http://dx.doi.org/10.20880/kler.2016.51.5.5

Trends and Issues in Adolescent Literacy Theories and Research: An Integrative Review

Jang, Bong Gee Syracuse University

Ⅰ. Introduction
Ⅱ. Review Methodology
Ⅲ. Trends in Theoretical Perspectives and Research
Ⅳ. Trends in Policy
Ⅴ. Conclusion

Ⅰ. Introduction

One of the most notable trends in literacy theory and research is the increasing interest in the reading and writing practices of adolescents (Alexander & Fox, 2011; Alvermann & Hinchman, 2012; Cassidy, Ortlieb, & Shettel, 2011; Christenbury, Bomer, & Smagorinsky, 2009). This trend is evident not only in the ever-increasing numbers of papers being published on adolescents' reading and writing practices, but also the many recent national and international assessments (two notable examples are the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP; National Center for Education Statistics, 2011); and the (PISA; Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD], 2010) that have reported on adolescents' achievement in reading and writing. Moreover, current federal initiatives (e.g., Striving Readers, U.S. Department of Education, 2006), along with a host of federal reports (Berman, & Biancarosa, 2005; Biancarosa, & Snow, 2004; Graham, & Perin, 2007; Kamil, Borman, Dole, Kral, Salinger, & Torgesen, 2008), share the same focus.

As Vacca (1998) stated, adolescent literacy is a term that has "replaced secondary reading as an alternative and more powerful

concept to describe literacy learning among young adolescents and teenagers in middle and high schools" (p. xv). However, the term continues to be interpreted and used somewhat inconsistently by researchers and educators with different backgrounds and perspectives. This paper aims to help clarify this conceptual abstractness and inconsistency by providing an integrative review of recent literature related to adolescent literacy research and policies and by identifying current trends and issues in adolescent literacy.

Ⅱ. Review Methodology

An integrative literature review approach (Torraco, 2005; Whittemore & Knafl, 2005) was chosen for this review of adolescent literacy research and policy. Integrative review models have been developed by health-related researchers such as Broome (2000) and Whittemore and Knafl (2005) to first frame questions for a review, then identify and assess relevant work, and finally synthesize and interpret the evidence from the literature. An integrative literature review is different from a traditional literature review in that its purpose is to "describe precisely how researchers frame and investigate a problem or topic" (Conradi, Jang, & McKenna, 2014: 131).

Applying this approach to the field of education, Shanahan (2000) made a distinction between two types of research synthesis: quantitative and qualitative reviews. He argued that a meta-analysis provides a quantitative synthesis that focuses on a specific empirical question, while the type of research synthesis found in a literature review is more qualitative in nature. Kennedy (2007) also distinguished between systematic and conceptual reviews, where "a systematic review typically focuses on a

specific empirical question, often posed in a cause–and effect form, such as 'to what extent does A contribute to B?'" (p. 139) and a conceptual review is more interested in "gaining new insights into an issue" (p. 139). Kennedy's description of the conceptual review is congruous with the integrative review method in that both approaches examine how researchers go about framing a problem or investigating a topic.

This review of the adolescent literacy literature is based on a comprehensive search of relevant literature, by a multitude of search engines such as ERIC, and EBSCO using key indicators found in the articles to expand the working catalog until exhausting the obtainable sources. These indicators include, "literacy", "reading", "writing", and "comprehension", in conjunction with "adolescent", "youth", 'secondary", "middle–school students", and "high–school students" and detailed analytic recordings were documented for the analyses. Once a working bibliography had been generated comprised of relevant citations and abstracts, a set of criteria were defined to select the studies that would be included in the analysis, namely (1) a study must have been published in a peer reviewed journal between 2005 and 2015, and (2) it must either include empirical data from 4th to 12th graders, or be a federal report commissioned to guide policies related to adolescent literacy. Articles published after 2005 were only included in this study because I was interested in the most current trends and patterns in adolescent literacy research for the past 10 years. In addition, I only included articles published in high–quality journals registered in Social Sciences Citation Index® (SSCI®). Based on the data, each study was coded using a semantic feature analysis chart created for this study using Microsoft Excel. The database comprised of the subsequent categories, as suggested by Shanahan (2000): (a) bibliographic references, (b) publication type (journal article, dissertation, conference

paper, or book chapter), (c) theoretical framework, (d) research method, and (e) key constructs investigated. Guided by the recommendations of Baker, Pearson, and Rozendal (2010), Tracy and Morrow (2012), and Alexander and Fox (2004), theoretical frameworks were coded into five categories: cognitive, affective, developmental, socioculural, and critical perspectives. Categories of theories and trends then emerged through an analysis of the coded data. Based on these procedures, recent trends and issues in different theoretical approaches to adolescent literacy and policy-related documents were identified for this study.

Ⅲ. Trends in Theoretical Perspectives and Research[1]

1. Cognitive Perspectives

Cognitive or psycholinguistic views of reading comprehension focus on the "interactive nature of reading and the constructive nature of comprehension" (Dole, Duffy, Roehler, & Pearson, 1991: 241). Readers construct or reconstruct the meaning of texts based on the interaction between their existing knowledge and new information contained in the texts. Some cognitive psychologists (e.g., Anderson & Pearson, 1984; Rumelhart, 1980) conceptualize the readers' prior knowledge that they bring to the text as schema. Schema enable readers to evaluate importance of new information, draw inferences, and monitor their comprehension (Anderson & Pearson, 1984). In addition to the readers' schema, schema theory and related research has shown the importance

1 In this section on theoretical trends, some articles published before 2005 are included in order to discuss the development of the theories and explain the major assumptions of each theory.

of cognitive strategies that readers can use to make sense of text and to monitor their comprehension process (e.g., Anderson, Reynolds, Schallert and Goetz, 1977; Reynolds, Taylor, Steffensen, Shirey, & Anderson, 1982). Research based on the cognitive perspective emphasizes the distinction between strategy and skills (Afflerback, Pearson, & Paris, 2008; Dole et al., 1991). Strategies are considered "conscious, instantiated, and flexible plans readers apply and adapt to a variety of texts and tasks" (Dole et al., 1991: 242). This is not the same as skills, which are thought of as "highly routinized, almost automatic behaviors" (p. 242).

A notable trend in adolescent literacy research based on the cognitive perspective is the study of comprehension and the writing processes of students in digital contexts. (e.g., Colwell, Hunt-Barron, & Reinking, 2013; Cho, 2014; Coiro, 2011; Coiro & Dobbler, 2007; Damico & Baildon, 2007; Kymes, 2005; Zhang & Duke, 2008). For example, Coiro and Dobbler (2007) investigated eleven competent sixth-grade readers' comprehension processes while reading on the Internet. They reported that the proficient readers' uses of prior knowledge, inferential comprehension strategies, and self-regulated processes in the digital reading setting are both similar and more complex than those required in reading printed informational texts. Damico and Baildon (2007) compared two pairs of 8th graders' reading of online texts and were interested to find that although they showed similar patterns in locating key information, they evaluated the websites' credibility and used the information for their own narrative in different ways. Most recently, Cho (2014) found that competent adolescent readers employ multiple reading strategies to construct meaning from digital texts. Those strategies included both digital reading strategies (e.g., text location) and traditional print-based

reading strategies (e.g., meaning-making and self-monitoring).

