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Editor’s Note

This issue of the *TESOL Quarterly* focuses on the education of children and adolescents who are learning English as a second language. Although in many countries this population is increasing, research on young people learning English is quite limited. It is hoped that this issue will stimulate further inquiry and debate on this important topic. I have enjoyed working with Christian Faltis, Sarah Hudelson, and the contributing authors on this much-needed issue.

The fall 1995 special-topic issue will be on Qualitative Research in ESOL with guest editors Kathryn Davis and Anne Lazaraton. Abstract submission for this issue has closed. Readers will find in this issue a Call for Abstracts for the 1996 special-topic issue on Language Planning and Policy and the English Language Teaching Profession. General guidelines for special-topic issues can be found in the Information for Contributors.

Sandra McKay

In This Issue

Articles in this issue of the *TESOL Quarterly* focus on children and adolescents who are adding English as a second language in kindergarten through high school settings. The goal of the issue is to contribute to a better understanding of the multiple conditions that promote or inhibit these students’ participation in the classroom community and their language and literacy development. Four major themes emerged from this foremost concern: (a) first and second language acquisition are intimately connected, but L2 learners require adjustments in pedagogy to accommodate their language and academic needs; (b) classrooms with L2 learners need responsive teachers; (c) L2 learners can use their primary language to mediate their learning in English; and (d) good teachers see and treat their students in terms of strengths, not what they lack.
The lead article provides an in-depth overview and analysis of these major themes along with our beliefs about language and literacy acquisition. The second article describes the challenges faced by elementary and secondary ESOL teachers who decided to implement writing workshop in their classrooms. The third article presents a case study of how teachers learned to understand the meaning systems of a Dakota child by studying her written and visual works. The fourth article presents a study of a bilingual classroom in which the teacher does not speak the language of the students but encourages students to use their primary language for learning. The fifth article seeks to further the understanding of what goes on in exemplary English-only programs with regard to the use and function of the students’ primary languages. The focus of the sixth article is an intensive ESL program for French-speaking children in Quebec, Canada. The last article discusses the results of a large-scale study on the integration of language and content instruction.

- Our article begins with a summary of our beliefs about how children and adolescents learn language and literacy and are acquired by knowledge systems in school contexts. We then discuss these beliefs and attempt to integrate them within the four themes that emerged from the six articles we selected for this special issue.

- Joy Kreeft Peyton, Chuck Jones, Andrea Vincent, and Les Greenblatt describe the ways public school teachers in the Washington, DC, area responded to the challenge of implementing writing workshop in their classrooms. The authors discuss the ways teachers who participated in the study were forced to reconcile their visions of what writing workshop should be with the realities of their situations, the ways they dealt with their students’ needs, and the kinds of successes they experienced.

- Elizabeth Franklin and Jackie Thompson use a collection of written and visual works of one Dakota child to show how teachers can counteract the tendency to see American Indian children through deficiency labels. The teachers were able to understand the child’s meaning-making efforts by carefully studying the genres that emerged from her written work and art.

- Lucinda Pease-Alvarez and Adam Winsler report the results of a study on language uses and beliefs of Spanish-English bilingual students in a fourth-grade class taught by a teacher with only minimal proficiency in Spanish, the students’ primary language. The authors show how the teacher worked to promote the use and development of Spanish. Despite a strong commitment by the teacher and students to the maintenance and further development of Spanish, there was a considerable shift toward the use of English by the end of the school year.

- Tamara Lucas and Anne Katz draw from a study of nine exemplary K–12 programs for students who are adding English as an additional
language in which English was ostensibly the only language of the classroom. They argue that the students’ native language has an educationally important place in these classrooms. In many instances, they found that teachers who were monolingual English speakers or who did not speak the languages of all of the students incorporated their students’ native languages into instruction in ways that enabled greater student participation in and benefit from classroom learning activities.

- Patsy M. Lightbown and Nina Spada examine the way English as an additional language is taught in Quebec’s French-language schools in Grades 5 and 6. The goal of these schools is to produce students who can understand and speak English fluently after 5 months of full school days of English language activities that focus almost exclusively on communication and fluency. Lightbown and Spada discuss the effects of introducing a greater focus on form to promote the development of accuracy in language use within or in addition to the communicative activities found in most classes.

- Deborah J. Short describes an ongoing research project to examine the implementation of social studies lessons designed to integrate language and content objectives, critical thinking, and issues of cultural diversity in colonial America. Also highlighted are some of the successful strategies teachers used to help students comprehend the content and develop their academic skills. Many of the strategies used for content instruction are adaptations many recognize as good ESL pedagogy.

Also in this issue:

- The Forum: George Braine's comments on A. Suresh Canagarajah’s “Critical Ethnography of a Sri Lankan Classroom” are followed by a response from the author. Sarah Benesch also responds to Desmond Allison’s comments on her article, “ESL, Ideology, and the Politics of Pragmatism.” In the Teaching Issues section, Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and Kamal Sridhar discuss ESL and mother tongue maintenance.

- Reviews: K. Murugan reviews Focus on the Language Classroom: An Introduction to Classroom Research for Language Teachers, by Dick Allwright and Kathleen Bailey; Joan Wink and LeAnn Putney review Christian Faltis’s Jointfostering: Adapting Teaching Strategies for the Multilingual Classroom; and Zoltán Dörnyei reviews Lexical Phrases and Language Teaching by James R. Nattinger and Jeanette S. DeCarrico.

- Book Notices: Eight texts and resource books are discussed.

    We would like to thank Sandra Silberstein, Sandra McKay, and the Editorial Advisory Board of the TESOL Quarterly for providing us with
this opportunity to devote an issue to the needs and concerns of children and adolescents who are learning English in school contexts. We hope that the themes and concerns presented in this issue will inspire many in our audience to join this critical field of inquiry.

Christian Faltis and Sarah Hudelson, Guest Editors
This special-topic issue of the TESOL Quarterly is dedicated to immigrant and native language minority learners worldwide who enter K–12 schools proficient in a language other than English and who bring with them linguistic, cultural, and social traditions that are often distinctly different from those assumed by the schools. Frequently English learners in English-speaking countries face a challenge and a prejudice that most English-speaking students rarely experience. Accordingly, our goal in this issue is to begin a new dialogue about ways language educators can collaborate with other school personnel to improve the educational experience of English learners worldwide.

Exactly what changes schools need to make to accommodate linguistic and cultural diversity is an issue that involves linguicism, ethnocentrism, xenophobia, and the politics of language (see Bilingual Research Journal, 12 (1 & 2), 1992, and Skutnabb-Kangas, 1988, for discussions of these factors from U.S. and European viewpoints, respectively). We realize that a full and reasonable treatment of these matters is well beyond the scope and purpose of this special issue. Nonetheless, we would like to elaborate on what we feel K–12 schools need to do minimally to move toward a quality education for learners who will be adding English to their language and learning experiences. To do so, we begin by describing our assumptions about teaching and learning.

TEACHING AND LEARNING IN AND OUT OF SCHOOL

Learning as Being Acquired by a Knowledge System

First, we believe that language and literacy learning in schools results from understanding and participating in social interaction with classmates and the teacher about topics that matter to both the teacher and the students. Moreover, we believe that students can achieve an
understanding of concepts, principles, and processes associated with knowledge systems such as science and social studies only when they are invited to join in the discussions about them through listening, reading, talking, and writing. From our stance, language and literacy learning in school contexts is as much a matter of students’ being acquired by a knowledge system as it is a matter of students’ acquiring that knowledge system by internalizing concepts, principles, and processes associated with it.

Our perspective on learning is based on the idea that learners absorb knowledge and store it in some cognitive fashion but that the crux of learning occurs through social interaction in which content is being discussed and negotiated. (This view is in line with Edelsky, Altwerger, & Flores, 1991, and Lave & Wenger, 1991, among others.) That is, learning takes place when learners are invited to participate (through multiple means) in the ways of knowing that full members of a particular community possess, value, display, and reinforce. In this manner, learners not only generate new knowledge based on peer knowledge, but they also acquire knowledge that has a social history and a discourse through which to talk about that knowledge (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Lemke, 1989, 1990).

This learning perspective places cognitive ideas about second language acquisition (SLA) (see Long, 1993, for categorization of extant SLA theories) aside in favor of learning as contextually situated in activities that must have one or more knowledgeable members who interact with learners in ways that invite them to “join the club,” as Smith (1988) has often said. We believe that our socially based perspective more adequately depicts what happens in classrooms that invite students who are acquiring English to generate as well as gain knowledge and discourse from peers and the teacher.

**L1 Interaction Facilitates Learning Through the L2**

Second, we believe that students are most likely to interact socially about topics that matter to them in a language they identify with and can use for understanding and knowing (Hudelson, 1987). This means that, whenever possible and feasible, students should be both encouraged and allowed to use their primary language(s) for literacy and language development, even in all-English classrooms (Faltis, 1993; Hudelson & Faltis, 1993). Support for this stance has been found recently in the pages of this journal (Auerbach, 1993a) but is virtually absent from SLA theory. To the best of our knowledge, the role of the L1 in SLA most often discussed is that it can interfere with L2 development. In contrast, we propose that the use of the L1 in English-based classes is beneficial for SLA because it enables learners to discuss
topics and issues in a language they understand before they attempt to participate with others in the language of the classroom, English. In other words, it enables learners to join in the English discussion with more confidence and greater understanding about topics at hand.

**Learning With and Through Legitimate Literacy**

Third, we support the incorporation of legitimate and extensive uses of reading and writing across subject matter and through grade levels (see Edelsky, 1991, Chapter 5, for a discussion of legitimate literacy activities in and out of school). Many literacy educators (Freeman & Freeman, 1992; Hudelson, 1986, 1989; Samway, 1987, 1993; Samway & Taylor, 1993; Serna & Hudelson, 1993; Urzúa, 1987, 1992) have shown repeatedly and convincingly that immigrant or native-born children and adolescents are able to read and write extensively in English while they are still learning the language. Moreover, these authors point out, learners read and write more proficiently when they are interested in what they are reading and writing, when they have a personal stake in or connection with what they are reading and writing, and when what they are reading and writing is related directly to their own lives (Freeman & Freeman, 1992; Kawazoe, 1990; Samway, Whang, Cade, Gamil, Lubandina, & Phommachanh, 1991).

**Teaching as a Sociopolitical and Ethical-Moral Activity**

Our final assumption has to do with our view of teaching. We take the perspective that the status quo in schools as well as in society should not be maintained (Hudelson & Faltis, 1993). We believe that teachers should become agents of change working both for better schools for all learners (regardless of their English proficiency or ethnic origin) and for a more just and democratic society (Auerbach, 1993a, 1993b; Edelsky, 1993). This view of teachers and teaching requires all members of the school community to work collaboratively to critique many of the existing practices in schools and in society. For example, teachers need to question the practice and the result of socially and physically segregating ESL students from native English-speaking students through pullout and other less obvious means such as tracking. Is it just to place ESL students in classrooms with teachers who are not prepared in bilingual and ESL methodology? Who benefits most from using discrete-item tests, language minority students or the test publishers?

Similarly, elementary and secondary teachers need to be involved in analyzing and critiquing existing social practices and policies in their classrooms. Peterson (1991) provides an excellent example of how he
engaged fourth-grade bilingual/L2 learners in examining and acting upon diverse issues such as the U.S. role in El Salvador and trash in the school yard. Other elementary school bilingual teachers have explored such high-quality English and Spanish literature as *Faithful Elephants* (Tsuchiya, 1988), *Number the Stars* (Lowry, 1989), *La Sequía* (Zatón, 1988) and *Si Ves Pasar Un Cóndor* (Ocampo, 1986). Learners from ages 6 to 12 have made connections between these stories and events and issues like the 1991 Gulf War, war in general, and animal rights (Fournier, 1993; Hudelson, Fournier, Espinosa, & Bachman, in press).

Until recently, teachers of language minority students have not enjoyed a large political advocacy base in the TESOL organization. This situation has changed slowly for the better as witnessed, for example, by the increased membership in TESOL’s Elementary Education and Bilingual Education Interest Sections, by the higher visibility of these groups in the organization, and by the larger number of presentations on language minority students at the annual TESOL convention. But there is still a long way to go. Language educators and teachers of language minority students alike would be hard pressed to find significant research or information on bilingual education or ESL at the middle- or high-school level published before 1990 (Faltis & Arias, 1993). We must continue to increase TESOL members’ awareness of and concern for language minority students in K–12 schools. In the U.S., for example, there is approximately one bilingual/ESL teacher for every 350 ESL children in school, and many of these teachers are clustered into segregated schools where their impact is likely to be limited to the building in which they teach (see Cazden, 1986). Moreover, the gap between bilingual/ESL teachers in K–12 schools is likely to widen in the future as the numbers of immigrant and native-born students reared speaking a language other than English are escalating exponentially. The situation in the U.S. is being repeated in many other English-speaking countries. The time for political action to promote change for more just schools is now.

**EMERGING THEMES**

Fortunately, a number of language educators and teachers are actively working to change K–12 schools to improve education for all students. In this special issue we have assembled six articles, five by authors from the U.S. and one by authors from Canada, that move the discussion about what is going on in K–12 schools significantly forward from the days when ESL was taught as an isolated subject, divorced from subject matter and from literacy in general. We selected
these studies because we believe they offer multiple perspectives on the language and academic development of child and adolescent learners of English as an additional language. But we also have found commonalities across the pieces. All six articles evidence a concern for the student and the ways the classroom environment promotes or prohibits learners’ participation in the classroom community and their development of language proficiency. Around this central concern, four major themes emerge: (a) There is a connection between learning in an L1 and an L2, but pedagogy needs to be adjusted to accommodate L2 language learners; (b) classrooms with L2 learners require teachers who are responsive to these students’ needs; (c) L2 students can use their primary language to understand and exchange ideas about subject matter before they attempt discussion or writing in English; and (d) good teachers see their students in terms of strengths, not deficits or weaknesses.

The L1 and L2 Acquisition Connection

The first theme we identified is that of basic similarities between first and second language literacy and content learning and, consequently, congruence between effective pedagogy for L1 learners and for those who are learning a second or additional language. All of the articles in this issue affirm certain positions with regard to both oral and written language learning: (a) Language learning involves figuring out how language works; (b) language is learned within social contexts and interactions; (c) language is best learned through use, that is, when the learner utilizes language to accomplish some real purpose; and (d) oral language development and written language development are interrelated and often occur simultaneously rather than sequentially. Several of the articles (Lucas & Katz; Short; Peyton, Jones, Vincent, & Greenblatt) also affirm the principle that learners generally relate new learning to what they already know. Although these principles were proposed originally in terms of L1 acquisition and content learning in a native language (see, for example, Barnes, 1976; Barnes, Britton, & Torbe, 1986; Lindfors, 1987), they have now gained significant acceptance by K–12 L2 educators as well (see, for example, Enright, 1984; Enright & McCloskey, 1985; Freeman & Freeman, 1992; Gibbons, 1993; Peyton & Staton, 1993; Rigg, 1991).

The kinds of progressive, innovative pedagogies that are congruent with the language-learning principles just articulated are those examined and/or referred to in the research presented in this issue: process writing through writing workshops; journals of various types; paired and small-group activities; cooperative problem solving, experimentation, and research projects; drama; utilization of authentic texts; and
literature response and study. As with the theoretical perspective, these innovative instructional strategies were first discussed in native language settings and are now being advocated for use with students who are still learning their L2 (Enright & McCloskey, 1988; Faltis, 1993; Gibbons, 1993; Hadaway & Mundy, 1992; Lim & Watson, 1993; Peyton & Reed, 1990; Rigg & Allen, 1989; Samway et al., 1991; Samway, 1992; Urzúa, 1992).

The articles in this issue demonstrate that instructional strategies may need to be adjusted because of the special situation and needs of L2 learners. For example, in their study of the implementation of writing workshops with ESL students, Peyton et al. show that good ESL-oriented teachers learned to respond successfully to student needs as they intertwined with the realities, constraints, and demands of the school system over the school year. In traditional writers’ workshop pedagogy (Atwell, 1987; Calkins, 1986; Graves, 1983), teachers are cautioned against correcting such aspects of student drafts as spelling, grammar, and punctuation. Providing word lists for particular topics is viewed as inhibiting to the writer. Writers select their own topics and work independently on their pieces. Yet many teachers who utilized writers’ workshop with their L2 learners, especially those in intermediate, middle school, and senior high placements, did respond to student queries about conventional forms by supplying them. They did, early on in the learners’ writing experiences, suggest topics. They did spend significant amounts of time talking about topics before learners wrote. They did supply word lists. They made these adjustments because the learners requested information about literacy conventions and because they were aware of the learners’ previous schooling experiences (which often emphasized form, not expression), the learners’ needs vis-à-vis their non-ESL classes, and the learners’ current confidence levels, abilities, and willingness to engage in writing. In this way the teachers were able to keep the literacy activities legitimate and to attend to the students’ as well as the school communities’ needs. This adjustment further enabled the ESL students to join the new literacy club that now required a certain level of conventional knowledge and performance without totally sacrificing legitimate opportunities for communicating through reading and writing.

