

4. Suggest options to teachers for aiding CG lessons through technology.

With future research in these recommended areas the next decade's CG sources could prove evidential in advanced student grammar growth and learning. Furthermore, studies down the road could provide a springboard to new advancements and teaching methods in CG.

References

Benjamin, A., & Oliva, T. (2007). *Engaging grammar: Practical advice for real classrooms*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Braddock, R., Lloyd-Jones, R., & Schoer, L. (1963) *Research in written composition*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Crovitz, D., & Devereaux, M. (2016). *Grammar to get things done: A practical guide for teaching anchored in real word usage*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Dean, D. (2011). Shifting perspectives about grammar: Changing what and how we teach. *The English Journal*, *100*(4), 20-26. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/23047772

DeBoer, J. J. (1959). Grammar in language teaching. *Elementary English*, *36*, 412-421.

Hadjioannou, X., & Hutchinson, M. C. (2010). Putting the G back in English: Preparing pre-service teachers to teach grammar. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique, 9*(3), 90-105. Retrieved from http://education.waikato.ac.nz/research/files/etpc/files/2010v9n3art6.pdf

Hartwell, P. (1985). Grammar, grammars, and the teaching of grammar. *College English*, *47*(2). 105-127. doi:10.2307/376562

Haussamen, B. (2003). *Grammar alive!: A guide for teachers*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Hoyt, F. S. (1906). The place of grammar in the elementary curriculum, *Teachers College Record*, *7*, 483-484.

Hillocks, G. (1986). *Research on written composition: New directions for teaching*. [Adobe Reader 9 version]. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED265552.pdf

Jesson, J., & Lacey, F. (2006). How to do (or not to do) a critical literature review. *Pharmacy Education, 6*(2), 139-148. doi:10.1080/15602210600616218

Jones, S., Myhill, D., & Bailey, T. (2013). Grammar for writing? An investigation of the effects of contextualized grammar teaching on students' writing. *Reading and Writing*, *26*(8), 1241-1263. doi:10.1007/s11145-012-9416-1

Kolln, M. (1981). Closing the books on alchemy. *College Composition & Communication*, *32*(2), 139-151. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/356688

Kolln, M. (1996). Rhetorical grammar: A modification lesson. *English Journal*, *85*(7), 25-51. Retrieved from http://www.ncte.org.ezproxy.lib.uwstout.edu/journals/ej/issues/v85-7

Kolln, M., Gray, L. S., & Salvatore, J. (2016). *Understanding English Grammar*. Boston, MA: Pearson.

McClure, E. S. (2007) *Six middle school language arts teachers' beliefs about grammar and their teaching of grammar while participating in a professional learning community* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://scholarworks.gsu.edu/msit_diss/10

Micciche, L. R. (2004). Making a case for rhetorical grammar. *College Composition & Communication*, *55*(4), 716-737. Retrieved from https://www.csun.edu/~bashforth/305_PDF/305_PDF_Grammar/MakingACaseForRhetoricalGrammar_Micciche.pdf

National Council of Teachers of English. (1985). *Resolution on grammar exercises to teach speaking and writing.* Retrieved from http://www2.ncte.org/statement/grammarexercises/

National Council of Teachers of English. (2002). *Some questions and answers about grammar.* Retrieved from http://www2.ncte.org/statement/qandaaboutgrammar/

National Governors Association (NGA) Center for Best Practices, Council of Chief State School

Officers (CCSSO) (2010). *Common Core State Standards for Language Arts.*

Washington, DC: National Governors Association (NGA) Center for Best Practices,

Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). Retrieved from

http://www.corestandards.org/ELA-Literacy.

Patterson, N. (2001). Just the facts: Research & theory about grammar instruction. *Voices from

the Middle*, *8*(3), 50-55. Retrieved from http://www.ateg.org/grammar/q&a.htm

Strom, I. (1960). Research on grammar and usage and its implications for teaching writing.

Bulletin of the School of Education, *36*, 13-14.