Another trend in adolescent literacy research based on the cognitive perspective is the increasing amount of research that examines the comprehension of informational texts (see, for example, Braasch, Bråten, Strømsø, Anmarkrud, & Ferguson, 2013; Davis & Guthrie, 2015; Ramsay & Sperling, 2015; Liebfreund, 2015; O'Reilly & McNamara, 2007; Samuelstuen & Bråten, 2005; Taboada & Guthrie, 2006; Wolfe & Goldman, 2005). Traditionally, cognitive research on adolescent literacy focused more on understanding literary texts, since this it a dominant view for researchers and most secondary English teachers, who generally believe that their job is to teach literature (Ericson & Strefling, 2001). However, recent studies on adolescent literacy have reported that adolescents use prior knowledge and cognitive strategies differently when they read literary texts. For example, Wolfe and Goldman (2005) reported 6th graders who read two contradictory informational texts tried to connect historical events within and across texts and to justify the connections they made. The number of connections and the quality of their explanation demonstrated positive correlations among students. More recently, Bråten et al. (2014) identified the casual relationships among adolescents' epistemic beliefs, deeper-level strategy uses, and comprehension of multiple informational texts.

2. Affective Perspectives

Affective perspectives focus on emotional and motivational constructs such as motivation (e.g., Wigfield & Guthrie, 1997), attitudes (e.g., McKenna, Conradi, Lawrence, Jang, & Meyer, 2012), interests (e.g., Worthy, Moorman, & Turner, 1999), self-concept (e.g., Chapman & Tunmer, 1995), and self-efficacy (e.g., Jacobs, Osgood, Eccles, &

Wigfield, 2002), all of which are known to play important roles in learning and literacy practice (Conradi, Jang, McKenna, 2014). These affective components encourage adolescents to engage in deeper and more internalized literacy practices, which are likely to be shallow and superficial if not motivated (Ryan & Deci, 2000; Guthrie & Coddington, 2009). Researchers have proposed a number of different theories (e.g., self-determination theory, Deci & Ryan, 1985; motivation theory, Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000; attitude theory, McKenna, 1994) in order to provide a systematic explanation of these motivational constructs.

One major trend in recent adolescent literacy research based on affective perspectives is the complex relationship between motivational constructs and cognitive achievement or engagement (e.g., Guthrie , Coddington, & Wigfield, 2009; Guthrie, Klauda, & Ho, 2013; Guthrie, Hoa, Wigfield, Tonks, Humenick, & Littles, 2007; Katzir, Lesaux, & Kim, 2009; Petscher, 2010; Taboada, Tonks, Wigfield, & Guthrie, 2009; Troia, Harbaugh, Shankland, Wolbers, & Lawrence, 2013; Unrau & Schlackman, 2006; Wolters, Denton, York, & Francis, 2014). For example, Taboada et al. (2009) reported that motivation, background knowledge, and cognitive strategy-use significantly predicted later reading comprehension. Related to writing, Toria et al. (2013) found that motivational beliefs on writing exerted a positive influence on students' writing quality. These studies suggest that affective factors support not only adolescents' love of literacy but also their proficiency in literacy tasks.

The other major trend in this area is to study the effect of social factors on the development of positive affective components (e.g., Bifuh-Ambe, 2007; Dressman, Wilder, & Connor, 2005; Moje, Overby, Tysvaer, & Morris, 2008; Nolen, 2007; Protacio, 2012). Researchers have suggested that motivational constructs should be reconceptualized to take into account more complex contextual factors, such as a digital

reading setting (e.g., McKenna, Conradi, Lawrence, Jang, & Meyer, 2012; Moje et al., 2008; O'Brien et al., 2007), out-of-school contexts (e.g., Moje et al., 2008), and diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds (e.g., Protacio, 2012). For example, McKenna et al. (2012) categorized reading attitudes into four sub-constructs: attitudes toward 1) recreational reading in print, 2) academic reading in print, 3) digital recreational reading, and 4) digital academic reading. They found that adolescents who have positive attitudes toward recreational reading of digital texts do not necessarily like the other types of reading activities. Moje (2008) reported that some adolescent students identified as struggling readers based on their in-school literacy might actually be motivated and engaged in out-of-school literacy practices.

3. Developmental Perspectives

In a sequence of studies, Chall and her colleagues (Chall, 1983, 1996; Chall, Jacobs, & Baldwin, 1990, 2003) suggested a series of stages through which students pass on their way to becoming proficient readers. In this developmental view, students experiencing reading problems are identified as struggling readers by comparing and contrasting them with so-called "normal" reading development. According to the stage of reading development, learning to read occurs in distinct phases or stages that progress in a hierarchical order similar to the stages of language and cognitive development, although there is overlap across the stages in terms of the knowledge and skills the reader uses. Within each stage of development, the reader demonstrates varying degrees of control over different reading behaviors, which are associated with the knowledge and skills related to sound and word knowledge, comprehension, fluency and vocabulary development (Chall, 1996). As the reader progresses through

to higher levels of reading development, he or she is able to read more critically and understand more complex and abstract concepts. In the more advanced stages, the reader must have a deep understanding of the world, the material and ideas being read.

The most distinctive trend in adolescent literacy research based on this developmental perspective is the investigation of potential predictors of later comprehension and reading difficulties (Andreassen & Braten, 2010; Arrington, Kulesz, Francis, Fletcher, & Barnes, 2014; Barth, Catts, & Anthony, 2009; Catts, Compton, Tomblin, Bridges, & Sittner, 2012;Cirino et al., 2013; Cutting & Scarborough, 2006; Hock et al., 2009; Vaughn et al., 2013;). For example, Cutting and Scarborough (2006) reported that both word recognition/decoding and oral language skills predicted significant variance in reading comprehension. Catts et al. (2012) identified different types of reading difficulties in adolescents: 1) comprehension problems only, 2) word reading problems only, and 3) both problems.