Lightbown and Spada (this issue) also make the case for taking the learners’ responses into account in designing and implementing curriculum. They found that francophone children whose communicative, meaning-based ESL classes included some attention to conventional forms (approximately 20% of class time) utilized some of those features more accurately than children whose ESL experiences involved no attention to form. The teacher decided which forms to
call the learners’ attention to by observing the children’s language production and taking her cues from them.

In addition to struggling with and making adjustments in innovative pedagogues, increasing numbers of educators are discovering that using progressive pedagogues eventually and inevitably leads to a concern for assessment that is congruent with newer views of teaching and learning. Franklin and Thompson (this issue) provide an example of the kind of innovative assessment of learners that documents not only what learners have accomplished but also who they are. As their detailed review of one child makes clear, describing a learner through her actual work paints a much more complete and accurate picture of both the learner and the learning process than does a test score.

**Responsive Teaching**

A second theme that appears in these articles is that of responsive teaching. By this we mean that the teachers described in these articles demonstrated particular sensitivity to the realities and needs of the learners with whom they were working and engaged in teaching behavior that took their students into account. As we have just documented, one of the ways teachers were responsive to students was to adjust innovative pedagogues to take into account learners’ actions, comments, and needs. The teachers took their cues from the learners and adapted pedagogy to meet the needs of their students in ways that respond to criticisms of educators such as Delpit (1986) and Reyes (1991), who have expressed concern that innovative pedagogues used with learners from the mainstream majority culture may not be equally effective with linguistically and culturally diverse learners unless those learners’ special needs are taken into account.

The teachers portrayed here also engaged in responsive teaching by deliberately including the learners’ cultural backgrounds and life experiences in some of their lessons. Franklin and Thompson (this issue) engaged Dakota Sioux children in responses to literature, and they intentionally chose books that represented stories and legends of American Indian peoples. The ESL curriculum used by the teachers in Lightbown and Spada’s work (this issue) developed from the interests of students. The adapted social studies unit that Short (this issue) describes included significant amounts of information on the cultural diversity that existed in what is now the U.S. at the time of the American Revolution as a way of illustrating to recent immigrant students that the U.S. has been a culturally diverse society since its inception. The teachers with whom Short collaborated also used current events familiar to the learners (e.g., events in Los Angeles after the Rodney King
verdict, the attempted coup d'état in Thailand) to explain concepts such as protest to students. Thus these teachers both adapted instruction and made it relevant to the learners in their classrooms.

The Place of Native Languages

The third theme identified is that of respect for and utilization of the learners’ native language(s). Pease-Alvarez and Winsler and Lucas and Katz in this issue provide many examples of the ways language minority students used their native language(s) to support and reinforce their learning of English and schoolwork in English. Peyton et al. (this issue) document the importance of allowing learners new to the process of writing to write in their native language so that they begin to feel some comfort with writing. Pease-Alvarez and Winsler also share the ways that one limited-Spanish-speaking teacher used Spanish with his pupils to demonstrate the value he placed on the learners’ native language and his conviction that it should be used for classroom learning. The Sioux children written about in Franklin and Thompson’s article in this issue received several hours of instruction weekly in their tribal language. The overriding goal of the schooling in Quebec described by Lightbown and Spada (this issue) is the retention of French by francophone children.

Thus these authors present rationales for including the native language that are linguistic (native language ability facilitates L2 learning; it is beneficial to the individual to be bilingual), cultural (ancestral languages should be retained and/or revitalized, and the schools may be a part of this), cognitive-academic (learners may be assisted in their learning of content if they make use of the native language as well as the L2), and affective-psychological (learners may react more positively to the new language if they experience acceptance and valuing of the native language). Their examples make the points that learners of various ages will benefit from this inclusion, that teachers do not need to be fluent speakers of the native language(s) of the learners to encourage the use of the native language(s) in the classroom, and that such use is possible even when multiple languages are present.

These educators and many others, then, value the retention and utilization of native languages. Pease-Alvarez and Winsler (this issue) also discuss an all-too-common phenomenon in settings where the majority language is English: language shift, learners choosing to use English instead of their home languages. Pease-Alvarez and Winsler offer some strategies that may counteract this reality, but language shift happens nonetheless in many contexts and merits continued careful examination and consideration given the trend toward including
rather than excluding languages other than English in the English classroom.

**Learner Strengths**

The fourth theme we have identified is that of respect for learners and of viewing learners in terms of their strengths. The articles in this issue do not conceive of or write of learners in deficit terms. Lucas and Katz and Franklin and Thompson acknowledge that deficit perspectives often have been applied to linguistically and culturally diverse populations, but they openly reject these labels. Franklin and Thompson portray one child’s individual, social, cultural, and linguistic interests and abilities, invoking an appreciation for her accomplishments and for her personhood. Pease-Alvarez and Winsler describe three bilingual children’s language use in ways that make obvious their linguistic and communicative competence, their sophisticated understanding of language choice in bilingual settings, and their able utilization of two languages. These educators challenge us to think of learners in terms of what they are able to do rather than in terms of what they are not able to do.

**LOOKING TO THE FUTURE**

The work featured in this issue of the *TESOL Quarterly* was carried out by researchers committed both to understanding the complexities involved in providing educational opportunities for school-age learners of English as an additional language and to improving the quality of schooling experiences for this ever-increasing group of learners. We hope that the articles stimulate discussion, reflection, and action on the part of readers, both those who identify themselves as TESOL educators and those who view themselves as having expertise in other areas but who also work with child and adolescent learners of English as an additional language. We also hope that this issue will encourage others who are working in primary and secondary education settings to submit manuscripts to this journal. We know that significant work is taking place; these efforts need to be shared with TESOL audiences in many parts of the world.

Many concerns with regard to K–12 populations occur to us as we conclude our work on this issue and reflect on what has not been considered in these pages. One concern is how to better identify and describe what learners know and can do when they enter our schools. Current instruments and approaches do not provide the depth and breadth of information that educators need to work most effectively...
with linguistically, socially, culturally, and academically diverse populations. Another concern is including the complexities and realities of L2 learning in K–12 settings within the purview of SLA theory. For example, literacy development is of paramount importance in elementary and secondary schools, yet the roles of reading and writing generally are not included within discussions of how an L2 is acquired. Still another concern is that of examining ways in which governmental educational policies affecting school-age learners of English as an additional language influence and are influenced by political realities, including political change. We also need more accounts of schooling in various parts of the world where educators and policy makers are struggling with the roles of native languages in relationship to English.

In closing, we invite the reader to give the following articles an enthusiastic reading and, in doing so, to step inside some of the social and educational realities faced by the masses of children and adolescents who are learning English as an additional language in K–12 settings. Looking into our crystal ball, we cannot help but hope that the needs of this population of English learners will figure prominently in the future agenda of TESOL advocates and practitioners.
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Teachers implementing writing workshop with ESOL students often find that the realities of their teaching situation do not match their original vision of what writing workshop could or should be. Constraints of the school context and students’ English language and literacy proficiency and cultural backgrounds present challenges that they need to address in innovative ways. In this article we describe the visions, challenges, strategies, and successes of ESOL teachers involved in The Books Project, in which they learn about writing workshop in a semester- or year-long course and are supported as they implement it. They have found that they are particularly constrained by limited time, space, and resources, as well as conflicts between the approach they are attempting and other school- or districtwide demands. In the classroom they struggle with the dynamics of student writing fluency, conferencing and sharing, revising, and preoccupations with correctness. Their experiences have implications for other ESOL teachers and for teacher development. Teachers need much more than models of innovations, which they are to adapt and replicate. In addition, they need time, support, and resources to understand underlying theories and processes and to develop their own teaching practice, informed by the models.

Atwell (1987), Calkins (1986), and Graves (1983), among others, have supplied powerful models for implementing writing workshop with native-English-speaking students from early elementary grades through middle school. They and the children they worked with and studied have shown that even very young children can produce creative and interesting texts when writing is treated as a natural, open-ended activity; when it is supported by a print-rich environment;
and when students have predictable and extended times to write, choose their own topics, receive authentic responses from teachers and other students, and publish their writing for various audiences and purposes.

Likewise, teachers and researchers working with students from diverse language backgrounds have given valuable insights into what these students can do when they receive appropriate instruction and opportunities to write freely (Ammon, 1985; Edelsky, 1983; Hudelson, 1986, 1989; Ortiz, 1990; Peyton & Staton, 1993; Taylor, 1990; Urzúa, 1987). Samway (1992) has described how writing workshop can be structured for students learning English as a second or additional language.

However, beyond a few individual accounts and classroom portraits, very little information is available about the contexts in which teachers implement writing workshop with students learning English and the constraints they face. ESOL teachers feel strongly that writing workshop is a valuable tool for developing literacy and a centerpiece for a language and literacy curriculum, but very little is known about how it might look in actual practice. What forms do writing instruction in general, and writing workshop in particular, take when students speak a language other than English? What obstacles do teachers face, and how do they overcome them? How do teachers adapt the basic framework for writing workshop when students are learning not only to write but also to communicate in a language in which they are not fully proficient? In what ways is writing workshop effective with these students?

In this article, we describe the ways that public school teachers in The Books Project in Washington, DC, and its affiliate, A World of Stories in Prince George’s County, Maryland (both referred to here as The Books Project), have responded to the challenge to implement writing workshop in their classrooms. We discuss how they have reconciled their visions of what writing workshop should be with the realities of their situations, how they have negotiated with the constraints and demands of their school systems and the needs of their students, and how they have succeeded.

DATA

The data for this study come from our work with teachers in The Books Project during the 1992–1993 school year. The primary data source is four focus group meetings held at the end of the school year with a total of 16 Books Project teachers. The teachers answered open-ended questions in a survey before the meetings and discussed those
questions at the meetings, which were audiotaped and transcribed. We interviewed selected teachers more extensively and reviewed conference and workshop presentations and articles published by some of the teachers (e.g., Bartley, 1993; Parks, 1993). In addition, Books Project staff observed the teachers’ classes throughout the year and wrote field notes and summaries. We also reviewed Books Project course assignments (described below) and end-of-year project evaluations. Finally, because The Books Project has been in existence for 3 years, the insights presented here are informed by our overall experience with the project as well. All teachers mentioned in this article actually participated in the project.

The teachers in the project work with students from the early elementary grades through high school, but primarily in Grades K–6. Most are ESOL pullout teachers. The predominant native language of their students is Spanish (most of the students are from El Salvador), but speakers of many different languages may be found in one classroom. Students in one class may also have different literacy levels and educational backgrounds—from low literacy, both in the native language and in English, to very proficient in English, and from no previous schooling in their native country to several years of schooling in the U.S. Classes vary in size from 6 to 25 students.

The teachers’ experience with implementing writing workshop ranges from 6 months to 4 years. Most begin writing workshop as a result of Books Project courses, one- or two-semester-long introductions to teaching the writing process. The texts used in the course are Calkins’ (1986) *The Art of Teaching Writing* for elementary teachers and Atwell’s (1987) *In the Middle* for middle school and secondary teachers, supplemented by articles focusing on writing for students learning an L2. Teacher consultants and course alumni come to class periodically to discuss their practice. Books Project staff visit teachers’ classes three or four times a year to support workshop implementation, and teachers work with a partner to observe each other’s classes, give each other nonjudgmental feedback, and share ideas. Finally, teachers keep a personal journal, document their implementation of writing strategies, write a case study of one student writer’s growth over time, and develop their own piece of writing for inclusion in a project anthology.

**RECONCILING THE VISION AND THE REALITY**

In most staff development programs about the writing process, the presenters call forth a vision of a writing classroom (usually called a writers’ or writing workshop) that is warm, supportive, creative, productive, and at the same time orderly. Writing workshop is the
form that the writing process takes in the classrooms described in Atwell (1987), Calkins (1986), Harwayne (1992), and Samway (1992), among others. Essentially, in regular and predictable blocks of time, teachers begin with a minilesson, followed by periods of drafting, conferencing and sharing, revising, redrafting, editing, publishing, and celebrating.

Initially, writing workshop is depicted vividly through text descriptions, pictures, and videotapes that show classrooms in action; those act cumulatively to create a model of what a writing classroom should look like. However, for most Books Project teachers, returning to their classrooms to implement this model means coming face-to-face with issues that never seem to have appeared in the texts. Matilde Arciniegas, for example, a K–6 ESOL teacher, described her experience of coming to terms with reality this way:

As I read the work of Donald Graves this year, I thought to myself, “What a wonderful match! Good solid research by a university professor who isn’t afraid to roll up his sleeves, sit on the carpet, and go to work with any group of children placed before him; talented and daring teachers ready to embrace a new approach to writing; and middle-class children who have an above-average command of the English language.” But what about children who know very little English and who may not be literate in their native language? Can the work of Graves and others be useful in an ESOL classroom? If so, how?

Mary Ball, a high school teacher, envisioned talking and laughing with her students about an exciting piece of student writing. Then the students would make connections between their own writing, other students’ writing, and published works and incorporate all of that into their own developing repertoire. She has now learned that “these things don’t just happen automatically. Students don’t just absorb these things without a great deal of teacher modeling and support.”

These teachers have experienced the natural evolution that seems to attend the implementation of the writing process (or any other educational innovation; see Bruce, 1993). At first, the teacher envisions the possibility of an ideal learning environment in which writing has a preeminent place, students and the teacher work cooperatively together, and students develop as readers and writers. Almost impossible to see are the obstacles teachers face and the hard work, soul searching, and trial and error that go into refining the classroom practice reported in the texts and videos.

Typically, after several weeks, frustration and disappointment surface as initially motivated children want to stop writing, peer response groups get mired in the same set of comments about their pieces, and the teacher loses track of what individual students are doing and where
they might go next. The disparity between the envisioned model and the classroom experience is heightened by the absence of conditions that seem to be necessary for a successful writing workshop: teacher autonomy and control over time schedules, arrangement of physical space, and resources; support from administrators, parents, and other teachers; pedagogical congruence with other programs in the school; and shared teacher and student values regarding and commitment to literacy.

Teachers who push through this period of frustration and develop a successful writing workshop have come to terms with a phenomenon of learning itself: They must own in practice what they have learned in the abstract. Below we summarize the situations the ESOL teachers in this study face in their buildings and classrooms, their realizations about the adaptations needed in their own thinking and classroom practice, the successes that are possible with their students, and implications for teacher development.

NEGOTIATING THE SYSTEM

**Working With Limited Time:**
The Case of the ESOL Pullout Teacher

*It’s very difficult to implement writing workshop when you see the kids for only 30 minutes a day once a week.* (Books Project teacher)

Time is a treasured commodity for all writers and one of the crucial elements of the writing process. However, most ESOL pullout teachers, who take their students from general education classes for short blocks of time two or three times a week, feel they have impossibly little time for writing in their classes. In the schoolwide competition for time, ESOL pullout teachers almost always lose. Their already short classes can be taken away because of assemblies, special programs, half days, and field trips, or they may be expected to complete activities, such as reviewing spelling words or vocabulary lists, started by the classroom teacher. One teacher reported that during 1 month she saw her students only 9 of 20 scheduled days because of conflicts with other school activities. Another wrote that she had to make “umpteen schedule changes, felt pushed in a million directions,” and had to fit writing in around other activities expected of her.

Schedules present challenges and problems for allowing writing to evolve in an ongoing workshop. One teacher said it takes 15 min of her 30-min class for students to start writing, leaving only 15 min to write. They have to wait until the next class to continue and then want
to start writing anew rather than work on a piece that has grown cold. The only teachers who reported feeling no time crunch are those who see their students for an hour and a half or more every day.

The teachers have worked out various strategies to alleviate the time problem. One coordinates schedules with the classroom teacher so she can keep students for longer periods of time. Another spends her instructional time in the regular classroom rather than pulling the ESOL students out, which allows more time for writing and better integration of writing workshop with other tasks. Another does only writing workshop for 4 weeks and then does activities more closely related to the students’ regular class for 6 weeks. Another combines writing workshop with content-area study so students will accomplish classroom objectives. Others establish predictable routines and patterns to carry the writing from one session to the next.

Carol Bartley begins her 30-min class with a 3-min minilesson, followed by 12 min of student writing, 10 min of peer conferencing, and 5 min of rewriting. Publication occurs at a different time. She sometimes gives students writing prompts to help them get started in a short period of time. She also combines 30-min writing projects that give her students a sense of accomplishment with opportunities for them to write and develop extended pieces about their own topics over time (Bartley, 1993).

Working With Limited Space and Resources

One teacher told us that when she heard about writing workshop she envisioned “a large classroom with a big book rack, a storytelling circle, a science center, a conferring area, and a computer.” Samway (1992) described a classroom with an editing center, an illustrating center, and a publishing center. In contrast, many ESOL teachers, pullout or not, work with extremely limited space and resources. There is no space to make reading and writing materials available or for students to spread out to write quietly, confer with others, publish, or display their writing. One teacher works in the front half of the counselor’s office. A telephone on the counselor’s desk rings each time the phone rings in the office, and the front office staff call the teacher on the intercom to ask her to find other staff for telephone calls. Other teachers described small, often dingy rooms, including a closet; some work with groups of up to 10 students in rooms not much larger than 10 by 12 ft. The teachers also reported limited resources—no money to purchase writing materials, trade books, big books, or cassettes and tape recorders for listening to books; no access to photocopying facilities; and, in some cases, no paper.

Teachers use their ingenuity to deal with limited space and resources.
Many decorate the spaces they have with bulletin boards of students’
published work, posters and displays on a theme, and shelves full
of inviting children’s literature. Many also purchase their books and
supplies with their own money.

**Working With Others in the School or District**

Similar to the whole language teachers interviewed by Walmsley and
Adams (1993), who described feeling “vulnerable, isolated, alienated,
or ostracized” (p. 173), some teachers have reported feelings of isola-
tion, insecurity, and burnout (Mauro, 1992). They believe they work
within school systems that do not support curricular reform and
teacher development. They lack the energy to work toward change
because they believe others in the school do not understand and respect
their educational philosophy and approach, do not appreciate their
efforts, and in some cases critically evaluate them. Some teachers re-
ported feeling torn between opposing curriculum and assessment
forces. They want to adapt whole language approaches to improve
the achievement of their students, but they also feel obliged to follow
established, traditional curriculum guidelines and assessment proce-
dures, which may run counter to the underlying principles of the
writing process. They thus experience conflict about their responsibil-
ity to student learning and their accountability to the school system.
Some teachers reported feeling doubly marginalized—they are ESOL
teachers, and they are using writing workshop.

In some cases the ESOL teacher’s role in relation to the mainstream
class is misunderstood as well. Some classroom teachers treat ESOL
teachers like tutors who should supplement classroom work; ESOL
teachers are so busy trying to keep up with the demands of what is
required in the regular classroom that they have no time to do writing
workshop. Teachers often feel guilty spending time on writing work-
shop and wonder if their students will leave their classes with the skills
they need to function in mainstream classes or to do well on discrete-
point assessment tests. One teacher said, “I feel pressure to get the
kids ready for standardized tests because that is how my performance
is judged.”

To address the problem of isolation and to reconcile the conflict
between their practice and other school priorities, ESOL teachers are
collaborating more with other teachers and attempting to integrate
writing workshop with other learning and assessment activities. Car-
olyn Parks, a K—6 ESOL pullout teacher in Prince George’s County,
believes that writing workshop cannot be a luxury, separated from
the requirements of the school or county. For her, writing workshop
provides the framework for assessing what her students know and
deciding what she needs to teach. As Graves (1983) argues, “Teachers find time for writing by taking it. They take it from reading, handwriting, spelling, and language, knowing that writing produces gains in all of these subject areas” (p. 90).

ADAPTING WRITING WORKSHOP

The English language proficiency of the students also affects workshop implementation. When nonnative English speakers produce extended text in English, they face not only the ordinary struggles of writers but also the challenge of working in a language in which they may be only minimally proficient. Research has shown that these students employ in their writing the same general cognitive and linguistic processes that native English speakers do (Ammon, 1985; Edelsky, 1983; Farr & Daniels, 1986; Hudelson, 1986), and their writing instruction can be guided by the same general principles. However, ESOL teachers are not simply teaching the writing process; they are also using the writing process to build language and literacy in general.

The teachers continually reminded us that their students are different from those portrayed in much of the writing process literature. Students may have had interrupted schooling, and their literacy levels may be far below their age and grade levels; their backgrounds, experiences, and attitudes toward learning may not match those of the school or of the teachers and students they are interacting with and the texts they are reading (Boyle & Peregoy, 1990); in addition, they may have a fear of writing and be reluctant to write, stemming from a sense of language deficiency. Teachers find they need to adapt writing workshop primarily in the following areas to meet the needs of their L2 learners: getting students started writing, conferencing and sharing, and revising.

Getting Started: Developing Writing Fluency

A student writing in an L2 faces a number of complex, simultaneously occurring dynamics. An idea that is rich and fully developed in the native language may seem diminished and trivial when funneled through the English vocabulary and syntax available to the student. Translation to English may be tedious and not worth the effort, or impossible. Students may hesitate to tell cherished stories to unfamiliar people or may feel those stories are inappropriate for school. The need to get it right may overshadow all attempts at producing English. Students who have not previously attended school may find the physical act of holding a pencil and producing letters awkward and painful.
Older students’ perceptions that their language is deficient and that they can work only on a “childish level” may create an emotional bind that discourages them from putting words on paper.

As a result, early workshop attempts maybe halting. Some students can tell interesting and clear stories orally, but they slow down or freeze when they start to write, and the words do not make it to the page. They may even abandon topics of interest because they do not have the English to write about them. Others are preoccupied with producing correct English and will write only what they can write correctly, or they want to copy from whatever they have just read.

Teachers promote writing fluency by providing supports that give their students additional experiences, concepts, words, and structures and provide an overall schema that they can draw from:

• Talking and writing extensively around the writing, in English and the native language—allowing students time to think out loud and to talk through ideas, stories, and feelings before and during drafting;

• Providing topics, vocabulary, and verb lists, as well as visual and tactile cues such as pictures, webs, diagrams, and realia;

• Encouraging lots of reading (including reading aloud, silently, alone, and in groups) and writing in response to that reading; (Extensive reading sparks ideas for writing and gives students language they can use. When many readings relate to one theme or idea, students lose the desire to copy from one book and start to make connections among ideas in various texts.)

• Placing the writing within a thematic unit or genre study; (Like teachers of native English speakers [see, for example, Atwell, 1990; Calkins & Harwayne, 1991], ESOL teachers are developing thematic units to immerse students in a topic or genre and build a schema within which to write—tapping knowledge, experiences, vocabulary, and structures that students have and building on them; pooling class knowledge; and making connections among ideas.)

• Giving minilessons and modeling writing for the students, and encouraging many different kinds of writing—letters, signs, notes, journal writing, story writing, expository writing;

• Giving lots of encouragement and, in the beginning, accepting and celebrating whatever students write;

• Not pushing students to read and write in English, but rather allowing and encouraging reading and writing in the native language as well; (This may also involve posting native language print around the room, having collections of books in students' native languages, and
bringing in respected staff members or members of the community who speak the native languages.)

- Suggesting writing topics as well as giving students freedom to choose their own;
(Although teachers believe that students must be exposed to the kinds of tasks real writers face, including coming up with their own topics, they also feel that assigning topics or establishing a topic area and helping students find a place within it helps structure the experience for the novice writer and beginning L2 user.)

These supports provide “literacy scaffolds” (Boyle & Peregoy, 1990), repeated language and discourse patterns that students can use as they construct their own pieces. When students have these supports and understand the logistics of the writing process, writing eventually becomes more comfortable for them.

**Responding to the Writer: Conferencing and Sharing**

In listing the essentials of a successful writing workshop, Atwell (1987) stresses writers’ need for response to their writing. Two key features of writing process response are responding to the needs of the writer over the needs of the writing and developing the recognition that response can come in different forms and from different voices in the room: the teacher and the other students become a collaborative support group.

In a model writing workshop, while most students are drafting, teachers are visiting individual students for short and focused conferences. They are attempting to discover where the writer is and what the writer needs to do to move to a higher level of clarity or quality. They may ask questions to better understand the writer’s process, clarify the writer’s meaning, or improve the writing craft or mechanical or stylistic conventions. Additionally, students may form their own peer response groups in which they read their pieces to get feedback from their audience. Later the teacher may convene a whole-class share, in which several students read their pieces and receive encouragement and feedback. The result of this conferencing and sharing is information that helps the writers to expand, focus, and revise their pieces.

A great deal of instruction about writing occurs throughout these interchanges, as instruction grows out of actual writers’ successes and problems. For ESOL teachers, these forms of response embody a perfect (and eminently purposeful) example of the reading-writing-listening-speaking dynamic. However, their classroom experiences reveal several daunting challenges.
Perhaps the first common challenge is that students do not have the experience or expertise to offer valuable feedback. If they have not been encouraged to see themselves as writers or to respond to other students’ writing, conferencing and sharing can be frustrating and minimally useful. One teacher said, “I haven’t gotten the students to ask the right questions or say the right things about each others’ papers. This is a very clear failure.” Another said that students’ questions to each other are often superficial, focusing on mechanics or small details of the piece and resulting in the writer simply adding small pieces of information but leaving the larger issues of form, tone, and sequence untouched.

A key component in students’ knowing how to respond to other writers is the teacher’s ability to model these new attitudes and behaviors. Samway (1993) has demonstrated that even young ESOL students (second through sixth graders) can internalize evaluation criteria and ways of talking critically about writing when it is modeled in mini-lessons, whole-class discussions, and teacher-student conferences. She finds that students need a great deal of experience and modeling, consistently and over time. Teachers’ own experiences as writers and their metacognitive awareness of their own processes as writers are crucial to the ability to model a discourse that will lead to deeper probing of content and form.

Another challenge relates to the teacher’s and students’ perceptions of their roles in the classroom. Some students believe that they have nothing valuable to offer and that only the teacher can give helpful feedback. Low proficiency in English, combined with low levels of self-esteem and confidence, heightens the sense that the beginning writer has little to offer. Moreover, the presence of several different languages and accents may mean that students do not understand each other’s pieces or each other’s comments.

Teachers in low-proficiency ESOL classrooms may be the only model of oral English proficiency, increasing students’ reliance on them for clear feedback. It may take a good deal of time for students to begin to see the benefits of peer sharing and response and take part wholeheartedly. In the meantime, teachers who are novices to the workshop approach may decide to hold only teacher-student conferences and then struggle, without the help of the other students, to comment on pieces they can barely understand.

Those teachers committed to sharing and peer conferencing have found ways to make it work in their classes. Parks (1993), for example, shows how meaning can be negotiated through extensive student and teacher interaction around a piece, even when the students speak many different languages. With the help of a lot of excitement and talk about her story and the class’s willingness to support her and make
guesses about its meaning, Rafia, an 8-year-old girl from India who had been in the U.S. only 2 months and knew very little English, was able to make her story clear and interesting to the other students and, over a succession of drafts, to elaborate on and improve it.

Teachers reported a number of strategies to facilitate sharing. One is to make printed copies of the piece to be shared so that every student can see it; this technique can circumvent a good deal of the frustration due to pronunciation interference. Another is to spend significant time in the beginning of the year in teacher-modeled AllShares (whole-class sharing and response sessions); later, to move to PairShares (two students paired); finally, to attempt peer response groups, after students have become comfortable with their role as responders and have some skill and confidence as writers. A variation is to have shy or reluctant writers share only in PairShares, with pieces they select as their best or strongest and with students they trust or select themselves.

Teachers who have succeeded with sharing and conferencing feel that the effort it takes to make responding work is time well spent. The presence of an audience beyond the teacher for their writing gives students purpose and motivation to write clearly and well. Also, peer conferencing facilitates the kinds of interactions that develop both oral and written communicative competence. As students discuss their ideas and share their writing, they have multiple opportunities to use language in real and urgent ways.

However, teachers also report that effective responding takes time, patience, and a lot of modeling and practice. Students who have not yet learned to respond to other student writers need to learn how to do it, and students learning English need to learn both the processes and the language of sharing and responding.

**Reworking the Writing: Revising**

Revisiting a piece—reading it over, taking audience feedback into account, and making revisions—is at the heart of the writer’s craft, and Urzúa (1987) has shown that elementary school children learning ESL can take audience into consideration, revise their pieces according to feedback, and manipulate language for the best effect. However, revising seems to be the most difficult and neglected aspect of writing instruction, regardless of the students’ English proficiency level. When asked about revising in their classes, teachers responded, “We’re probably not doing enough.” “It’s probably my weakest point.” “Most of what we do focuses on grammar, punctuation, and spelling.” “It’s really hard for students to see that their papers are not perfect as they are.”

Teachers mentioned that students who have struggled to produce a piece find it painful to go back to it. They have written what they
could, with the English they had, and working more on it might take them into areas they do not have the English for. Students also do not want to remove any of the text they have so painstakingly produced. They are willing to add new text but not to take any away.

Teachers feel strongly that students should not be pushed into revising pieces if they are not ready, and their readiness depends to a certain extent on their age and language proficiency (see also Scott & Ytreberg, 1990). Some students may need a long time to write freely in personal or dialogue journals before they attempt to craft a piece to be shared with others, commented on, revised, and edited.

Teachers also reported that they need to learn when to let a piece go and not insist on further revision. At a certain point the student is tired of working on it, and attempts to improve it further are counterproductive. Teachers said they are tempted to seek perfection in student pieces, but as Graves (1983) points out, they need to focus instead on the writer, helping the writer develop strategies that will help him or her in the future rather than trying to make a particular piece of writing perfect. Teachers also feel it is important, especially early in the workshop, to publish students’ pieces quickly and often—to go through the entire writing process in a short period of time so students can begin to understand the process and experience the pride and celebration of publishing. (Samway, 1992, provides a model for doing this in a weeks time.)

One teacher feels that writers’ notebooks (Calkins & Harwayne, 1991) are key to encouraging students to revise and help break the “finished” syndrome. As they peruse the topics they have written about in their notebooks, students begin to see that they are interested in and have a lot to say about certain topics, and their strong sense of ownership over those topics compels them to make substantive revisions. Computers also facilitate revision because they allow students to move, cut, and change text easily without having to laboriously copy multiple drafts.

It is clear from observing revising in teachers’ classes that revision happens throughout the writing process. Although the teacher may not always realize it, students are revising as they select topic, genre, and audience, change direction with a piece, or decide to start over. At the same time, teachers insist that it takes a long time, possibly a school year or longer, to break old habits that students may have developed over years. Students need time, patience, modeling, and repetition to see that working on content is as important as, or more important than, spelling or punctuation. They need to see the teacher, other students, and other writers revise and to have as much information as possible about choices that writers make when working on their pieces and different approaches they can take.
An issue that is woven throughout any discussion of fluency, sharing, and revision is correctness. Teachers commonly report the phenomenon of the ESOL student who cannot begin or proceed with a piece until some problem of correctness is resolved. A standard response to this dilemma is to reassure students that they do not need to worry about correctness now, that it will be taken care of later during editing. However, the teachers told us that their students simply become more frustrated by this approach. When they address their students’ correctness concerns with direct instruction about how to get beyond them—for example, in minilessons about how to overcome fluency blocks by drawing lines where they cannot find the right word or by writing the word in their native language for the time being—they find less anxiety and more fluency.

Likewise, the teacher’s own beliefs about correctness can inhibit writing. Publishing student pieces can be slowed down if teachers conference with each student until all pieces are perfect. Teachers give students mixed messages when they explain the primacy of content over mechanics but then spend most of their conferencing and revision time and effort on mechanics. Because the attitude that correctness is important plays itself out across the entire writing process, and because it is deeply embedded in traditional notions of both writing and second language acquisition, the most difficult part of a teacher’s shift from older to newer models of instruction may be realizing where and how issues of correctness actually appear and might be addressed.

**REALIZING SUCCESS**

Much of this article has focused on the challenges of implementing writing workshop with English language learners. However, when asked about where they have experienced success, all of the teachers had positive changes to report in their students and in themselves. The most notable positive change in students is in attitude. Students are no longer afraid of writing or blocked by a blank sheet of paper. They feel more confident about themselves and their writing, and they enter aggressively into their own and others’ writing. Changed attitudes are accompanied by changed behaviors. Some students have overcome the need to write a perfect piece the first time and are ready to revise. Some are learning to interact with other students more successfully. Most teachers feel their students are better writers but are not sure the improvement is evident on school or district assessments; however, one teacher did report that her students scored better last year on the district writing test than other students who were not doing writing workshop.
Teachers feel they themselves are now better writers and better at working on writing with their students. They are better at tuning in to individual students and knowing where they are, what they need, and what questions to ask. They are better at learning from and with their students and at writing with them and in front of them. Some feel they are now able to see where to relinquish control and allow students ownership of their writing.