Another recent trend in adolescent literacy research based on the developmental perspective is to investigate the reading difficulties of English language learners (ELL) (Kieffer, 2011, Lesaux & Kieffer, 2010; Mancilla-Martinez, Kieffer, Biancarosa, Christodoulou, & Snow, 2011), and students with low SES (Brasseur-Hock, Hock, Kieffer, Biancarosa, & Deshler, 2011; Kieffer, 2012) or learning disabilities (e.g., Hock et al., 2009). For example, Lesaux and Kieffer (2010) examined predictors of comprehension difficulties in adolescent English language learners and distinguished three distinct skill profiles (slow word callers, automatic word callers, and globally impaired readers) for struggling ELL readers. Hock et al. (2009) also identified several distinct profiles among struggling minority readers, reporting that nearly two thirds of the struggling readers exhibited weak word reading and comprehension skills.

4. Sociocultural Perspectives

Sociocultural perspectives treat literacy as a socially constructed practice (Cook-Gumpez, 1986, 2006; Scribner & Cole, 1981; Street, 1984, 1995) situated within a specific social context (Barton & Hamilton, 2000; Gee, 2001). Here, it is not only the individual process of understanding the text but also a social practice that includes negotiating and constructing new meanings by interacting with knowledgeable others, such as the writer of the text, peers who have already read the text, and teachers (Lee & Smagorinsky, 2000). Such an extended view builds on previous seminal research that established the foundation of sociocultural perspectives to literacy (Halliday, 1978; Rosenblatt, 1978, 1995; Vygotsky, 1978).

From this perspective, adolescents practice literacy in formal and informal ways both within and outside school settings (Alvermann, 2008) and at the "interaction of learner knowledge and interest, textual factors, and social, cultural, and disciplinary contexts" (Moje et al., 2008: 113). These multiple literacy practices based on multiple texts in- and out-of-school often go beyond the school and textbook-based definitions of literacy (Alvermann, 2008; Bean & Readence, 2002).

One representative trend here is to examine the inconsistency between adolescents' in-school and out-of-school literacy (e.g., Brass, 2008; Hull, & Katz, 2006; Lewis & Fabos, 2005; Skerrett, & Bomer, 2011; Ünlüsoy, De Haan, Leseman, & Van Kruistum, 2010). In most cases, adolescent readers distinguish in-school literacy as an academic activity performed to demonstrate their achievement and literacy out of school as an activity based on their personal interests and preferences. Outside the school boundaries, they often engage actively in multiple digital literacy tasks demonstrating competence in using technology and the Internet.

This is not surprising: most adolescents have never experienced living without computers, smartphones, and other forms of ICTs (Bean & Harper, 2009; Moorman & Horton, 2007). However, within school contexts they sometimes show resistance to reading tasks (Lenters, 2006; Wilhelm; 2007), which often results in struggling with reading.

The other trend in this area is to examine the relationship between adolescents' literacy practices and the construction of their identities as readers and writers (e.g., Black, 2005; 2009; Hall, 2010; 2012; Lewis & Fabos, 2005; Sutherland, 2005; Yoon, 2012). In particular, their literacy practices are closely related to their developing awareness of their existing identities as readers and writers and the formation of new identities as they participate in multiple literacy contexts (e.g., Dressman, Wilder, & Connor, 2005; Moje et al., 2008; West, 2008). Several studies have identified how different ethnic backgrounds contribute to the formation of adolescents' identities as readers and writers (e.g., Black, 2005; 2009; Lam, 2009; McLean, 2010; Villalva, 2006; Yi, 2008; Yoon, 2012; Wilson, Chavez, & Anders, 2012), while other studies have focused on gender differences in their constructions of identity (Gómez, 2010; Guzzetti & Gamboa, 2005; Moeller, 2011; Vetter, 2010). A great many studies have described how adolescents' literate identities are constructed in online spaces. For example, Black (2005) studied Latina youths identified as English language learners and found that they built their new identities as proficient writers and readers while writing fan fiction online. These studies of how the youths used new media illustrate "how differently positioned the youth were both in terms of language and literacy skill and in terms of identities in the different spaces of the classroom and online worlds" (Luke & Moje, 2009: 432).

5. Critical Perspectives

Critical perspectives assume that literacy is not a neutral set of skills but a social practice that must be understood in context and with due attention to the power dynamics involved (e.g., Freire & Macedo, 1987; Gee, 2012; Lewis, Enciso, & Moje, 2007; Muspratt, Luke, & Freebody, 1997; Morrell, 2004, 2008; Siegel & Fernandez, 2000). These perspectives are distinct from sociocultural perspectives in that they extend the scope of contextual factors "beyond the social and the cultural to include historical, political an economic forces" (Baker, Pearson, & Rozendal, 2010: 27). Those forces represent social oppression that not only reinforces persistent inequalities in students' opportunities to learn but also maintains the ideological power of a particular group (Siegel & Fernandez, 2000).

A major trend in research undertaken by those adopting this perspective is to reconceptualize the notion of proficiency and achievement in literacy and thus empower marginalized adolescent readers and writers. They argue that proficiency within the school context is too narrowly defined and often creates negative labels such as at risk and struggling reader, which, in turn, are likely to limit adolescents' potential for developing their literacy practices (O'Brien, Stewart, & Beach, 2009). Many adolescents labeled as struggling emerge as creative and socially engaged knowledge producers if more open-minded climates and inclusive instructions are provided (e.g., Alvermann, Hagood, Heron-Hruby, Hughes, Williams, & Jun-Chae, 2007; Barden, 2009; Dressman, O'Brien, Rogers, Ivey, Wilder, Alvermann, Moje, & Leander, 2006; Franzak, 2008; Hall, 2009; Heron-Hruby, Hagood, & Alvermann, 2008; Wissman, 2007; Triplett, 2007).

Another trend is to investigate critical consumption of new media for adolescent literacy. Critical perspectives contend that technology-related studies do not suggest any implications regarding the new concerns that

have emerged related to digital environments. Perhaps the most important of these concerns is the so-called "digital divide" (Warschauer, 2003), which is generally defined as "inequities of access to technology based on factors of income, education, race, and ethnicity" (O'Brien & Scharber, 2008: 67). Recent research (e.g., Dressman, Wilder, & Connor, 2005; McLean, 2010; Wilder & Dressman, 2006; Walton, 2007) indicates that this digital divide might limit opportunities for students to read and write in digital settings.

6. Summary

This integrative review has revealed how multiple perspectives and theories contribute to understanding and studying different aspects of adolescent literacy. A growing attention to evolving technology and digital contexts and their influences on a range of literacy outcomes (such as test scores, engagement, and identity formation, etc.) was manifest across all the different theoretical perspectives guiding research into adolescent literacy. The following section examines the trends emerging from federally-funded reports and policies related to adolescent literacy.

IV. Trends in Policy

1. Adolescent Literacy as Crisis

From A Nation at Risk (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983) to the most recent NAEP Report Card (National Center for Education Statistics, 2011), the results revealed by the national achievement data collected by the U.S. government has consistently alarmed

policy makers, especially adolescents' low achievements in reading and writing (e.g., Jacobs, 2008; Moore, 2009; Snow & Biancarosa, 2003; 2004). A number of reports sponsored by the U.S. government (e.g., the Carnegie Council on Advancing Adolescent Literacy, 2010; National Association of State Boards of Education, 2005) have also contributed to making reading achievement at the secondary level a highly visible educational and political issue. International large-scale assessment datasets such as PISA (OECD, 2010) have also contributed to the identification of American adolescents' underachievement compared to youth in other countries. Based on these negative results, the U.S. Department of Education initiated the Striving Readers program to improve adolescents' literacy achievement. All these trends share a common assumption that adolescent literacy is a crisis or problem that must be urgently addressed.

The notion of adolescent literacy as crisis is mostly based on the developmental perspectives on literacy (Alexander, 2005/2006; Chall, 1983; Jacobs, 2008), which expects adolescents to master basic reading skills including decoding and literal comprehension (Chall, 1983). Young people who do not exhibit proficient reading and writing ability at their notional developmental stages are usually tested and screened as struggling readers and writers. A federal initiative, Response to Intervention (RTI) has been implemented to identify reading problems early and provide effective intervention strategies to correct these problems.

2. Adolescent Literacy as Content Literacy

Literacy researchers who embrace the cognitive perspective have conceptualized the notion of adolescent literacy as content-area reading since the beginning of the twentieth century (Moore, Readence, & Rickelman, 1983). Content literacy, including content-area reading and

writing across curricula, is "the ability to use reading and writing for the acquisition of new content in a given discipline" (McKenna & Robinson, 1990: 184). Unlike learning to read and write, content literacy corresponding to reading and writing to learn assumes reading and writing develop alongside appropriate speaking and listening tools for learning in various disciplines. Since adolescents' abilities to use literacy to learn vary from subject-area to subject area, adolescent literacy is thus considered as developing content-specific strategies and skills to maximize content acquisition. This is why content literacy sometimes overlaps with disciplinary literacy, another term that focuses on the differences in adolescents' literacy practices across disciplines (Harmon, Hedrick, & Wood, 2005; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008). Academic literacy is another term that has been used interchangeably with content literacy and is defined as "the reading, writing, speaking, listening, and thinking skills, dispositions, and habits of mind that students need for academic success" (Warschauer, Grant, Del Real, & Rousseau, 2004: 526). This includes the ability to analytically read and interpret a wide range of texts, to write with proficiency in scholarly genres, as well as engage in and contribute to mature academic discussions (Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates, 2002). However, as McKenna and Robinson (1990) indicated, content literacy should not be mistaken for content knowledge, as content literacy represents the skills and strategies necessary to acquire content knowledge.

Content literacy is an important agenda item for policy makers seeking to improve adolescents' achievement. Traditionally, English teachers tend to believe their job is simply to teach literature (Erickson & Strefling, 2001), while other content-area teachers believe their major responsibility is to teach subject knowledge rather than strategies for understanding the content (Holloway, 1999). To address this issue, a series of reports and

teaching materials that include "content literacy" (Heller & Greenleaf, 2007; National Institute for Literacy, 2007) in their titles have been published by the federal government and various national agencies. These materials all list research-based instructional recommendations that can be applied across multiple content areas.

3. Adolescent Literacy as Instructional Strategies

Most federal reports and teacher resource materials published by federal agencies whose titles include adolescent literacy or related terms describe instructional strategies for improving adolescents reading and writing skills (Carnegie Council on Advancing Adolescent Literacy, 2010; Graham & Perin, 2007; Kamil, 2003; Kamil et al., 2008; National Association of State Boards of Education, 2005; National Governors Association, 2005). These instruction strategies are suggested either in terms of general levels for all students across all content areas (e.g., Biancarosa & Snow; 2004; Gram & Perin, 2007; Kamil et al., 2008; Heller & Greenleaf, 2007; National Governors Association, 2005; National School Boards Association, 2006; Torgesen et al., 2007; Torgesen & Miller, 2009) or specific levels for particular adolescents such as students with learning disabilities (Faggella-Luby & Deshler, 2008; Mastropieri, Scruggs, & Graetz, 2003; Scammacca et al., 2007) or English language learners (Short & Fitzsimmons, 2007).

4. Summary

These trends in adolescent literacy policy share the common assumption that literacy educators and administrators are powerful agents capable of significantly improving student achievement. Additionally, those reports require ongoing professional support and effective interventions or

school-wide programs (Faggella-Luby, Ware, & Capozzoli, 2009) that should be provided by either the state or federal government. However, none of these reports take into account either adolescents' own abilities to improve their literacy outcomes nor the multiple social factors that influence their active engagement in literacy practices. This is largely because the authors of these reports were influenced mainly by the cognitive and developmental perspectives. The incorporation of more personal and cultural aspects of adolescent literacy into building federal policies and initiates would likely lead to a more complete picture of adolescent literacy in the U.S.

V. Conclusion

This integrative review of current theories, research, and policy-related materials suggests that the notion of adolescent literacy both in research and policies needs to be reconceptualized to take into account the diverse and authentic needs of today's youth. Although different perspectives have contributed to our understanding of the multi-faceted construct of adolescent literacy, federal policies have not yet assimilated the findings of the most recent research in this area. Future research and policy needs to be based on a more nuanced and comprehensive approach to adolescent literacy.

Submitted: 2016.11.14.
First revision received: 2016.12.09.
Accepted: 2016.12.09.

REFERENCES

Afflerbach, P., Pearson, D., & Paris, S. G. (2008). Clarifying the differences between reading skills and reading strategies. *The Reading Teacher*, 61(5), 364-373.

Alexander, P. A. (2005/2006). The path to competence: A lifespan developmental perspective on reading. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 37(4), 413-436.

Alexander, P. A. & Fox, E. (2004). A Historical Perspective on Reading Research and Practice. In R. B. Ruddell, & N. J. Unrau (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading*, 33-68, Newark: International Reading Association.

Alexander, P. A. & Fox, E. (2011). Adolescents as readers. In M. L. Kamil, P. D. Pearson, E. B. Moje, & P. P. Afflerbach (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 4), 157-176, New York: Routledge.

Alvermann, D. E. (2008). Commentary: Why bother theorizing adolescents' online literacies for classroom practice and research?. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 52, 8-19.

Alvermann, D. E., Hagood, M. C., Heron-Hruby, A., Hughes, P., Williams, K. B., & Jun-Chae, Y. (2007). Telling themselves who they are: What one out-of-school time study revealed about underachieving readers. *Reading Psychology*, 28, 1-19.

Alvermann, D. E. & Hinchman, K. A. (2012). *Reconceptualizing the literacies in adolescents' lives* (3rd ed.). Mahwah: Erlbaum.

Anderson, R. C. & Pearson, P. D. (1984). A schema-theoretic view of basic progress in reading comprehension. In P. D. Pearson, R. Barr, M. L. Kamil, & P. Mosenthal (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research*, 253-292, New York: Longman.