CONCLUSION

We have described some ways that writing workshop for ESOL teachers differs from writing workshop as portrayed in the literature, the challenges these teachers face, and the decisions they make. The themes and patterns we have identified must be interpreted with caution as they come from the work of a small group of teachers from two projects in one part of the country. The information reported comes primarily from teachers’ reports of their classroom practice rather than detailed, systematic observations or conversations with students. In addition to the common patterns reported here, we also found individual differences and contrasts. Whereas one teacher has tremendous difficulties with conferencing and revising and focuses almost entirely on drafting, another uses sharing, conferencing, and revising as an integral part of the workshop. One feels the need to tightly structure the writing workshop and maintain a lot of order and control, but another does not and moves easily among students who are engaged in a wide range of activities, make individual choices, and complete pieces on very different schedules. One feels that her students initially approached the workshop with great reluctance, but another’s students jumped enthusiastically into the workshop and began writing eagerly and confidently.

We have identified some themes that recurred from teacher to teacher and classroom to classroom and are supported by published reports of teachers implementing writing process approaches. These themes have important implications for teachers implementing writing workshop with ESOL students. First, many of the challenges, strategies, and successes experienced by these ESOL teachers and their students are similar to those experienced by teachers of native English speakers. All teachers struggle with time, space, and resource constraints, and those attempting to change well-established instructional practices wrestle with long-held and sometimes clashing attitudes and procedures within the school system, their students, and even themselves.

Second, teachers cannot take the ideas about writing workshop pre-
Presented in the print and video literature, both with native and nonnative English speakers, and adopt them in toto (see Delpit’s, 1988, and Reyes’, 1992, criticisms of “one size fits all” instruction). Instead, they need to see themselves as competent professionals and as skilled readers and writers, able to take the ideas presented by others and make them their own—“try them, mull them over, alter them to fit their own teaching situation, and generate their own ways of teaching” (Samway, 1992, p. i).

To do this, teachers need time, flexibility, and courage—to try, change, try, and change again. Getting started and maintaining the approach can be difficult. Even long-time participants in The Books Project still have not answered all their questions or resolved all their problems. When we asked them what advice they had for other teachers starting to implement writing workshop, some of their comments were, “Don’t give up. Stick with it.” “It can’t be and doesn’t need to be perfect right away. Do it wholeheartedly for a year, then step back and see what happened.” “Be willing to grow over time, to learn gradually how it works best for you and your students.”

Teachers also need support and opportunities to work intensively over time with other teachers who are doing the same thing. The Books Projects teachers told us how frustrating it is to attend a onetime workshop on a new educational approach and be asked to jump on the latest educational bandwagon but be left to cope by themselves with few resources. Teachers need time to read what others have said about theory and practice; work on their own writing; discuss with, observe, and get feedback from other teachers; learn about and have the time and resources to buy new books and other instructional materials; and attend and present at conferences and workshops. Teachers reported that before they began to work closely and consistently with other teachers also implementing writing workshop, they felt as if they were isolated and floundering. Their work with other teachers gave them the support they needed to keep trying even when they felt frustrated.

When teachers are introduced to educational innovations, they need more than models, which they attempt to adopt and replicate. They need to be exposed to the crucial features of models but also information about ways that students learn and that writers write, out of which they can design their own practice. As teachers struggle, together and over time, to understand a new model, approach, or concept, their own teaching and learning practices and their attitudes toward teaching and learning gradually change, and as they change, the teachers themselves can eventually bring about major change in their classrooms, districts, and school systems.
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Describing Students’ Collected Works: Understanding American Indian Children
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American Indian children are frequently seen through deficiency labels that deny their subjectivity as persons and strengths as language users and makers of meaning. Descriptive studies of the collected written and visual works of American Indian children are one way to counteract their objectification in schools. This article describes the collected written and visual works of one Dakota child, Monica, and three themes—relationships, cultural commitment, and romance—visible in her works. Through a descriptive study of her works, Monica’s teachers were able to understand her particular meaning-making efforts, the way in which various genres (e.g., personal narratives, realistic and romance fictional narratives, cards and letters, written and visual responses to books) supported her exploration and expression of meaning, and the struggles and tensions inherent in her creative process.

American Indian children, like many bilingual and L2 learners, have been objectified by schools for a long time. Instead of being viewed as cultural members of various American Indian tribes who use English and ancestral languages in rich ways, American Indian children are frequently seen through deficiency labels (e.g., dropouts, disadvantaged, at-risk) that deny their subjectivity and strengths as language users and makers of meaning.

This article discusses the importance of teachers using children’s collected works, in conjunction with descriptive processes, as a way to better understand the language and meanings of American Indian

1 Although we realize that many use the term Native American, we prefer to use the term American Indian when referring to American Indian tribes.
CHILDREN MAKING MEANING: A THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE

All children are thinkers, propelled by wonder to make sense of their life experiences (Cobb, 1977; King, 1987). Although embedded within cultural traditions and language genres, making sense is particular to the person and reflects deeply felt interests and preferences (Carini, 1982; Franklin, 1989; Himley, 1991).

In The School Lives of Seven Children, Carini (1982) explores the patterns of interest of seven children over 5 years of their school lives. According to Carini, “It is as if certain ideas, things and qualities called to each of the children in a voice that the child could hear, or as if those ideas, things, and qualities beckoned and led each child along particular paths” (p. 74). Through careful observation of the children learning, as well as detailed descriptions of their written and visual works, teachers working with these children came to understand the patterns that marked each child in particular and individual ways.

Carini (1982) expresses two pivotal ideas: that children, like adults, create “works” as they write, draw, paint, play, and build, and that children’s thought, like adult thought, is partially visible in the works they produce. The careful and descriptive reading of children’s works, involving an initial viewing of collected works in their entirety for general impressions, followed by the detailed description of the content, genre, style, tone, images, and themes of particular works, provides a way to partially understand children as thinkers (Carini, 1986). Like Bleich’s (1978) and Rosenblatt’s (1978) reader responses to the works of adult authors, descriptive studies of children’s works normally take place within a community of interested, involved readers who collaboratively create meaning as they read children’s works.

In their descriptive response, teachers are not trying to be interpretively right about a work, nor are they judging a work against outside standards; rather, teachers dwell in the work in order to open up meaning, to find the “shared territory” between the child and themselves (Himley, 1991). Too often evaluation disrupts the teacher-child relationship because teachers are asked to view and define a child through the narrow, depersonalized lens of a percentile rank, a standardized test score, or a letter grade. The description of works deepens a teacher’s understanding of a child. It is acknowledged that ambiguous meanings will always be part of this process and that meanings and
understandings will change as the interpretive powers of the teachers describing the works change (Carini, 1991).

An additional factor must be considered, however, when studying children’s meaning-making, particularly in reference to American Indian children. The individual meanings that children explore and express in their works are made possible by existing cultural patterns, traditions, and genres. Himley (1991) argues that children’s writing, for example, is “a simultaneously cultural and expressive activity” (p. 8) in which writers write through and are written by genres. Because conflicting and shifting meanings are embedded within multiple and contradictory cultural traditions, the creation of works by children often involves appropriating and resisting certain meanings and forms (Himley, 1991). Himley maintains that

To learn to write, then, is not merely to acquire a new symbolic means for expressing one’s private thoughts and ideas, but rather to learn about, to assimilate, and to come to own (or at least to rent) the very meanings one can have. It is also to fight other meanings, to resist, to want words but not finally to have them. (p. 98)

This perspective, that children’s works are simultaneously cultural and expressive and that children both appropriate and resist meanings, is an important one for educators of American Indian children. It suggests that the works of American Indian children need to be studied carefully as both expressive and cultural works. Previous research that has focused on the works of American Indian children includes Brady’s (1984) study of the stylistic, structural, and interfactional features of oral skinwalker narratives performed by fifth- and sixth-grade Navajo students, Kasten’s (1987) descriptions of cultural themes found in the written works (i.e., narratives and letters) of three Tohono O’odham third and fourth graders, and Goodman and Wilde’s (1992) descriptions of themes, as well as writing attitudes and use of writing strategies of third- and fourth-grade Tohono O’odham children.

The ways in which American Indian children appropriate some meanings and resist others have not been studied extensively. Some research on the learning of American Indian/Alaska Native children has focused on understanding broad differences between American Indian/Alaska Native and non-Indian children with respect to learning styles (Swisher & Deyhle, 1992), classroom interfactional patterns (Erickson & Mohatt, 1982; Philips, 1983; Van Ness, 1981), and English oral language features (Leap, 1982, 1992). American Indian children, like most bilingual and L2 children, struggle to create meanings within mainstream cultural traditions and ideologies that at best ignore, and at worst are harmful to, positive Indian identities. In addition, American Indian children also struggle, like all children, to find within their own
cultural and language traditions the meanings that are most important and useful to them.

In their work, Carini (1982) and Himley (1991) provide a foundation that affirms the meaning-making efforts of American Indian children, argue that these meaning-making efforts can be expressed in works particular to the individual child, acknowledge the role that cultural traditions and genres (both American Indian and mainstream) play in the meanings of individual children, and recognize the tensions and struggles inherent in the meaning-making process, including the creation of works. Their theoretical perspective lays the foundation for the following discussion of the works of Dakota children.

COLLECTING AND DESCRIBING THE WORKS OF DAKOTA CHILDREN

During the 1992–1993 school year, we collected and descriptively read the written and visual works of seven Dakota first-grade children (six of them bilingual in Dakota and English) attending the Tate Topa (Four Winds) Tribal School on the Devil’s Lake Sioux Indian Reservation. Jackie Thompson, an enrolled member of the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa, was raised on the reservation and has taught in their schools for 12 years. Elizabeth Franklin, on developmental leave from the University of North Dakota, taught with Thompson and organized the collection and descriptive review processes, referred to from this point on as child studies.

Thompson’s classroom reflects a whole language philosophy. Whole language—with its emphasis on reading and writing activities authentic to children and their communities, the use of child-selected topics and materials, cooperative and less directive relationships between children and teachers, and thematic units that build on and support children’s interests—is advocated as a philosophy of language and literacy instruction appropriate for American Indian children (Fox, 1992; Kasten, 1992; McCarty, 1993; McCarty & Schaffer, 1992). The majority of themes in Thompson’s room were multicultural in focus, with a heavy emphasis on American Indian/Alaska Native content and issues. In addition, children received 3 hours of instruction per week in Dakota language and culture. Weekly school opening and closing activities also affirmed the values, culture, and language of the Dakota Oyate.

As we taught together during the year, we observed the children learning, kept anecdotal records of the children’s reading and writing, taped each child reading three times during the year, and collected and photocopied or photographed all the written and visual works of
the seven child-study children. In addition, all children reviewed their accumulated work each 9-week grading period and wrote letters to their parents about what they had learned. During parent-teacher conferences, each child’s collection was discussed and given to the parents.

During the year, we reviewed the children’s works in several ways. We listened every day as children shared their works, talking with them about what they had done. Second, on a daily basis, we recorded in a teacher notebook descriptions of works, as well as commentary about the child’s process of creating works. Third, at the end of each semester we categorized by genre the works in the collection of the seven children studied, noted emerging themes, and calculated percentages of works that were child selected versus teacher planned.

At the end of the year, child studies were written for the seven children. Each child study opened with a lengthy observation of the child working on a project, followed by a summary of parental responses to questions about the child’s learning at home and school and a summary of characteristics of the child’s learning at school. The actual written and visual works were discussed by genre and themes, followed by recommendations for each child’s continued learning. Each child study was approximately 100 pages long and included at least 50 pieces of work and numerous observational examples to show the richness and texture of each child’s school life. A variety of people read the child studies; each reader contributed a perspective that informed our understanding of the themes in each child’s work. The readers included the child’s parents or grandparents, a teacher in the Dakota Language and Culture Program, and an educational leader. A brief description of Monica, one of the child-study children, perhaps best gives a sense of this approach to the works of children.

UNDERSTANDING MONICA THROUGH HER WORKS

Monica (a pseudonym) was one of the child-study children in our first-grade classroom. She is bilingual in the Dakota and English languages. Her knowledge of the Dakota language is primarily oral, although she did read and write simple texts in Dakota as part of the Dakota Language and Culture Program, made her own dictionary of Dakota words, and occasionally wrote Dakota words (e.g., Kunsi, or grandmother) as part of other activities.

Monica entered first grade reading simple, predictable stories in English and writing in English with invented spelling. Although Monica occasionally requested dictation during the first few months of the school year, she wrote the vast majority of her works by herself. During
her first-grade year, Monica created 704 works, almost all of which were in English and all of which included both writing and art. Sorted by type of classroom activity, Monica wrote and/or drew 383 notebook pages (a combination of 136 personal narratives, 55 fictional narratives, 102 labels, 17 messages, and other texts written in a bound notebook during writing workshop); 19 responses to books (31 pages of work); 10 theme projects; 10 pages in class books; 13 informational texts (54 pages of work); 19 narratives and books (98 pages); 60 letters, cards, and notes; 5 photograph annotations; and 36 pages of writing classified as “other.” Seventy-eight percent (546 pieces) of Monica’s works were classified as self-selected, composed during play, free time, or writing workshop time. Monica wrote almost all of her self-selected writing in her notebook and in cards and notes. Twenty-two percent (158 pieces) of Monica’s writing was part of teacher-planned literacy and theme activities (e.g., the teacher suggested a genre, a topic, an art project, or a writing structure).

As we described these works, various themes emerged. This article will discuss the three richest and most extensive themes in Monica’s work: relationships, cultural commitment, and romance. References to the works of other children will be used to illustrate differences among children.

Relationships

Monica explored the theme of relationships extensively and regularly in her work. During the year, she primarily used three genres—personal narratives, fictional narratives, and letters and cards—to think about her relationships to friends and family, to describe the nature of the cooperative activities that friends share, and to express her feelings for her friends and family in order to deepen the bonds between them. In addition to the 50 cards and notes written to friends and family, Monica wrote 90 personal and fictional narratives that featured children in the classroom as protagonists.

Below are eight of Monica’s personal and fictional narratives, edited for spelling and punctuation. Pseudonyms are used for all children in the classroom.

Personal Narratives

I have a friend. Her name is Julie. We are jumping rope. See. We are jumping rope. Me and Julie.

Me and Julie went to the pow-wow and we got money from dancing.
Me and Dawn and Anna and Julie.
We were being chased by John.
He caught us and we were tired. Anna, Julie, Monica [labeled figures]
But we were us.

We were playing marbles.

**Fictional Narratives**

Me and Julie, Laura, we went to the park.
We see a rainbow. It looked like a shooting star.
Oh, no, no! We lost Julie.

Anna and Me and Julie, Dawn and Laura, we were going to the store and we bought some pop because we were thirsty. We went back to my treehouse.

Me and Laura, Julie, Krissy, Anna went to Florida.
We saw Mickey Mouse.
We got some balloons. Me, Anna, Laura, Julie, Dawn (labeled figures)
We saw a troll puppet.
And we got to see Cinderella.
We went back home.

I am playing with Julie and Anna. We are picking berries. And Dawn.

Each genre helped Monica think about relationships in different ways. When writing personal narratives (i.e., true stories), Monica related joint, cooperative, and often physical activities that she and her friends participated in at school and on the playground. They jumped rope, climbed on monkey bars, swung and slid on the playground, got chased by boys, and made jewelry. Monica rarely wrote about herself engaged in a solitary activity, participating in a team sport, or winning or losing a game (options chosen by other children). She presented herself and her friends as equal partners in the activities she related. Monica also rarely repeated a topic in her personal narratives. Instead of being a type of diary in which daily events were accurately recorded (some children used their writing notebook in this way), Monica used her notebook-writing time to record and explore the range of activities that friends share.

Monica’s illustrations to her personal narratives captured both the physical movement of the activities and the feelings that friends share as they participate in these activities. Monica’s figures are smiling and happy as they run, bend, reach, climb, and kneel (e.g., while playing marbles). The illustration that accompanied her narrative about the pow-wow, for example, depicted two smiling girls dancing side by side;
one of the girls, wearing a shawl, has her arms bent in a dancing motion. The other figure, dressed for a jingle dance, is depicted with the jingle cones swaying as she dances. Monica only wrote one story about conflicts between friends; instead, she preferred to write about the positive experiences that bind girls together as friends.

The writing of realistic fictional narratives provided Monica with the space to think imaginatively about wider possibilities for activities with friends. In her fictional narratives, Monica moved beyond the classroom and school playground to make up realistic stories about the girls’ cooperative participation in reservation activities (e.g., going to the store, going to the park, picking berries). At times it was difficult to tell whether a narrative was true or fictional. When we would ask Monica if a particular story was true, she would reply, “No. This is just writing.” At other times Monica would write a less plausible but still realistic story. The story about going to Disney World and seeing Mickey Mouse was inspired by a teacher’s honeymoon to Florida. Except for her romance writing (discussed in a later section of this paper), Monica never wrote fantasy stories, stories with animal characters, stories about the future, or stories that had characters who were not her classroom friends, whereas other children chose these options regularly. Monica was grounded in the here and now of life, using both fictional and personal narrative writing to explore and express the cooperative activities of friends.

In her fictional narratives, Monica began to experiment with devices that intensified the feeling and drama of a story. This is best exemplified in the narrative about going to a park, seeing a shooting star, and losing a friend. In many of her fictional stories Monica invented interesting (but realistic) things friends saw together (e.g., rainbows, shooting stars, Disney World’s Mickey Mouse, and Cinderella) or interesting and exciting (but realistic) events that happened with friends (e.g., a bunny followed them home, they were riding bikes, and the sun shone in their eyes). Monica used the device of someone getting lost and the language of concern (e.g., “Oh, no, oh, no!”) in several of her stories. The other children in the classroom responded positively to her efforts to add drama and intensity to her fictional writing.

Monica reserved card and note writing for direct and open expressions of feelings for her friends and family. In contrast to other children who combined narratives with statements of affective feeling (e.g., “I like my Mom. She loves me. We went to the park to play.”), Monica clearly separated the functions of narratives and card and note writing. In her narratives, Monica wrote about activities with friends; in cards and notes, Monica directly expressed her feelings for these friends.

Over the course of the year, Monica wrote 60 notes, cards, or letters.
Only 8 of these cards and letters—an invitation to a grandparent’s party, a Halloween card, a letter to Santa, 3 letters to her parents, and 2 letters to her teacher—were written as part of teacher-planned activities. The rest were written during play and free time or in quick moments before or after other learning activities, using a variety of writing materials. Three examples are displayed below.

**Birthday Card to Mrs. Thompson**

To you.
From
Monica.
Stars for me and hearts for you. I love you.
To Mrs. Thompson.
From Monica.
Happy Birthday.

**Get-Well Card to Classmate**

I miss you, too, Anna, very much, so much. And I love the stuff that you wear all the time.

**Birthday Card to Mom**

To Mom.
I love you.
I love you. Tomorrow is your birthday. So Mom here’s to you. If I love you you love me too.

Love, Monica

Monica was quite taken with the idea of sending cards and notes to people and appropriated them more than any other genre. She liked
sending cards and writing messages on formal holidays such as Halloween, Christmas, and St. Valentine’s Day, as well as writing birthday, get-well, welcome-back, and going-away cards, similar to the ones displayed above. She also wrote numerous friendship notes to particular friends, affirming her friendship with them. Although we modeled some card writing for the children (e.g., giving a birthday card to an individual child), Monica seized every available opportunity to give a card or note to someone.

As the examples demonstrate, Monica was quite proficient when writing cards and notes. She quickly learned opening and closing conventions, as well as appropriate card- and note-writing content. She individualized the content of cards for a particular person (e.g., telling Anna she liked the clothes she wears), she utilized conventionalized celebratory sayings (e.g., “Here’s to you!”), and she composed poems and poetrylike expressions (e.g., “Stars for me and hearts for you.”) as a way to express her feelings about particular persons, celebrate their existence, and affirm her relationship with them.

In summary, the theme of relationships was an important and extensive one in Monica’s work. She explored and expressed this theme in three genres: personal narratives, fictional narratives, and cards and notes. Within each genre, Monica appropriated those meanings and uses of language that best served her particular meaning-making interests, and she resisted those meanings and uses of language that would not help her think about relationships in the way she wished. With personal narratives, Monica affirmed the bonds that exist between friends by writing about the happy, cooperative physical activities that friends participate in on the playground and in the classroom. Monica extended her possibilities for meaning about relationships among friends by writing fiction. In her fiction, she continued to narrate stories about friends participating in everyday events, but at times she heightened the intensity of the events by the inclusion of a dramatic moment in the story. The writing of cards and notes afforded Monica an opportunity to directly express feelings about friends and family. She utilized particular card-writing conventions as well as poetic expressions to name and celebrate her friendships with others.

Cultural Commitment

A second theme visible in Monica’s collected works is cultural commitment, an interest in thinking about those cultural and language practices that define someone as a member of the Dakota Oyate. She explored and expressed the theme of cultural commitment through three genres and/or activities: responses to specific books (oral, written, visual), the writing of an informational book on American Indians,
and notebook writing during writing workshop time. Responses to books and the informational writing were teacher planned; the content of notebook writing was self-selected.

Nineteen times during the year, children wrote and/or drew individual responses to books, activities designed to deepen and extend understanding of stories, especially those with a multicultural and American Indian focus. (There were also group response projects, but these were not included in the collected works of individual children.) Eleven of the 19 books were multicultural; 9 of the 11 multicultural books focused on American Indian or Alaska Native content. Children were asked to complete a variety of activities after hearing a book: draw and write about a favorite scene; create a character sketch or character mobile; complete a partial retelling; or complete an art project designed to deepen an appreciation of symbols, colors, or designs reflective of American Indian/Alaska Native cultures. Two of Monica's responses, combining art and writing, illustrate the degree to which her Dakota culture and heritage influenced her interpretation and understanding of stories about American Indians.

In September, the children listened to *Knots on a Counting Rope* (Martin & Archambault, 1966), a story about the relationship between a Navajo grandfather and his blind grandson. At the grandson's request, the grandfather tells a series of stories, one of which is about the grandson's birth. The grandfather describes the darkness of the night at his grandson's birth, the sound of the wind, the weakness of the newborn child, the appearance of two blue horses who give the child strength, and the child's naming ceremony. An evocative, prayerlike quality pervades the book. The illustrations depict the Navajo world of mesas, hogans, ceremonies, horse corrals, and nighttime fires. After listening to the story, the children were asked to draw and write about a favorite scene.

Monica painted a watercolor, using purple, pink, blue, and black tones. In the center of her watercolor was a mountain with a painted tepee on top. Two figures were standing near a fire built next to the tepee. In the foreground, Monica painted two figures on horseback who appeared to be racing. After painting, Monica dictated the following text:

Tell me. Tell me about the sacred mountain. You were born in 1991, 20th. When you were born I teach you how to say father. We sat around the fire and had a ceremony. That is the end, child.

Monica understands the feelings and meaning of the story (e.g., a storytelling situation, a relationship between an older and a younger person, a birth, talking around a fire, having a ceremony, racing horses) but reworks the story to be more reflective of the Dakota Oyate perspec-
tive. The specific mention of the sacred mountain (e.g., the Black Hills) and the placing of a painted tepee in her visual work mark the text as one belonging to the Dakota spiritual world. Monica’s text, like the text in *Knots on a Counting Rope*, has a spiritual, evocative feeling to it. Her language (“Tell me. Tell me about. . . .” “That is the end, child.”) as well as her content (e.g., learning to say father, having a ceremony) suggests that the text is one appropriate for talking about sacred occasions. Monica’s response demonstrates a clear understanding of the feeling of the story, but she expresses her understanding through symbols and content reflective of her own culture.

*The Star Maiden* (Esbensen, 1988), an Ojibway legend about the origin of the water lily, was read to the children in April, and they were asked to write about and draw their favorite scene. In the legend, the Star Maiden is looking for a form to assume on earth. The first form she assumes is a rose; the second form is a prairie flower. Because buffalo stampedes keep her from resting, she eventually assumes her final form, that of a water lily. In this legend, the world of the Ojibway is presented: Wigwams, canoes, hills and lakes, evening stars, and prairie grass plains define the Ojibway world.

Monica created two different responses to *The Star Maiden* (Esbensen, 1988), both of which were watercolors that had brief retelling of episodes. In her first work, she painted two tepees and a prairie flower. Her text read, “She lived in a flower, but the ground shaked.” In her second response, a scene from the end of the legend, Monica made a tepee standing next to a lake. Three other tepees were set in the background. Her text read, “The Star Maiden lived in the water.”

Monica accurately retold both episodes from *The Star Maiden* (Esbensen, 1988). In her visual work, however, Monica brought her Dakota perspective to bear by adding tepees to her illustrations. In this way, she restructured the Ojibway legend’s visual images to be more reflective of her Dakota experience. These responses, as well as the response to *Knots on a Counting Rope*, illustrate Monica’s strong commitment to understanding American Indian content, especially spiritual content, from a Dakota Oyate perspective. Reading the books provided her with an opportunity to dwell in a space filled with American Indian symbols, feelings, ideas, and values. In her responses to these books, however, Monica captured, through either language or visual images, those ideas and feelings most closely related to her own American Indian experience.

In other works, Monica demonstrated more consciously the choice she was making to think about and relate things to her Dakota cultural and spiritual heritage. A group response to *The Mouse Raid* (Ward, Burr, & Ahler, 1989), a Hidatsa tale from long ago about children
learning to silently raid a village for food, clearly illustrates this point. After listening to the book, the children made a mural of a Hidatsa village. They drew earthlodges, a fence around the village, fields of corn and pumpkins, and a river running along the village. After Monica made her earthlodge, she spontaneously began to draw a village of Dakota tepees on the other side of the river. It was as if she felt compelled to relate the Hidatsa world of long ago to the Dakota world of long ago.

The final example involves an informational book (which often contained narratives) about American Indians/Alaska Natives that the children made as part of a unit on those peoples. Monica titled her book *My Tepee Book*, and 8 of her 10 pages dealt with Dakota symbols (e.g., tepees) and content (e.g., references to the Great Spirit, dreams, ceremonies, tepees). For example, one page contained a decorated tepee and a dictated text that read, “When we were tired, we saw the Great Spirit in our dreams up high. We followed him up in the sky.” Although all the children wrote about the Dakota in their informational books, they did not write as extensively about this topic, nor did they make references that reflected a Dakota view of the spiritual world. At this same time, in the notebook she wrote in during writing workshop time, Monica drew 12 more tepees and wrote a poem with Dakota content (e.g., about buffalos, eagles, tepees). The tepee, an important cultural and religious symbol for the Dakota Oyate, was the most dominant American Indian symbol in Monica’s work.

In summary, Monica explored and expressed the theme of cultural commitment in her written and visual responses to books about American Indians, in her informational book on American Indians, and in her writing notebook. The descriptive study of works revealed her strong interest in writing about and drawing the Dakota Oyate, especially in those contexts that encourage the exploration of spiritual content, and in relating what she was learning to her Dakota cultural and spiritual heritage.

**Romance**

Romance, a third theme in Monica’s work, loosely embodied ideas associated with courtship, love, marriage, princesses and princes, castles, and Renaissance costumes. In February and March, Monica created 37 works reflecting this theme. All of the works were initiated by Monica, and 34 were written or drawn in her notebook during writing workshop time. Twenty-two of the works were short narratives (not more than two sentences) with illustrations; 9 were drawings with
figures labeled with names of children in the classroom; 3 were drawings with accompanying affective statements (e.g., “I am happy that ________ is back”); and 3 were drawings with no written language text. Three transcribed works are found below.

It’s beautiful. Julie was first to dance with prince.

Laura had a wedding. Me and Julie was a flower girl.

Me and Laura were going to a castle. We were dressed for the prince.

As these works demonstrate, writing and drawing romance texts fulfilled several functions for Monica. Like her other more realistic fictional writing, romance writing provided Monica with an opportunity to think about different ideas (e.g., courtship, marriage, ballroom dances), different settings (e.g., fairy tale world of princesses, princes, and castles), and friends doing different activities together (e.g., dancing with princes, going to castles, being flower girls). In romance works, Monica’s friends were still the main characters; however, instead of engaging in childhood play, her romance characters engage in more adult and fantasy-related actions (e.g., dancing with princes, falling in love, getting married). The settings of Monica’s romance works were either the fairy tale world of castles, princesses, and princes or the world of grownup women who are in love and getting married while wearing elaborate costumes.

Romance writing and drawing also gave Monica an opportunity to create elaborate Renaissance and bridal costumes. In fact, Renaissance clothing was a more important marker of this theme than the content of the stories. We feel that is why all the stories are so short; she spent a great deal of time on the illustrations. The figures in illustrations to romance works had long, full hair swept to the side of the face (like the Little Mermaid), were dressed in elaborate gowns, wore crowns and veils, and carried swords, wands, or bouquets of flowers. Monica drew her illustrations with great attention to the details of the figures and their clothing. Often her figures were foregrounded in her drawings, walking up to castles set in the background.

The theme of romance was only visible in the works of first-grade girls. Several boys drew castles, but they were castles associated with Batman and other warring figures. The girls’ interest grew out of their knowledge of contemporary cultural practices associated with dating and marriage and the courtship aspects of Cinderella, Sleeping Beauty, and The Little Mermaid. The girls played queen on and off throughout the year; after viewing The Little Mermaid over the Christmas break, however, this theme emerged very strongly, particularly in the works
of Monica and her two best friends, Julie and Laura. By April, Monica’s interest in romance began to wane. She continued to draw her friends and herself dressed in Renaissance costumes, but the girls in her stories were once again engaged in normal childhood play.

CONCLUSION

The collection and description of Monica’s written and visual works was a critical tool in our understanding and appreciation of her as a learner and thinker. Through the study of her works, we better understood her particular interests and meanings, the ways in which she explored and expressed her meanings within a variety of genres, and the tensions associated with the appropriation of and resistance to genres and meanings.

The themes of relationships, cultural commitment, and romance were predominant in Monica’s collected works. She used a variety of genres—personal narratives, realistic and romance fictional narratives, cards and notes, visual and written responses to books—to think about these themes. Each genre offered a range of meaning possibilities; Monica sorted through these possibilities as she wrote and drew about those meanings that were most interesting and important to her. The other children in the classroom showed preferences for different themes and genres and, even within a specific genre such as personal narratives or fictional narratives, preferences for different meanings. The study of the collected works of the first-grade children opened up for us the vastly different meanings that were expressed by children and the role that genre played in their thinking.

Individual children appropriate some meanings and genres while simultaneously resisting others. Monica extensively and regularly explored and expressed her interest in relationships during the year. She used personal narratives, realistic fictional narratives, and cards and notes to think about the theme of relationships. Other children wrote in these same genres but either explored different themes (e.g., adventure) or different ideas within the theme of relationships (e.g., conflicts and competition between friends). Still other children showed very little interest in writing either personal narratives or realistic fictional narratives. Instead, they wrote fantasies, war stories, or adventure stories that enabled them to think about themes of struggle, conflict, and heroes overcoming great obstacles.

As we studied children’s works, we documented strengths in our curriculum. The use of notebooks in which children were able to select their own topics, content, and genres was clearly the single most
important writing and art activity in the classroom. The majority of each child’s written and visual work came from the notebooks, and the works in the notebooks were critical to our understanding of children’s interests and preferences. Having card- and note-writing materials available for the children’s use was also an important part of the literacy curriculum. Several of the girls, including Monica, wrote cards and notes regularly and extensively. By writing in this genre, the girls explored and expressed meanings not as readily available to them in other genres (e.g., expressing “happy birthday” or “get well soon” messages). Finally, through the study of the children’s works, we realized the importance of written and visual responses to books, especially those with American Indian content, for the expression of American Indian content, symbols, and designs. Reading and responding to multicultural books creates a space where American Indian children can think about their culture and heritage. The study of the children’s works affirmed for us the value of including extensive amounts of multicultural literature in the curriculum.

The study of the children’s collected works also revealed weaknesses in the curriculum. Children wrote comparatively few texts in Dakota; we are now thinking through ways to encourage them to write more frequently in Dakota. In addition, the boys wrote fewer cards and notes than did the girls. We are thinking of ways to model card and note writing, as well as other genres, more extensively and more appropriately for boys.

The descriptive study of the Dakota children’s written and visual works helped us understand and respect the children as serious makers of meaning. The process of collecting and describing works strengthened and deepened our relationship to the children. Bilingual and L2 children need to have connections to their teachers. Collecting and describing their works is one way to establish those connections.
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This article reports on a study of the language use practices and beliefs of bilingual students enrolled in a fourth-grade class taught by a teacher who is only minimally proficient in their native language, Spanish. Combining an ethnographic and a quantitative perspective, the study is based on two major data sources: extensive field observations of the classroom and interviews with the students and teacher. In addition to drawing upon interview data that describe the language choices and attitudes of the students as a whole, this article focuses on the language use of three case-study children who were observed longitudinally in the classroom at regular intervals over 14 months. The results depict a classroom where students and teacher are committed to the maintenance and further development of Spanish. Spanish-speaking students, particularly girls, used considerable amounts of Spanish in the classroom despite their teacher’s reliance on English. Children in the classroom consistently held very positive attitudes toward Spanish and bilingualism regardless of their language practices at home or school. However, our data reveal that a substantial shift toward English over the school year characterized the sociolinguistic environment of this classroom. Most children in the class reported using greater amounts of English as they progressed through the grades, and the case-study children’s use of English in the classroom increased considerably over the course of the school year. In addition to addressing the different factors at work in the way students use and develop their native languages in school settings, we describe ways English-medium teachers can foster the maintenance and development of their students’ native languages.