Anderson, R. C., Reynolds, R. E., Schallert, D. L., & Goetz, E. T. (1977). Frameworks for comprehending discourse. *American Educational Research Journal*, 14, 367-381.

Andreassen, R. & Braten, I. (2010). Examining the prediction of reading

comprehension on different multiple-choice tests. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 33, 263-283.

Arrington, C. N., Kulesz, P. A., Francis, D. J., Fletcher, J. M., & Barnes, M. A. (2014). The contribution of attentional control and working memory to reading comprehension and decoding. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 18(5), 325-346.

Baker, E., Pearson, D. and Rozendal, M. (2010). Theoretical perspectives and literacy studies: An exploration of roles and insights. In E. Baker (Ed.), *The new literacies: Multiple perspectives on research and practice*, 1-22, New York: Guilford.

Barden, O. (2009). From "acting reading" to reading for acting: A case study of the transformational power of reading. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 53(4), 293-302.

Barth, A. E., Catts, H. W., & Anthony, J. L. (2008). The component skills underlying reading fluency in adolescent readers: a latent variable analysis. *Reading and Writing*, 22, 567- 590.

Barton, D. & Hamilton, M. (2000). Literacy practices. In D. Barton, M. Hamilton, & R. Ivanic (Eds.), *Situated literacies: Reading and writing in context*, 7-15, New York: Routledge.

Bean, T. W. & Harper, H. (2009). The "adolescent" in adolescent literacy: A preliminary review. In K. D. Wood & W. E. Blanton (Eds.), *Literacy instruction for adolescents: Research-based practice*, 37-53, New York: Guilford.

Bean, T. & Readence, J. (2002). Adolescent literacy: Charting a course for successful futures as lifelong learners. *Literacy Research and Instruction*, 41(3), 203-209.

Berman, I. & Biancarosa, G. (2005). *Reading to achieve: A Governor's guide to adolescent literacy*. Washington: National Governors Association.

Bifuh-Ambe, E. (2007): Inviting reluctant readers to the literacy club: Some comprehensive strategies to tutor individual or small groups of reluctant readers. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy,* 50(8), 632-638.

Black, R. W. (2005). Access and affiliation: The literacy and composition practices of English language learners in an online fanfiction community. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 49(2), 118-128.

Black, R. W. (2009). Online fanfiction, global identities, and imagination. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 43(4), 397-425.

Braasch, J. L. G., Bråten, I., Strømsø, H. I., Anmarkrud, O., & Ferguson, L. E. (2013). Promoting secondary school students' evaluation of source features of multiple documents. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 38, 180-195.

Brass, J. J. (2008). Local knowledge and digital movie composing in an after-school literacy program. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 51, 464-473.

Brasseur-Hock, I. F., Hock, M. F., Kieffer, M. J., Biancarosa, G., & Deshler, D. D. (2011). Adolescent struggling readers in urban schools: Results of a latent class analysis. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 21, 438-452.

Broome M. E. (2000) Integrative literature reviews for the development of concepts. In B. Rodgers & K. Knafl (Eds.), *Concept development in nursing* (2nd ed.) (pp. 231-250). Philadelphia: Saunders.

Carnegie Council on Advancing Adolescent Literacy. (2010). *Time to act: An agenda for advancing adolescent literacy for college and career success*. New York: Carnegie Corporation of New York.

Cassidy, J., Ortlieb, E., & Shettel, J. (2011). What's hot for 2011. *Reading Today*, 28(3), 1.

Catts, H. W., Compton, D., Tomblin, J. B., Bridges, M. S., & Sittner, M. (2012). Prevalence and nature of lateemerging poor readers. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 104(1), 166-181.

Chall, J. S. (1983). *Stages of reading development*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Chall, J. S. (1996). *Stages of reading development* (2nd ed.). Fort Worth: Harcourt College.

Chall J. & Jacobs, V. (2003). The classic study on poor children's fourth-grade

slump. *American Educator*, 27(1), 14-15.

Chall, J. S., Jacobs, V. A., & Baldwin, L. E. (1990). *The reading crisis: Why poor children fall behind*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Chapman, J. W. & Tunmer, W. E. (1995). Development of young children's reading self-concepts: An examination of emerging subcomponents and their relationship with reading achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 87, 154-167.

Cho, B-Y. (2014). Competent adolescent readers' use of Internet reading strategies: A think-aloud study. *Cognition and Instruction*, 32(3), 253-289.

Christenbury, L., Bomer, R. & Smagorinsky, P. (2009). *Handbook of adolescent literacy research*. New York: The Guilford Press.

Cirino, P. T., Romain, M. A., Barth, A. E., Tolar, T. D., Fletcher, J. M., & Vaughn, S. (2013). Reading skill components and impairments in middle school struggling readers. *Reading and Writing*, 26(7), 1059-1086.

Coiro, J. (2011). Predicting reading comprehension on the Internet: Contributions of offline reading skills, online reading skills, and prior knowledge. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 43(4)352-392.

Coiro, J. & Dobler, E. (2007). Exploring the online comprehension strategies used by sixth-grade skilled readers to search for and locate information on the Internet. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 42, 214-257.

Colwell, J., Hunt-Barron, S., & Reinking, D. (2013). Obstacles to developing digital literacy on the Internet in middle school science instruction. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 45, 295-324.

Conley, M. & Hinchman, K. (2004). No child left behind: What it means for adolescent literacy and what we can do about it. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 48(1), 42-51.

Cook-Gumpez, J. (Eds.). (1986). *The social construction of literacy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cook-Gumpez, J. (Eds.). (2006). *The social construction of literacy* (2nd ed.).

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cramer, E. H. & Castle, M. (Eds.). (1994). *Fostering the love of reading: The affective domain in reading education*. Newark: International Reading Association.

Damico, J. & Baildon, M. (2007). Examining ways readers engage with websites during think-aloud sessions. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 51, 254-263.

Davis, M. H. & Guthrie, J. T. (2015). Measuring reading comprehension of content area texts using an assessment of knowledge organization. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 108(2), 148-164.

Deci, E. L. & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum.

Dole, J. A., Duffy, G. G., Roehler, L. R., & Pearson, P. D. (1991). Moving from the old to the new: Research on reading comprehension instruction. *Review of Educational Research*, 61, 239-264.

Dressman, M., O'Brien, D., Rogers, T., Ivey, G., Wilder, P., Alvermann, D., Moje, E., & Leander, K. (2006). Problematizing adolescent literacies: Four instances, multiple perspectives. In J. V. Hoffman, D. L. Schallert, C. M. Fairbanks, J. Worthy, & B. Maloch (Eds.), *Fifty-fifth yearbook of the National Reading Conference*, 141-154, Owl Creek: National Reading Conference.