Bilingualism plays an important role in the personal and social lives of children who live in ethnic minority and immigrant communi-
ties throughout the U.S. Children who acquire two languages have access to a wide range of resources that are largely unavailable to monolingual English speakers. It is commonly believed that bilingualism, if maintained, leads to social and economic rewards. In addition, literature on the cognitive functioning of balanced bilingual (i.e., children with equal or nearly equal levels of proficiency in both languages) suggests that bilingualism, compared with monolinguism, offers children a number of cognitive advantages (Diaz, 1985; Duncan & DeAvila, 1979; Hakuta & Diaz, 1985; Kessler & Quinn, 1980).

Yet for many immigrant groups living in the U.S., bilingualism is a temporary phenomenon (Fishman, 1966; Grosjean, 1982). Immigrant children typically arrive in the U.S. as monolingual speakers of their native languages, develop bilingualism as they acquire English, establish English-speaking households once they are adults, and raise their children to be English-speaking monolingual. Thus far, research yields an uneven picture about the degree to which language shift is occurring among Spanish speakers living in the U.S. Depending on the aspect of language under investigation (i.e., language choice, proficiency, or attitude) and the methodology being used, research on this group has either provided evidence of a relatively rapid shift toward English or a tenacious preservation of the native language. For example, survey data have portrayed Spanish as seldom used beyond the second or third generation of immigrants (Lopez, 1978; Veltman, 1988). Some studies have even found that first- and second-generation Latino children lose their ability to speak and understand Spanish at an early age. Based on her collection of parental reports, Fillmore (1991) reported a shift toward English in young children who attended preschools in which English was used during all or part of the school day. According to many of the parents Fillmore and her colleagues interviewed, formerly Spanish monolingual children who were enrolled in these preschools no longer spoke Spanish well, nor did they use it much at home. As Fillmore has described, communication between these children and their non-English-speaking parents was impaired, thereby jeopardizing the parents’ ability to socialize their children.

Yet other research that distinguishes between different components of language shift conveys a view of ethnolinguistic vitality among Spanish-speaking children and their families. For example, Hakuta and D’Andrea (1992) found that high school students born in the U.S. to Mexican immigrant parents reported using mostly English at home and in school. However, in terms of language proficiency, they had maintained as much Spanish as their counterparts who had immigrated from Mexico in the last 5 years. Similarly, in our research focusing on Mexican-origin children between the ages of eight and ten (Pease-
Alvarez & Hakuta, 1993), we found that children retained fairly high levels of proficiency in Spanish although they did not necessarily participate in a sociolinguistic milieu where Spanish predominated.

Where do schools fit in this mixed view about native language maintenance? Does the classroom contribute to children’s maintenance or loss of their native tongue? Overall, schools in the U.S. do not consider the development and maintenance of bilingualism among immigrant populations to be a central goal. In line with an assimilationist perspective on the schooling of ethnic minority children, most schools serving them focus on the acquisition of English and assimilation into the mainstream curriculum (Moll, 1992). The central goals underlying federal bilingual education legislation are to develop the English language and to help language minority children make the transition to an English-only curriculum.

However, many who work in schools are aware of the advantages associated with being bilingual and multicultural. Many teachers argue forcefully that language minority children should have access to schooling that contributes to the development and/or maintenance of their native languages. Despite these sentiments, a number of factors impede teachers’ ability to work toward that goal. Perhaps the most glaring is teachers’ usual lack of proficiency in their students’ native languages. Given this limitation (one that is not likely to change in the foreseeable future), an important question is whether, and to what degree, monolingual or nearly monolingual English-speaking teachers can foster the maintenance and development of their students’ native languages.

Our ongoing investigation (Pease-Alvarez & Hakuta, 1993) of Spanish language maintenance and loss in a Mexican immigrant community we call Eastside (all names of people and schools are pseudonyms) provides a theoretical and empirical base from which to address that question. The study referred to in this article was designed to describe the language use practices and beliefs of bilingual students enrolled in a fourth-grade classroom at one of Eastside’s elementary schools, which we will call Oakside. This classroom, like many in the district, is labeled an English-only or nonbilingual classroom and was taught by a teacher, Randy Dean, who was only minimally proficient in Spanish.

This study focuses on both the sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic manifestations of language shift in a group of 64 children of Mexican origin from different immigration backgrounds. Children and their family members participated in interviews and activities investigating their language proficiency, attitudes, and language choices. Findings from interviews and various measures of children’s oral proficiency in English and Spanish (i.e., analyses of children’s narratives in English and Spanish, their performance on a translation task, and their scores on English and Spanish versions of the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test) indicate that children who immigrated to this country or whose parents immigrated as adults were successfully maintaining oral proficiency in Spanish despite considerable variation in their language choices and those of their family members, teachers, and friends.
the native language of the majority of the students. The present study, combining both an ethnographic and a quantitative perspective and drawing upon two major data sources—extensive field observations and interviews with the students and teacher—addresses the question of how students use English and Spanish in a classroom in which the teacher, although open to and supportive of native language maintenance, relies almost exclusively on English and for whom the development of Spanish is not an explicit instructional goal. Initially, the goal of the project was to describe in detail the school language practices of three case-study children who had also participated in the larger study on language shift (Pease-Alvarez & Hakuta, 1993). However, during the course of our classroom observations the students in the classroom used Spanish in complex ways for both academic and non-academic activities. Thus, to better assess the role that Spanish and English played in the classroom, we decided to expand the study by conducting student interviews to tap the attitudes and language practices of all the students in the class, none of whom were in the full study except for the three case-study children.

**METHOD**

**The Subjects**

**The Classroom**

Dean’s fourth-grade class is located at Oakside School, one of four Eastside schools where children have access to bilingual education. Most children who are classified as dominant speakers of Spanish attend classes taught by bilingual teachers for their first 3–4 years at Oakside. Once deemed to be sufficiently proficient in English, they are reclassified as either transitional or fluent English speakers and assigned to classrooms where English is emphasized throughout the curriculum. Like Dean, most of the teachers in these classrooms speak little or no Spanish. Although Dean speaks very little Spanish in his classroom, he is somewhat proficient in the language. He is able to read and write Spanish at what he describes is a second-grade level, and he frequently corrects students’ Spanish syntax and spelling.

Like other teachers in the school district, Dean realizes that acquiring English and moving students into an English-only curriculum is the main goal of the district’s bilingual education program. Nevertheless, he feels that a classroom taught by a teacher like himself, who is only minimally proficient in Spanish, may not always meet the academic needs of Spanish-speaking students. He particularly worries that some
students will not grasp important instructional concepts that he presents in English. He also wonders if he is contributing to the eventual demise of his students’ bilingualism, an ability that he feels will help them secure employment and improve their economic well-being.

In line with the pedagogical approach embraced by the entire Oakside faculty, Dean advocates a child-centered, holistic pedagogy. A self-described whole language teacher, he believes students should spend time engaged in activities they find meaningful rather than on the mastery of discrete skills. Under his guidance, children in his class spend a good portion of each day reading and writing about topics of their own choosing. Time is also set aside for students to interact with one another while they discuss books, compose stories, and seek input about their writing.

Dean’s class includes 18 children of Mexican descent, 1 student from Costa Rica, 2 students of Tongan descent, 1 African American student, 1 Samoan student, and 1 student of Indian descent who recently immigrated to Eastside from the Fiji Islands. Twenty (83%) of the 24 children in the classroom (all students for whom we had parental consent to participate in the study) were interviewed for the study. Sixty-five percent of the students were born in the U.S., and most had attended schools in Eastside since kindergarten. However, 95% of the students’ parents were born outside of the U.S. With the exception of one student, all the students of Mexican or Latino origin were proficient in English and Spanish. Most students began kindergarten in bilingual classes, and the majority told us that in kindergarten they had used more Spanish than English with their teachers and classmates. Only a few reported having used mostly or exclusively Spanish with their teachers and classmates in first grade.

The Case-Study Children

Three students (Sebastián, Raúl, and Cristina) from the classroom were observed longitudinally. All were born in the U.S. to immigrant, working-class parents who did not complete high school. Upon entering Oakside School, each child was first enrolled in classes taught by bilingual teachers and, based on their self-reports, used mostly Spanish in the early primary grades. All three first learned to read and write in Spanish.

Because the three children had participated in the larger study, we had access to additional data on their language proficiencies and choices. Compared with the students in the larger sample, the three case-study children displayed either average or above average proficiency in both English and Spanish. Measures of vocabulary, translation skill, and narrative quality in each language revealed that although...
the three children had approximately equal levels of Spanish proficiency, Sebastián was the most proficient in English, followed by Cristina and then Raúl.

When queried about their home language environments, the case-study children and their parents told us that the children spoke Spanish almost exclusively at home with their parents and, in the case of Cristina and Sebastián, with their preschool-aged siblings. In each home, parents spoke only Spanish with one another. Raúl and Sebastián reported using mostly or exclusively Spanish with their parents, but Cristina told us that she spoke both languages equally with her mother and more Spanish than English with her father. All three reported using more English than Spanish with their closest siblings.

Procedure

Student Interviews

One of two female researchers interviewed students individually during school hours in a separate room of the school. The students were familiar and comfortable with the two interviewers because of the researchers’ extended presence in the classroom from earlier studies. All students were interviewed within a span of 2 weeks during the sixth month of the school year. Interviews followed a structured protocol, were conducted in the language that was most comfortable to the student (Spanish or English), and lasted about 50 min. Each interview was tape recorded.

The interview protocol was designed to obtain the following six types of information: (a) children’s current language use patterns in both the home and school; (b) students’ general attitudes about Spanish, English, and bilingualism; (c) children’s historical recall of their language use patterns since the beginning of school; (d) students’ current language choices for reading and writing; (e) students’ prior use of language during literacy events; and (f) basic demographic information about the family. Questions concerning language use took the following basic form: “When you speak with ______, what language do you use?” (“¿Cuando hablas con ______, qué idioma usas?”). A visual aid with a 7-point scale was used on each of the questions. The scale was 1 = All Spanish (No más español), 2 = Almost all Spanish (Casi todo español), 3 = More Spanish than English (Más español que inglés), 4 = Both languages equally (Las dos igual), 5 = More English than Spanish (Más inglés que español), 6 = Almost all English (Casi todo inglés), 7 = All English (No más inglés). Subjects indicated in this way the degree to which they spoke Spanish and English with their parents, their peers and teachers at school, and each of their classmates. They
were also asked to recall the language they used with peers and teachers in all previous years of school, one grade at a time. After indicating the appropriate location on the scale for each of the language-use questions, students were asked to give reasons for their reported language use patterns.

We assessed language attitudes by asking a series of questions of the following form: “How important do you think it is for you to _________?” (“¿Qué tan importante es para tí _________?”). The blanks included such items as being bilingual, speaking each language well, and reading and writing in each language. These questions used another scaled visual aid indicating degree of importance on a 5-point scale ranging from zero to four large, black stars. Subjects pointed to the column with the number of stars they felt best represented their view. Children were also asked which language they thought was more important and which they preferred. In addition, students were prompted to give the reasons for each of their answers.

Classroom Observations

Over the course of 14 months (1 full school year plus the last 2 months of the previous academic year), one of three observers (two male, one female) followed one of the three case-study children for roughly the entire school day. On these days, case-study children wore a miniature microphone that transmitted to a receiver and headphones (worn by the observer) that recorded all child speech. Using a time-sampling procedure, observers watched the target child for 30 s and, after hearing a prerecorded time signal in the headphones, recorded their observations on a behavioral observation checklist for the next 30 s. Then the headphones sounded again and the next 30-s observation began. In addition to taking running field notes about classroom activities, observers noted on a behavioral observation checklist instrument the child’s (a) language (English, Spanish, both, none), (b) interlocutor(s) (peer, self, teacher, other adult, entire class, none), (c) location (in class, outside, computer room, other room, cafeteria), (d) participant structure (individual, small group, large group), and (e) activity (on task, on and off task, play, other).

Children were usually observed for their entire school day (from 8:30 a.m. to 2:30 p.m.) minus a brief lunch break for the observer and occasional time-outs for technical reasons. However, because of abbreviated school days and observers’ schedule requirements, 8 (36%) of the 22 observation occasions lasted somewhat less than a full day (usually half a day). Cristina was observed 10 times (6 full school days, 4 partial days), Sebastián 7 times (5 full, 2 partial), and Raúl 5 times (3 full, 2 partial). The typical time interval between observations for
each child was approximately 3–4 weeks. A total of 3,924 30-s observations were carried out for the three target children. Selected portions of the audiotapes were transcribed.

Reliability of Observation

During the final piloting of the checklist instrument, two observers followed the same child for 68 observations to assess the reliability of observation. Percentage agreements were language spoken = 84%, first interlocutor = 82%, second interlocutor = 70%, location = 100%, participant structure = 89%, child’s activity = 100%.

RESULTS

Student Interviews

Language Use at Home

Figure 1 shows the mean for the 20 students in the class for the languages used with their mother, father, closest older sibling, and closest younger sibling, according to students’ self-reports during the interviews. Children in this class used more Spanish than English with their parents and, on average, slightly more English with their fathers (M = 3.35, SD = 2.09) than with their mothers (M = 3.10, SD = 1.89). Students used more English with their siblings than with their parents and more English with their older siblings (M = 4.67, SD = 1.73) than with their younger siblings (M = 4.00, SD = 1.86). Students spoke both languages equally more often with siblings (32%) than with their parents (25% with mothers, 18% with fathers). Thus, the majority of students in the classroom spoke a significant amount of Spanish in the home.

Language Use at School

Figure 2 shows the language(s) students used, on average, with Dean, with their friends at school, and with all classmates, reported separately by gender. Whereas children in this classroom spoke almost exclusively English with their teacher, Dean (M = 6.15, SD = 1.04), they used a fair amount of Spanish with their school friends (M = 5.27, SD = 1.29), and girls used more Spanish with their friends (M = 4.78, SD = 1.26) than did boys (M = 5.67, SD = 1.23). An average of the children’s ratings for their four closest friends showed that seven girls
(78%) and one boy (9%) used both languages approximately equally (4) with them.

Because the numbers reported above for the children’s overall language use with their friends are aggregates of what language(s) the students used with their four closest friends, there were two possible ways to obtain a 4 (both languages equally) on this score. Either the child used both languages in tandem all the time with all their friends (i.e., $M = 4, SD = 0$), or they used English with some friends and Spanish with others (i.e., $M = 4, SD = 3.5$). In this class, for the girls the former seems to apply, and for the boys, the latter. That is, the girls who spoke Spanish in this class tended to use both Spanish and English back and forth with most of their friends, whereas the boys showed more differentiation in their language choices by more often using predominantly English for some people and Spanish for others. This observation is supported by the fact that (a) the standard deviation for the friend aggregate is smaller for girls (.79) than it is for boys.
(1.09), and (b) the majority of girls who indicated that they spoke both languages equally overall with their friends did so with each of their four friends.

Also depicted in Figure 2 is the language used, on average, by students with all of their classmates. Both boys and girls used more English than Spanish with their classmates (but still a fair amount of Spanish) \( (M = 5.62 \text{ for boys, } 5.23 \text{ for girls}) \). In addition, students reported that they read more often in English than Spanish at school \( (M = 5.20, SD = 1.70) \) and that they wrote more often in English than in Spanish at school \( (M = 5.45, SD = 1.39) \). These numbers, combined with the fact that only a quarter of the class reported that they read and wrote exclusively in English, indicate that the students spontaneously chose to use Spanish for academic literacy activities fairly often. Thus, the students, despite the fact that they received instruction exclusively in English, used a fair amount of Spanish in the classroom—most often between friends and more among female friends than among friends.

**FIGURE 2**

Students’ Reported Language Use in the Classroom, by Gender

\[ \text{See note to Figure 1.} \]
male peer groups. The girls’ pattern of language use was characterized by more frequent code switching than the boys’, and the boys’ pattern more by the use of predominantly Spanish with some peers and English with others.

**Attitudes About Bilingualism**

Overall, students held very favorable views toward Spanish, English, literacy in each language, and bilingualism. Students thought it very important (on a scale of 0 to 4) to be able to speak both English and Spanish well and not more important to be able to speak one language over the other (importance of speaking English, $M = 3.6, SD = .64$; importance of speaking Spanish, $M = 3.6, SD = .5$), and boys and girls did not differ on these items. Although boys and girls did not differ in how important they thought it was to be able to read and write in English, girls thought it was more important to read and write in Spanish ($M = 3.8, SD = .44$) than did boys ($M = 3.3, SD = 1.0$). Also, girls reported that it was slightly more important to be bilingual ($M = 3.9, SD = .33$) than did boys ($M = 3.5, SD = .93$). When asked which language they thought was more important in general, the majority (68%) of the students thought both languages were equally important whereas 21% reported English to be the more important language. Interestingly, two (22%) of the girls reported Spanish to be the more important language, but none of the boys did. Thus, the students all seemed very positive about maintaining their Spanish language proficiency, and the boys, although still positive, seemed to think that reading and writing in Spanish was somewhat less important than girls did.