Dressman, M., Wilder, P., & Connor, J. J. (2005). Theories of failure and the failure of theories: A cognitive/sociocultural/macrostructural study of eight struggling students. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 40(1), 8-61.

Erickson, C. & Strefling, A. (2001). Make every teacher a reading teacher. *Middle Ground*, 5(2), 33-37.

Fagella-Luby, M. N. & Deshler, D. D. (2008). Reading comprehension in adolescents with LD: What we know; what we need to learn. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice*, 23(2), 70-78.

Faggella-Luby, M. N., Ware, S. M., & Capozzoli, A. (2009). Adolescent literacy

—reviewing adolescent literacy reports: Key components and critical questions. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 41(4), 453-475.

Franzak, J. K. (2008). On the margins in a high-performing high school: Policy and the struggling reader. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 42(4), 466-505.

Freire, P. & Macedo, D. (1987). *Literacy: reading the word and the world*. Westport, CO: Bergin & Garvey.

Gee, J. P. (2001). Reading as situated language: A sociocognitive perspective. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 44, 714-725.

Gee, J. P. (2012). Social linguistics and literacies: *Ideology in discourses* (4th ed.). London: Routledge.

Gómez, A. G. (2010). Disembodiment and cyberspace: Gendered discourses in female teenagers' personal information disclosure. *Discourse & Society*, 21(2), 135-160.

Graham, S. & Perin, D. (2007). *Writing next: Effective strategies to improve writing of adolescents in middle and high schools*. Washington: Alliance for Excellent Education.

Guthrie, J. T. & Coddington, C. S. (2009). Reading motivation. In K. R. Wentzel, & A. Wigfield (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation at school*, 503-525, New York: Routledge.

Guthrie, J. T., Coddington, C. S., & Wigfield, A. (2009). Profiles of reading motivation among African American and Caucasian students. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 41, 317-353.

Guthrie, J. T., Hoa, A. L. W., Wigfield, A., Tonks, S. M., Humenick, N. M., & Littles, E. (2007). Reading motivation and reading comprehension growth in the later elementary years. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 32, 282-313.

Guthrie, J. T., Klauda, S. L., & Ho, A. N. (2013). Modeling the relationships among reading instruction, motivation, engagement, and achievement for adolescents. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 48(1), 9-26.

Guthrie, J. T. & Wigfield, A. (2000). Engagement and motivation in reading. In M. Kamil & P. Mosenthal (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research*

(Vol. 3), 403-422, Mahwah: Erlbaum.

Guzzetti, B. & Gamboa, M. (2005). Online journaling: The informal writings of two adolescent girls. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 40(2), 168-206.

Hall, L. A. (2009). Struggling reader, struggling teacher: An examination of student-teacher transactions with reading instruction and text in social studies. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 43(3), 286-309.

Hall, L. A. (2010). The negative consequences of becoming a good reader: Identity theory as a lens for understanding struggling readers, teachers, and reading instruction. *Teachers College Record,* 112, 1792-1829.

Hall, L. A. (2012). The role of reading identities and reading abilities in students' discussions about texts and comprehension strategies. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 44(3), 239-272.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic*. London: Edward Arnold.

Harmon, J., Hedrick, W., Wood, K. (2005). Research on vocabulary instruction in the Content areas: Implication for struggling readers. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 21, 261-280.

Heron-Hruby, A., Hagood, M. C., & Alvermann, D. E. (2008). Switching places and looking to adolescents for the practices that shape school literacies. *Reading and Writing Quarterly*, 24(3), 311-334.

Heller, R. & Greenleaf, C. (2007). *Literacy instruction in the content areas: Getting to the core of middle and high school improvement.* Washington: Alliance for Excellent Education.

Hinchman, K. A., Payne-Bourcy, L., Thomas, H., & Chandler-Olcott, K. (2002). Representing adolescents' literacies: Case studies of three white males. *Reading Research and Instruction*, 41, 229-246.

Hinchman, K. A. & Sheridan-Thomas, H. K. (Eds.). (2014). *Best practices in adolescent literacy instruction* (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford Press.

Hock, M. F., Brasseur, I. F., Deshler, D. D., Catts, H. W., Marquis, J. G., Mark, C. A., et al. (2009). What is the nature of struggling adolescent readers in urban schools?. *Learning Disabilities Quarterly*, 32, 21-38.

Hohlfeld, T. N., Ritzhaupt, A. D., Barron, A. E., & Kemker, K. (2008).

Examining the digital divide in K-12 public schools: Four-year trends for supporting ICT literacy in Florida. *Computers & Education*, 51(4), 1648-1663.

Hull, G. A. & Katz, M. L. (2006). Crafting an agentive self: Case studies of digital storytelling. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 41(1), 43-81.

Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates. (2002). *Academic literacy: A statement of competencies expected of students entering California's public colleges and universities*. Sacramento: ICAS.

Jacobs, V. A. (2008). Adolescent literacy: Putting the crisis in context. *Harvard Educational Review*, 78(1), 7-39. HEPG.

Kamil, M. L., Borman, G. D., Dole, J., Kral, C. C., Salinger, T., and Torgesen, J. (2008). *Improving adolescent literacy: Effective classroom and intervention practices: A Practical Guide*. Washington: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.

Katzir, T., Lesaux, N. K., & Kim, Y. (2009). The role of reading self-concept and home literacy practices in fourth grade reading comprehension. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 22, 261-276.

Kennedy, M. M. (2007). Defining a Literature. *Educational Researcher*, 36(3) 139-147.

Kieffer, M.J. (2011). Converging trajectories: Reading growth in language minority learners and their classmates, kindergarten to grade eight. *American Educational Research Journal*, 48, 1157-1186.

Kieffer, M. J. (2012). Before and after third grade: Longitudinal evidence for the shifting role of socioeconomic status in reading growth. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 25(7), 1725-1746.

Kieffer, M. J. & Lesaux, N. K. (2012). Knowledge of words, knowledge about words: Dimensions of vocabulary in first and second language learners in sixth grade. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 25, 347-373.

Kymes, A. (2005). Teaching online comprehension strategies using think-alouds. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 48(6), 492-500.

Lam, W. S. E. (2009). Multiliteracies on instant messaging in negotiating local, translocal, and transnational affiliations: A case of an adolescent immigrant. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 44(4), 377-397.

Lenters, K. (2006). Resistance, struggle and the adolescent reader. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 50(2), 136-146.

Lee, C. D. & Smagorinsky, P. (Eds) (2000). *Vygotskian perspectives on literacy research: Constructing meaning through collaborative inquiry*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lesaux, N. K. & Kieffer, M. J. (2010). Exploring sources of reading comprehension difficulties among language minority learners and their classmates in early adolescence. *American Educational Research Journal*, 47, 596-632.