**Relationship Between Attitudes and Use**

Little correspondence existed between the language the students used at home or at school and their reported attitudes about language, as indicated by zero or near-zero correlations between the language use questions and the attitude questions. For example, none of the attitude items correlated with the languages used with students and their friends. Language use with the teacher, however, was associated with how important students thought it was to be literate in Spanish ($r = -.46$), which indicated that the students who reported reading and writing in Spanish to be more important were also those who spoke more Spanish with their teacher. The only attitudinal item associated with the children’s language use with their parents was students’ beliefs about the importance of speaking English well ($r = .32$ for language
used with mother, \( r = .49 \) for language used with father). That is, students who spoke more English with their parents thought it was more important to be able to speak English well in general. Interestingly, language use with one’s older sibling correlated somewhat with attitudes about the importance of being bilingual \( (r = -.30) \), speaking Spanish well \( (r = -.32) \), and being literate in Spanish \( (r = -.31) \). Thus, students who felt that maintaining fluency and literacy in Spanish was important also spoke more Spanish with their older sibling.

**Case-Study Observations**

Before discussing the results for each case-study child individually, we describe the language patterns used by the three children as a group. Our extended classroom observations showed that the language patterns described below for the three case-study children together adequately represent the language patterns for the entire classroom, on average. Of the 3,924 observations, 1,777 (45%) were of Cristina, 1,257 (32%) of Sebastián, and 890 (23%) of Raúl. In 48% of the observations the children were not speaking. Thus, children were speaking more than half (52%) of their school day, which is not surprising given the child-centered and small-group nature of the classroom. The overall distribution of the children’s interlocutors was peers = 66%, whole class = 9%, teacher = 9%, and self = 19%. The majority (79%) of our observations occurred in the classroom itself, 14% outside, and 7% in another room at the school.

Table 1 shows the percentage of observations in which the children were speaking Spanish, English, or both (within the 30-s period), by interlocutor, location, participant structure, and activity. Overall (the last column), the children spoke exclusively English 67% of the time, Spanish 17% of the time, and both languages for 14% of the observations. That children spoke Spanish 31% of the time they were talking (combining Spanish and both) during their school day is somewhat surprising given that their class is labeled an English-only rather than a bilingual classroom.

**Language by Interlocutor and Participant Structure**

As can be seen in Table 1, Spanish was quite prevalent when children were with their peers and in small groups. Forty-one percent of these children’s conversations with their peers included at least some Spanish (26% Spanish + 15% Both languages). Note that for all interlocutor categories except Peers the Both row in the table means that code switching occurred within the 30-s period with the same interlocutor. For the Peers column, however (and for the rest of the table), because
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language used</th>
<th>Interlocutor</th>
<th>Participant structure</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peers (n = 1,550)</td>
<td>Self (n = 392)</td>
<td>Teacher (n = 182)</td>
<td>Entire class (n = 190)</td>
<td>Individual (n = 97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n = Number of 30-s observations in the particular condition in which the target children spoke some language (not the total number of observations). Number of observations across levels of a variable may not add up to the total in the overall column owing to excluded categories or nonmutually exclusive categories (i.e., >1 interlocutor during the observation). Reported percentages reflect the percentage of observations in the particular conditions in which the target children spoke some language. Percentages within a column may not add up to 100% owing to excluded observations in which the language being spoken by the children could not be determined.
children often talked to more than one peer within the 30-s observation periods. Both includes instances of code switching with one partner as well as instances of using two languages with two people.

Interestingly, the great majority (85%) of the children spoke to themselves in English. Only 9% of children’s private speech utterances were in Spanish, and children rarely (1%) code switched between the two languages when speaking to themselves. Private speech (i.e., speech not explicitly addressed to another person) is quite common among elementary-school-aged children during school tasks (Berk, 1986; Winsler & Diaz, in press) and is known to serve a variety of self-regulatory functions for children (see Diaz & Berk, 1992). Consistent with the literature on private speech, the target children in this study talked to themselves on average during approximately 10% of our observations. Although reading to oneself was counted as private speech in this study, a great deal of the private speech we observed was self-regulatory in nature. That these bilingual children chose to use English as their private language and their language of thought at school suggests that they have internalized English to be their language for at least school activities. Children also seem to pick one language for private speech and rarely code switch. This finding is consistent with other research that has found bilingual children to code switch very little in their private speech while working on cognitive tasks (Diaz, Padilla, & Weathersby, 1991).

Speech to the teacher was, as might be expected, predominantly (85%) in English (Spanish = 4%). Code switching with the teacher (11%) occurred mostly during one-on-one conferences when the teacher was helping students with their writing. That 1570 of children’s speech with their teacher contained some Spanish is encouraging and reveals that students in this class at least felt comfortable using their native language with the teacher and that they did so on occasion. In the large-group setting, where children talk to the entire class, English is clearly dominant (92%). The 5% figure for both languages and the 3% figure for Spanish used with the group reflect mostly the moments during sharing time when students would read, translate, and discuss the stories they had written.

**Language by Location and Activity**

Children spoke the least Spanish in the classroom, where 71% of all speech was in English. When students were outside, either during recess or during an outdoor academic activity (i.e., physical education), they spoke slightly more Spanish (22%). Of most interest was that the case-study children spoke a relatively large amount of Spanish during lunch in the cafeteria (39% Spanish + 21% Both) and in other school-
rooms (43% Spanish + 6% Both). In the cafeteria the children could be with their younger siblings who attended the same school and ate lunch at the same time. This change of social context, combined with the possibility that students perceive eating as a nonschoollike activity associated with the family, could account for the extra use of Spanish in this setting. The two major activities that took place in other schoolrooms were computer sessions in the computer room and tutoring sessions in another classroom when the target children would help a younger child, usually with reading. The frequent use of Spanish during the tutoring sessions in other classrooms was to be expected, as the target children were often paired with younger, mostly Spanish-speaking students. However, the frequent use of Spanish in the computer room was surprising and especially encouraging given that it was one of the few clearly academic contexts in which Spanish seemed to have a strong foothold.

Also shown in Table 1 is how case-study children’s language patterns varied as a function of their activity. English was most prevalent during on-task, academic activity whereas Spanish emerged more during play and other activities. The On & Off Task category is especially interesting because of the relatively low frequency of English (50%) combined with the high frequency of both languages appearing within the same observation (24%). During most of the observations in which both languages were used, children were working on an academic task in English (on task), then briefly chatted with a classmate in Spanish about an unrelated topic (off task), and then returned to the task at hand, usually in English again. This pattern was common for children in this classroom.

**Language Shift**

Because we observed the same children repeatedly over the course of a year, it was possible to obtain a solid measure of how children’s relative use of English and Spanish changed throughout the school year. Figure 3 shows the amount of Spanish and English the target children used as a group over time. Although children spoke Spanish 29% of the time they were talking on the first day of observation, by the fifth day of observation (approximately 5–6 months later) that percentage had declined to 8%. Correspondingly, English usage started at 53% and finished at 83%. The amount of time children used both languages in tandem did not show any particular pattern of movement over time. Thus, even though Dean held a positive attitude toward language maintenance and was completely open to having Spanish in his classroom, considerable language shift from Spanish to English occurred within the span of only 1 year.
Table 2 displays the percentage of Sebastián’s speech during our observations that was in Spanish, English, or both by each of the context variables. What stands out is Sebastián’s complete reliance on English and his extremely infrequent use of Spanish across all contexts. Sebastián used exclusively English 95% of the time, with occasional code switching (2%) and practically no Spanish at all (1%). Recall that he started his academic career speaking Spanish at school. Interestingly, Sebastián used the most Spanish with peers in other schoolrooms (6%) or in the cafeteria at lunch (7%). Also notable is that during the entire academic year of observations, Sebastián used absolutely no Spanish with his teacher. Thus, Sebastián seems to have chosen English to use exclusively at school, even though his performance on the Spanish version of the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) and other
TABLE 2  
Observations (%) in Which Sebastian Lopez Spoke Spanish, English, or Both,  
by Interlocutor, Participant Structure, Location, and Activity  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language used</th>
<th>Interlocutor</th>
<th>Participant structure</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peers (n = 345)</td>
<td>Self (n = 98)</td>
<td>Teacher (n = 56)</td>
<td>Entire class (n = 99)</td>
<td>Individual (n = 24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. See note to Table 1.
Spanish language measures indicates that he is quite proficient in that language.

The little Spanish Sebastián did speak occurred early in our observations, and by the end of the school year he spoke exclusively English the entire day. His shift from mostly English to completely English is seen in the amount of time Sebastián used English and Spanish by order of observation day. During the first session Sebastián used English 90% of the time. This number increased across each observation session until at the end of the year he spoke English 100% of the time.

Sebastián’s self-reports during our interviews differed somewhat from our observations of his language choices. He told us that he used mostly (not exclusively) English with Dean and that he favored English in his conversations with 17 of his classmates. He reported that there was no one in his class with whom he conversed in only Spanish. Although he claimed to use both English and Spanish equally with 6 of his classmates and mostly Spanish with 1 of his classmates, we very rarely observed him conversing in Spanish with anyone. In fact, we never observed Sebastián engaged in an extended conversation using only Spanish. He even used English when conversing with classmates who initiated their conversations with him in Spanish. When we asked Sebastián about the languages he used with his closest friends and with the children seated at his table, he reported using mostly or only English because these children either knew no Spanish or preferred to use English.

Since first grade, Sebastián has been using English almost exclusively for reading and writing because, as he put it, English is the language of everything and everyone around him. He also told us that he had to write in English so that others in his class would understand what he had written. During the course of the last academic year, we never observed Sebastián reading or writing in Spanish. He wrote all of his stories and reports in English, as well as his journal entries. He read from chapter books and textbooks written in English even though Dean’s classroom library contained several Spanish books.

Although Sebastian relied mostly on English when speaking, reading, and writing, he held very positive attitudes toward both his languages and bilingualism. He repeatedly told us that bilingualism and being able to speak Spanish well enabled him to help friends and family members who are Spanish monolingual. He also explained that knowing English was essential for successful communication with his teacher. He stated that he liked both of his languages equally and

On the Spanish version of the PPVT all three children scored well within the range of scores obtained from the Mexican metropolitan norming sample—i.e., well within one standard deviation of the Mexican norm.
felt that they were of equal importance. When responding to the questions, “How important is it for you to know how to read and write in English/Spanish?” Sebastián chose the highest rating on our scale for both languages. As he explained, being able to read and write in English was necessary for doing homework, but a strong foundation in Spanish literacy was necessary for corresponding with friends and relatives who live in Mexico.

Raúl Carrazco

Overall, Raúl used 79% English, 10% Spanish, and 9% both, as reported in the last column of Table 3. Several of the percentages in Table 3 need to be interpreted with caution because of the small number of observations during which Raúl talked. For example, because Raúl rarely spoke to large groups of people or to the whole class (i.e., eight large group observations the entire year), the percentages for this column are not reliable.

For the most part, Raúl’s pattern of language use mimics that of the entire group of case-study children already discussed. However, we found a number of interesting deviations from this pattern. The first was the surprisingly large amount of Spanish Raúl spoke with the teacher (14% Spanish + 33% code switching = 47%). This difference may be due to the fact that the majority of Raúl’s observations with his teacher occurred during one-on-one conferences about his writing, which was often in Spanish, at least at the beginning of the year. The second deviation was that Raúl’s Spanish emerged more during academic on-task activities than during play and other off-task pursuits. This may have reflected his tendency to elicit help from Spanish-speaking peers when he was having difficulty with a particular assignment. Over the course of the year, Raúl also showed considerable shift from Spanish to English in his language use, using 20% Spanish at the beginning of the year and 8% at the end.

Not exactly consistent with our observations, Raúl told us that he spoke only English with Dean. English was also the language he reported favoring when interacting with the majority of his classmates (16 out of 24). He reported using equal amounts of English and Spanish or greater amounts of Spanish than English with nine of his classmates. He favored English when speaking with five of the six students with whom he interacted most frequently (i.e., close friends and those who sat at his table) and both languages equally with the sixth. When asked to provide reasons for his language choices, Raúl told us that his decisions were based on his interlocutors’ language proficiencies or preferences. Unlike Sebastián, Raúl sometimes contributed to conversations with peers and classmates using only Spanish.
TABLE 3
Observations (%) in Which Raúl Carrazco Spoke Spanish, English, or Both, by Interlocutor, Participant Structure, Location, and Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language used</th>
<th>Interlocutor</th>
<th>Participant structure</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peers (n = 271)</td>
<td>Self (n = 112)</td>
<td>Teacher (n = 43)</td>
<td>Entire class (n = 8)</td>
<td>Individual (n = 31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. See note to Table 1.
When bilingual classmates initiated conversations with him, Raúl followed their lead and used the language that they spoke. Raúl began the school year writing exclusively in Spanish. Getting his teacher to provide feedback and help him with his Spanish writing did not appear to be a problem for Raúl. During the first half of the school year, Dean conferred with Raúl in English about stories written in Spanish, and Raúl usually incorporated his suggestions into subsequent versions of his stories. By January, Raúl had switched to English for writing stories and reports. At the time of our interview in late March, he reported writing mostly in English. Yet despite this shift, Raúl continued to write in Spanish in one journal used for summarizing the day’s activities and for taking notes on films shown in class. Although his writing was characterized by a shift to English, Raúl’s choice of language for reading was consistent throughout the school year. He read exclusively in English from the library of children’s literature in Dean’s classroom. When asked why he read in English, he told us that he preferred the English stories to the Spanish ones available in the classroom. He also chose to read English versions of math and social studies textbooks.

Like Sebastián, Raúl held favorable views of bilingualism, biliteracy, and each of his languages. In our interviews, he emphasized the economic rewards associated with being bilingual, or as he put it, “Puedes ser rico si eres bilingue” (you can be rich if you’re bilingual). In his interview he also told us that knowing English was essential for work or for shopping, whereas knowing Spanish was essential for communicating with friends from Mexico. When asked which language he preferred, Raúl told us that he liked using English more than Spanish because very few people at school spoke Spanish. Yet he told us that both languages were of equal importance. When asked the questions, “How important is it for you to know how to read and write in English/ Spanish well?” Raúl chose the second-highest rating on the 5-point scale. When justifying his responses, he, like Sebastián, attached different functions to Spanish and English literacy: Being able to read and write well in English would help him achieve his ambition of becoming an author, and learning to read and write well in Spanish was a means of enhancing his ability to learn and think in Spanish.

Cristina Galvez

Table 4 shows Cristina’s language use patterns in the classroom. She spoke quite a bit of Spanish in the school setting (29% Spanish + 23% Both). The majority of Cristina’s Spanish emerged when she was with peers in small groups. Cristina, like the rest of the children, spoke significant amounts of Spanish during lunch and in other classroom settings. Her frequent code switching is evidenced by the relatively
TABLE 4
Observations (%) in Which Cristina Galvez Spoke Spanish, English, or Both, by Interlocutor, Participant Structure, Location, and Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language used</th>
<th>Interlocutor</th>
<th>Participant structure</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peers (n = 734)</td>
<td>Self (n = 182)</td>
<td>Teacher (n = 83)</td>
<td>Entire class (n = 83)</td>
<td>Individual (n = 42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. See note to Table 1.
high percentages of observations in which she used both languages, across most contexts. A common pattern for Cristina was to speak both Spanish and English in tandem during academic tasks and to switch back and forth between the languages while alternating between on-task and off-task activities. During play activities with friends inside and outside the classroom she spoke predominantly in Spanish. Cristina’s frequent use of Spanish, however, did not carry over to her speech with Dean as she conducted 90% of her contacts with him in English.

Toward the end of the year, Cristina used slightly less Spanish than earlier but did not shift as much from Spanish to English over the course of the observations as did the other two case-study children. In our early observations Cristina spoke more Spanish (42%) than English (30%), but during our last observation day she spoke 40% English and 33% Spanish. Notably, her language use fluctuated greatly from day to day, and her use of one language did not consistently increase or decrease over time. On some days, English made up 80% of her language use; on others, only 20%. This variation suggests that Cristina’s use of her two languages is highly context dependent, varying according to what classroom activities are scheduled for the day.

When asked about her language choices at school, Cristina told us that she used mostly English with her teacher. However, unlike the two boys, she relied much more on Spanish when conversing with classmates. She reported using English and Spanish on an equal basis with 8 students and somewhat more Spanish than English with 4 students. She relied exclusively or primarily upon English in her conversations with 11 students. As was true for the boys, Cristina did not rely exclusively on Spanish when talking with any of her classmates. When asked about her language choices with her four closest friends, Cristina claimed to use both languages on an equal basis, citing her interlocutors’ bilingualism as the factor underlying this decision.