Lewis, C. J., Enciso, P., & Moje, E. B. (Eds.) (2007). *Reframing sociocultural research on literacy: Identity, agency, and power*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Lewis, C. & Fabos, B. (2005). Instant messaging, literacies, and social identities. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 40(4), 470-501.

Liebfreund, M. D. (2015). Success with informational text comprehension: An examination of underlying factors. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 50(4), 387-392.

Mancilla-Martinez, J., Kieffer, M. J., Biancarosa, G., Christodoulou, J., & Snow, C. E. (2011). Investigating English reading comprehension growth in adolescent language minority learners: Some insights from the simple view. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 24, 339-354.

McKenna, M. C. (1994). Toward a model of reading attitude acquisition. In E. H. Cramer & M. Castle (Eds.), *Fostering the love of reading: The affective domain in reading education*, 18-40. Newark: International Reading Association.

McKenna, M. C., Conradi, K., Lawrence, C., Jang, B. G., & Meyer, J. P. (2012).

Reading attitudes of middle school students: Results of a U.S. survey. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 47, 283-306.

McKenna, M. C. & Robinson, R. D. (1990). Content literacy: A definition and implications. *Journal of Reading*, 34(3), 184-186.

McLean, C. (2010) A space called home: An immigrant adolescent's digital literacy practices. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 54(1), 13-22.

Moeller, R. A. (2011). "Aren't these boy books?" High school students' readings of gender in graphic novels. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 54(7), 476-484.

Moje, E. B. & Luke, A. (2009). Literacy and identity: A review of perspectives on identity and their impact on literacy studies. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 44(4), 415-37.

Moje, E. B., Overby, M., Tysvaer, N., & Morris, K. (2008). The complex world of adolescent literacy: Myths, motivations, and mysteries. *Harvard Educational Review*, 78(1), 107-154.

Moje, E. B., Young, J., Readence, J. E., Moore , D. W. (2000). Reinventing adolescent literacy for new times. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 43(5), 400-410.

Moore, D. W. (2009). Advocating reading instruction in middle and high school classrooms. In K. D. Wood & W. E. Blanton (Eds.), *Literacy instruction for adolescents: Research-based practice,* 37-53, New York: Guilford.

Moore, D. W., Readence, J. E., & Rickelman, R. J. (1983). An historical exploration of content area reading instruction. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 18(4), 419-438.

Moorman, G. & Horton, J. (2007). Millennials and how to teach them. In J. Lewis and G. Moorman (eds.), *Adolescent literacy instruction: Policies and promising practices*, 263-285. Newark: International Reading Association.

Morrell, E. (2004). *Becoming critical researchers: Literacy and empowerment for urban youth*. New York: Peter Lang.

Morrell, E. (2008). *Critical literacy and urban youth: Pedagogies of access,*

dissent, and liberation. New York: Routledge.

Mucherah, W. & Yoder, A. (2008). Motivation for reading and middle school students' performance on standardized testing in reading. *Reading Psychology*, 29, 214-235.

Muspratt, S., Luke, A., & Freebody, P. (Eds.) (1997). *Constructing critical literacies*. Creskill: Hampton Press.

National Association of State Boards of Education (2005). *Reading at risk: The state response to the crisis in adolescent literacy.* Alexandria: National Association of State Boards of Education.

National Center for Education Statistics (2011). T*he nation's report card: Reading 2011* (NCES 2012-457). Washington: Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.

National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Washington: US Department of Education.

National Governors Association. (2005). *Reading to achieve: A governor's guide to adolescent literacy*. Washington: National Governors Association, Center for Best Practices.

National Institute for Literacy. (2007). *What content-area teachers should know about adolescent literacy*. Washington: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.

National School Boards Association. (2006). *The next chapter: A school board guide to improving adolescent literacy*. Alexandria: Author.

National Telecommunications and Information Administration & U.S. Department of Commerce. (2000). *Falling through the net: Toward digital inclusion*. Washington: Authors.

Nolen, S. B. (2007) Young children's motivation to read and write: development in social contexts. *Cognition & Instruction*, 25(2), 219-270.

O'Brien, D. G., Beach, R., & Scharber, C. (2007). "Struggling" middle schoolers: Engagement and literate competence in a reading writing intervention class. *Reading Psychology*, 28(1), 51-73.

O'Brien, D. G., Stewart, R., & Beach, R. (2009). Proficient reading in school:

Traditional paradigms and new textual landscapes. In L. Christenbury, R. Bomer, & P. Smagorinsky (Eds.), *Handbook of adolescent literacy research*, 80-97, New York: Guilford.

O'Reilly, T. & McNamara, D. S. (2007). The impact of science knowledge, reading skill, and reading strategy knowledge on more traditional "High-Stakes" measures of high school students' science achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, *44*, 161-196.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2010). *PISA 2009 results: Executive summary*. Paris: OECD Publishing.

Petscher, Y. (2010). A meta-analysis of the relationship between student attitudes towards reading and achievement in reading. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 33(4), 335-355.

Protacio, M. S. (2012). Reading motivation: A focus on English learners. *The Reading Teacher*, 66(1), 69-77.

Ramsay, C. M. & Sperling, R. A. (2015). Reading perspective: Can it improve middle school students' comprehension of informational text?. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 108(2), 81-94.

Reynolds, R. E., Taylor, M. A., Steffensen, M. S., Shirey, L. L., & Anderson, R. C. (1982). Cultural schemata and reading comprehension. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 17(3), 353-366.

Rosenblatt, L. M. (1978). *The reader, the text, the poem: The transactional theory of the literary work*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Rosenblatt, L. M. (1995). *Literature as exploration*. New York: Modern Language Association.

Rumelhart, D. E. (1980). Schemata: The building blocks of cognition. In. R. J. Spiro, B. C. Bruce, & W. F. Brewer (Eds.), *Theoretical issues in reading comprehension: Perspectives and cognitive psychology, linguistics, artificial intelligence, and education*, 33-58, Hillsdale: Erlbaum.

Ryan, R. M. & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25, 54-67.

Samuelstuen M, & Bråten I. (2005). Decoding, knowledge, and strategies in

comprehension of expository texts. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 46, 107-117.

Scammacca, N., Roberts, G., Vaughn, S., Edmonds, M., Wexler, J., Reutebuch, C. K. et al. (2007). *Interventions for adolescent struggling readers: A meta-analysis with implications for practice*. Portsmouth: RMC Research Corporation, Center on Instruction.

Scribner, S. & Cole, M. (1981). *The psychology of literacy*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Shanahan, T. (2000). Research synthesis: Making sense of the accumulation of knowledge in reading. In M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, and R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research,* vol. III, 209-226, Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum and Associates.

Shanahan, T. & Shanahan, C. (2008). Teaching disciplinary literacy to adolescents: rethinking content-area literacy. *Harvard Educational Review*, 78(1), 40-59.

Short, D. & Fitzsimmons, S. (2007). *Double the work: Challenges and solutions to acquiring language and academic literacy for adolescent English language learners.* Washington: Alliance for Excellent Education.

Siegel, M. & Fernandez, S. L. (2000). Critical approaches. In M. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 3), 141-151, Mahwah: Erlbaum.

Skerrett, A. & Bomer, R. (2011). Borderzones in adolescents' literacy practices: Connecting out-of-school literacies to the reading curriculum. *Urban Education*, *46*(6), 1256-1279.

Snow, C. E. & Biancarosa, G. (2003). *Adolescent literacy and the achievement gap: What do we know and where do we go from here?.* Washington: Alliance for Excellent Education.

Snow, C. E. & Biancarosa, G. (2004). *Reading next: A vision for action and research in middle and high school literacy*. Washington: Alliance for Excellent Education.

Sutherland, L. M. (2005). Black adolescent girls' use of literacy practices to negotiate boundaries of ascribed identity. *Journal of Literacy*

Research, 37(3), 365-406.

Street, B. (1984). *Literacy in theory and practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Street, B. (1995). *Social literacies: Critical approaches to literacy in development, ethnography and education*. London: Longman.

Taboada, A. & Guthrie, J. (2006). Contributions of student questioning and prior knowledge to construction of knowledge from reading information text. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 38(1), 1-35.

Taboada, A., Tonks, S. M., Wigfield, A., & Guthrie, J. T. (2009). Effects of motivational and cognitive variables on reading comprehension. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 22, 85-106.

Tracy, D. H. & Morrow, L. M. (2012). *Lens on reading: An introduction to theories and models*. New York: Guilford Press.

Troia, G. A., Harbaugh, A. G., Shankland, R. K., Wolbers, K. A., & Lawrence, A. M. (2013). Relationships between writing motivation, writing activity, and writing performance: effects of grade, sex, and ability. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*. 26(1), 17-44.

Torgesen, J. K. & Miller, D. H. (2009). *Assessments to guide adolescent literacy instruction*. Portsmouth: RMC Research Corporation, Center on Instruction.

Torgesen, J. K., Houston, D. D., Rissman, L. M., Decker, S. M., Roberts, G., Vaughn, S. et al. (2007). *Academic literacy instruction for adolescents: A guidance document from the Center on Instruction*. Portsmouth: RMC Research Corporation, Center on Instruction.

Torraco, R. J. (2005). Writing integrative literature reviews: Guidelines and examples. *Human resource development review*, 4(3), 356-367.

Triplett, C. F. (2007). The social construction of "struggle": Influences of school literacy contexts, curriculum, and relationships. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 39(1), 95-126.

Ünlüsoy, A., De Haan, M., Leseman, P., & Van Kruistum, C. (2010). Sex differences in adolescents' out-of-school literacy practices: A multifaceted approach. *Computers & Education*, 55(2), 742-751.

Unrau, N. & Schlackman, J. (2006). Motivation and its relationship with reading achievement in an urban middle school. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 100, 81-101.

U.S. Department of Education (2006). *Striving readers*. http://www2.ed.gov/programs/strivingreaders/index.html.

Vacca, R. T. (1998). Forword. In D.E. Alvermann, K.A. Hinchman, D.W. Moore, S. F. Phelps, & D. R. Waff (Eds.), *Reconceptualizing the literacies in adolescents' lives*, xv-xvi, Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Vetter, A. M. (2010). "'Cause I'm a G": Identity work of a lesbian teen in language arts. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 54(2), 98-108.

Villalva, K. E. (2006). Hidden literacies and inquiry approaches of bilingual high school writers. *Written Communication*. 23(1), 91-129.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978), *Mind in society. The Development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Warschauer, M. (2003). *Technology and social inclusion: Rethinking the digital divide*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Walker, L. O. & Avant, K. C. (2010). *Strategies for theory construction in nursing* (5th ed.). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

West, K. C. (2008). Weblogs and literary response: Socially situated identities and hybrid social languages in English class blogs. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 51, 588-598.

Whittemore, R. & Knafl, K. (2005). The integrative review: updated methodology. *Journal of advanced nursing*, 52(5), 546-553.

Wigfield, A. & Guthrie, J. T. (1997). Relations of children's motivation for reading to the amount and breadth of their reading. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 89(3), 420-432.

Wilder, P. & Dressman, M. (2006). New literacies, enduring challenges? The influence of capital on adolescent readers' internet practices. In D. E. Alvermann, K. A. Hinchman, D. W. Moore, S. F. Phelps, & D. R. Waff (Eds.), *Reconceptualizing the literacies in adolescents' lives* (2nd ed.), 205-229, Mahwah: Erlbaum.

Wilhelm (2007) *"You gotta be the book": Teaching engaged and reflective*

reading with adolescents. New York: Teachers College Press.

Wilson, A. A., Chavez, K. & Anders, P. L. (2012). "From the Koran and Family Guy": Expressions of identity in English learners' digital podcasts. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 55(5), 374-384.

Wissman, K. K. (2007). "Making a way": Young women using literacy and language to resist the politics of silencing. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 51(4), 340-349.

Wolfe, M. B. W. & Goldman, S. R. (2005). Relations between adolescents' text processing and reasoning. *Cognition and Instruction*, 23, 467-502.

Wolters, C. A., Denton, C. A., York, M. J., & Francis, D. J. (2014). Adolescents' motivation for reading: group differences and relation to standardized achievement. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 27(3), 503-533.

Worthy, J., Moorman, M., & Turner, M. (1999). What Johnny likes to read is hard to find in school. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 34(1), 12-27.

Yi, Y. (2008). Relay writing in an adolescent online community. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 51, 670-680.

Yoon, B. (2012). Junsuk and Junhyuck: Adolescent immigrants' educational journey to success and identity negotiation. *American Educational Research Journal*, 49(5), 971-1002.

Zhang, S. & Duke, N. K. (2008). Strategies for Internet reading with different reading purposes: A descriptive study of twelve good Internet readers. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 40(1), 128-162.

ABSTRACT

Trends and Issues in Adolescent Literacy Theories and Research: An Integrative Review

Jang, Bong Gee

This paper aims to help clarify conceptual abstractness and inconsistency of adolescent literacy by providing a integrative review of recent literature related to adolescent literacy research and policies and by analyzing current trends and issues in adolescent literacy. Much of the current literature on adolescent literacy pays particular attention to evolving technology and digital contexts and their influences on a range of literacy outcomes. Most reports and teacher resource materials published by federal agencies were influenced by the cognitive and developmental perspectives. Future research and policy should incorporate more diverse and comprehensive approaches to adolescent literacy.

KEYWORDS Adolescent literacy, integrative review, digital literacy, policy