We observed code switching in many of Cristina’s conversations with the bilingual girls in her class. In her conversations with girls that focused on nonacademic topics, code switching often entailed the use of an English phrase or word in the context of a Spanish conversation. A similar pattern characterized conversations that accompanied academic activities. For example, we observed Cristina and her friends speak Spanish as they worked through math problems that they found challenging. They were usually consistent in their use of Spanish throughout these conversations with the exception of references to numbers, which were always in English.

Cristina reported using mostly English when reading and writing. Based on our observations, Cristina began the year writing several stories in Spanish. As was his practice with Raúl, Dean provided Cristina with input on her Spanish writing in the context of writing confer-
ences conducted primarily in English. Despite Cristina’s shift to English for writing by January, she often alternated languages while working with other girls on writing tasks or while conferring about her own writing. When jointly composing stories in English, Cristina and her collaborators alternated between English and Spanish when deciding on what they would eventually write in English.

Cristina also holds positive views of bilingualism although, unlike the two boys, she feels that English is more important than Spanish because, in her words, “cíasi en todas partes no más hablan inglés” (in most places people only speak English). Like the boys, she feels it is important to know both Spanish and English but for different reasons. Spanish is the language used in her home and the only language spoken by many of her family members. Knowing English allows her to function at school and will eventually help her land a good job. When responding to the questions, “How important is it for you to know how to read and write in English/Spanish well?” she chose the highest rating on our scale for both languages, arguing that being literate in each language was essential in her written transactions with people from different language backgrounds (i.e., family members in Mexico and English-speaking teachers in the U.S.).

DISCUSSION

As language minority children progress through the grades, their use of their native languages at school tends to decrease and in many cases disappear altogether. By the time many children reach the fourth grade, even those who previously came from bilingual programs are participating in an English-only instructional milieu. However, we found that the sociolinguistic environment in Dean’s fourth-grade classroom, at least during the first 4 months of the school year, contradicted this typical scenario. During this time, we observed Spanish-speaking students in his classroom use considerable amounts of Spanish when conversing about nonacademic topics and when participating in small-group instructional events despite Dean’s reliance on English. Our interview data, collected in late March, further contributed to our description of a classroom where Spanish played an important role. Most children in this class reported positive attitudes toward Spanish and bilingualism regardless of their language practices at home or school. Although no student claimed to rely exclusively on Spanish with any one classmate, girls tended to use more Spanish than boys. Moreover, most Spanish-speaking girls told us that they spoke both languages on an equal basis with other Spanish-speaking girls. Some girls, who, like Cristina, reported using both languages on an equal
basis with their friends, tended to code switch when conversing with other children. In contrast, most boys, including Raúl and Sebastián, tended to stick more with one language while conversing with peers.

Why girls used more Spanish than boys may be related in part to differences in their social networks. When responding to our question, “With whom do you most often converse?” boys usually named one or more of the few boys in the class who were not proficient in Spanish, but girls most often named other Spanish-speaking girls. Eight of the nine girls enrolled in the class were Spanish speaking. Nerrisa, the exception, was a native speaker of Hindi and an infrequent participant in the other girls’ social networks both inside and outside of the classroom. In contrast, two of the six non-Spanish-speaking boys enrolled in the class were very popular among all the boys. Our interview data lead us to speculate that the home environment may also help explain gender differences in the children’s use of Spanish and English. Most children reported that their mothers used more Spanish than their fathers. As role models for their daughters, mothers may have indirectly influenced their daughters’ language choices. Similarly, having an English-speaking male teacher may have affected the language choices of the boys enrolled in the class.

Despite evidence that Spanish played an important role in Dean’s class and that students held positive attitudes toward bilingualism and their languages, our data indicate that a shift toward English did indeed characterize the sociolinguistic environment of the classroom. Most children told us that the amount of English they read, wrote, and spoke had increased across the grades. Moreover, data from our observations of the three case-study children document a shift toward English in their oral language practices during the course of a single academic year. Our informal observations throughout the year showed that most of the children who began the year writing in Spanish had switched to English by the end of the year. In fact, during the last 2 months of school, we observed only two students writing in Spanish whereas nearly half of the class had written at least one story, report, or poem in Spanish before January. The Samoan child in the class even wrote a story in Samoan during the first half of the year. This decrease in the amount children were writing in Spanish toward the end of the year also meant that children had fewer opportunities to discuss their Spanish writing with Dean or the rest of the class, which surely contributed to the observed decrease in the amount of oral Spanish observed in the classroom.

This study portrays the complex sociolinguistic environment of the children’s classroom. The language choice practices of some children, particularly the boys, are closer to fitting a diglossic pattern (i.e., the allocation of each language to separate domains, interlocutors, or func-
tions), a sociolinguistic phenomenon that has been the subject of considerable controversy in discussions that focus on the maintenance of minority languages (Fishman, 1966; Hamel, in press; Hamel & Sierra, 1983; Pedraza, Attinasi, & Hoffman, 1980). In contrast, girls frequently used both languages in their conversations with other bilinguals. Judging from Cristina’s performance on measures of language proficiency, this tendency did not necessarily detract from her English and Spanish language ability. In fact, Cristina’s code-switching style of language use in the classroom was associated with more use of Spanish and less shift to English over the year.

This study contributes to an understanding of language shift. As we have found in the larger study, the relationship between the different components of language implicated in the phenomenon of language shift (e.g., proficiency, choice, and attitude) may operate somewhat independently of one another. Both our interview and observation data indicate that this discrepancy between language proficiency, attitudes, and choice held true for many of Dean’s students. Most notable were the positive attitudes toward bilingualism held by students who varied considerably in their language choice practices.

A question that remains for us, as language educators and advocates of bilingualism, is whether we should be concerned about the sociolinguistic environment of Dean’s classroom. Many would argue that in this class Spanish is used sufficiently, is valued, and is allowed to flourish. After all, relatively few bilingual children have access to their native language in instructional settings after they have been deemed proficient in English (McGroarty, 1992). However, we worry that the substantial shift toward English that we observed (in only 9 months) will continue to characterize children’s language choice practices across the grades. If this continues, children’s use of academic Spanish will certainly diminish, especially if their opportunities to use Spanish at home also decrease. Worse yet, teachers will have lost the opportunity to further develop the linguistic resources that children bring to the school.

This study provides insights for educators interested in making schools places where students continue to use and develop their native languages. No doubt some of Dean’s pedagogical perspectives and practices had a favorable impact on students’ decisions to use Spanish in the classroom. The fact that Dean knew at least a little Spanish most likely contributed to students’ decisions to share their Spanish writing with him. The one-on-one writing conference, in which the student and teacher discussed a student’s Spanish story, turned out to be an excellent context for the teacher to use Spanish in a meaningful way in the classroom, especially a teacher like Dean, who felt more confident reading and discussing children’s written Spanish than he did speaking...
Spanish spontaneously. Dean’s student-centered philosophy of teaching may have also contributed to a sociolinguistic environment where students spontaneously used their native language. In cooperative learning groups, an instructional practice grounded in a child-centered approach to teaching, some students, particularly bilingual girls, used Spanish. Yet small-group interactions involving many boys, particularly Sebastián, did not entail the use of much Spanish. Because cooperative modes of instruction do not guarantee the use of native languages, English-medium teachers interested in making sure that children continue to use their native language should be somewhat wary of this approach alone. Teachers may have to develop criteria for grouping students based on their own observations of the context and circumstances that influence students’ decisions to use their native language.

We also urge English-medium teachers to consider more explicit ways of incorporating their students’ languages into the sociolinguistic environment of their classrooms. It is clear from this study that if one’s goal is to foster the maintenance and development of students’ native languages, the sociolinguistic environment of the classroom cannot be left up to chance. Even in this class, where Spanish was highly valued, significant shift to English occurred during the year. As Sebastián’s case strongly suggests, teachers with a child-centered pedagogy do not necessarily have students who use their native language in class. When working with students like Sebastián, it appears, teachers must on occasion insist that their students use their native language.

Students in this study engaged in a few practices that suggest teachers can insist that their students use their native language. Raúl’s decision to use Spanish when writing in one of his personal journals could be translated into a classroom policy. That is to say, teachers could insist that students use Spanish, or their native language, to maintain at least one journal they periodically share with the teacher or with whomever else the child feels comfortable. At the beginning of the school year, when several children were writing Spanish stories during the 1-hour block of time known as writers’ workshop, they were very insistent about translating these stories aloud for non-Spanish speakers during the large-group sharing event that concluded the workshop. Perhaps translation could be used throughout the curriculum in ways that match students up with speakers of their native language. For example, children who write stories in English could translate their stories either aloud, using a tape recorder, or in writing, for a parent or non-English-speaking family member. The recipients of translated stories could also be kindergartners or primary-grade children who share the native language of the authors. Preparing videotaped, audiorecorded, or live
performances of native language versions of children’s stories for classmates, parents, and other community members represents another potential context for the use and development of children’s native languages.

Finally, when contemplating how to enhance the role of minority languages in the curriculum, teachers should never underestimate the role these languages play in children’s homes and communities. Features of Dean’s pedagogy and personality may have contributed to students’ decisions to use Spanish in the classroom, but the fact that the students live in a community where Spanish is valued and used in purposeful ways also affected the sociolinguistic character of their school and classroom. Students who are members of communities where Spanish plays a more subordinate role may be less inclined to use it at school. Consequently, it may be particularly crucial for their native language development to have teachers who insist that children use their native languages to some extent in the classroom. Given the potential for this kind of variation across communities, we see the need for similar studies in settings where native languages play different roles in children’s lives outside of school.
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The use of languages other than English in schooling is a subject of great controversy in the U.S., pitting those who hold assimilationist views (favoring English-only) against those who hold cultural pluralist view (favoring inclusion of the native language) (Secada & Lightfoot, 1993). A study of nine exemplary K–12 programs for language minority students in which English was the primary language of instruction showed that the incorporation of students’ native languages in instruction need not be an all-or-nothing phenomenon. The use of the native language appears so compelling that it emerges even when policies and assumptions mitigate against it. Teachers who are monolingual English speakers or who do not speak the languages of all their students can incorporate students’ native languages into instruction in many ways to serve a variety of educationally desirable functions. This article explores the complexities of the uses of students’ native languages in schooling, describes and illustrates various ways these languages were used in the English-based but multilingual programs, and argues that programs for language minority students should be reconceptualized to move beyond the emotional and politically heated debate that opposes English-only instruction to native language instruction.

We have been trapped in the past in an endless and often fruitless debate over the best language of instruction. I hope that this reauthorization [of federal education programs for English L2 students] can rise above this tired issue, so that we can turn our attention to more substantive problems—how to provide language minority students with an equal opportunity to learn challenging content and high level skills. (Hakuta, 1993)

The use of languages other than English in schooling is a subject of great controversy in the U.S. Educators, politicians, and others
hotly debate whether, when, how, and to what extent students’ native
languages should be a part of their formal education. Those engaged
in this debate address the issues from a multitude of perspectives:
legal, political, theoretical, research-based, social, humanitarian, and
commonsensical, to name a few. And, of course, people who take the
same perspective on the issues may take different sides of the argu-
ment, aligning themselves with an assimilationist view or with a cultural
pluralist view (Secada & Lightfoot, 1993).

In fact, the controversy about the use of native languages other
than English in schooling encompasses much more than educational
effectiveness. Cummins (1989) argues that the “bilingual education
debate” is “more strongly based on political than on pedagogical consid-
erations” (p. 39). Focusing specifically on ESL instruction, Auerbach
(1993) similarly asserts that “monolingual ESL instruction in the U.S.
has as much to do with politics as with pedagogy” (p. 29). Many people
perceive the growing numbers of speakers of languages other than
English in the U.S. as a problem. They may also see increasing numbers
of language minority (LM) residents as a threat to their status as
speakers of the dominant language and as members of the dominant
culture (see Cummins, 1989, for an in-depth analysis of this phenome-
non). They believe that the presence of LM students lowers standards
and places an unwanted burden on resources.

One response to this perceived threat has been strong opposition
to the use of other languages besides English in public and official
contexts. Since its founding in 1983, a group called U.S. English has
been advocating for a constitutional amendment to establish English
as the official language of the U.S. through the English Only movement
(see Crawford, 1989, for a description of the background and activities
of this movement). Several states have passed English-only laws. Al-
though these laws so far have had little direct impact on educational
programs, they will likely be used eventually to challenge the use of
native languages other than English in schools.

Research has shown that it takes 2–3 years to become proficient in
basic communication skills in an L2 and 4–10 years to approach grade-
level competence in L2 academic skills (see Collier, 1989; Cummins,
1981, 1984). If nonnative-speaking students are immersed in English,
they will not have access to the content area knowledge and academic
skills that their English-speaking peers are learning. They are likely
to get further and further behind in their academic development while
they are concentrating on learning English.

Unfortunately, concern about the language of instruction and a
“fixation on teaching English as quickly as possible” (Stanford Working
Group, 1993, p. 8) have greatly overshadowed concern about content
instruction for LM students. This emphasis is misplaced. First, federal
law (i.e., the *Lau v. Nichols* Supreme Court decision in 1974) requires that all students be provided meaningful access to a school’s educational program, not just to English language development. Second, because it takes at least 4 years to become proficient in academic uses of an L2, it is impractical to postpone teaching students content until they become proficient in English. For students with little or no proficiency in English, their native language is the only effective means for providing access to content area development. By discussing content in their native languages, students can interact more effectively about more sophisticated content and have greater access to their own knowledge and experience (see Moll, 1992).

Native language use and development have psychological benefits in addition to serving as a practical pedagogical tool for providing access to academic content, allowing more effective interaction, and providing greater access to prior knowledge. Using and valuing students’ native languages in schools and classrooms supports and enhances the students’ learning because they themselves are indirectly valued (see Lucas, Henze, & Donato, 1990). The use of students’ native languages can also increase their openness to learning by reducing the degree of language and culture shock they are encountering (Auerbach, 1993). Because “relations of power and their affective consequences are integral to language acquisition” (p. 16), student learning can also be enhanced by integrating students’ native languages into their educational experiences, thus giving their languages a status more comparable to that of English (Auerbach, 1993).

Using students’ native languages in schooling can also help them develop English proficiency. Although it may appear contrary to common sense, maintaining and developing one’s native language does not interfere with the development of L2 proficiency. Experience shows that many people around the world become fully bi- and multilingual without suffering interference from one language in the learning of the other (see, e.g., Beardsmore, 1993). Research findings show that “one of the best predictors of second-language proficiency is proficiency in the mother tongue” (Stanford Working Group, 1993, p. 9). Cummins’ linguistic interdependence principle (1981, 1989, 1991, 1992) explains this phenomenon by identifying a common underlying proficiency that enables cognitive/academic and literacy-related skills to transfer across languages.

Given the right circumstances (i.e., sufficient numbers of students who speak and are literate in the same native language and qualified bilingual staff), the development of native language skills and native language instruction in academic content areas give learners the best hope for building a solid foundation in content and cognitive development and support the growth of their self-esteem and their English...
abilities (for research showing the benefits of native language instruction, see Ramírez, 1992; Ramírez, Yuen, & Ramey, 1991; Willig, 1985). However, if schools wait to implement curricula for LM students until those circumstances exist, millions of children will lose the chance to be educated. In reality native language content classes and even formal classes in native language development (e.g., Spanish for Spanish speakers) are not always possible; “the human and material resources are not [always] available to implement comprehensive bilingual models” (Dolson & Mayer, 1992, p. 139). Programs, schools, and classrooms in which English is the principal language of instruction and which incorporate students’ native languages offer the only practical option for LM students in many situations.

**SPECIAL ALTERNATIVE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS**

Since 1984 Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act has funded a type of instructional program called Special Alternative Instructional Programs (SAIPs), which offer this option to schools and districts. In 1968, the first Bilingual Education Act became law as Title VII. Under this act, which was compensatory in its focus on poor and “educationally disadvantaged” children (Crawford, 1989, p. 36), schools were not required to use students’ L1s or to apply any specific instructional approaches. Not until the so-called Lau Remedies (named after the 1974 *Lau v. Nichols* Supreme Court decision) in 1975 were specific guidelines for addressing LM students’ needs and a timetable for doing so established. These remedies rejected the sole use of ESL for teaching limited English proficient (LEP) students, implying that bilingual education programs were preferable in many cases, and the Office of Civil Rights “embarked on a campaign of aggressive enforcement” (Crawford, 1989, p. 37). In 1980, the Carter administration set down a more prescriptive set of guidelines mandating bilingual education in schools with sufficient numbers of LEP students of one language group. The Reagan administration, which came into office in 1981, did not support these guidelines.

In the 1980s, approaches that used only English were again accepted alongside approaches that used students’ native languages. The reauthorization of Title VII in 1984 placed greater emphasis on preparing

---

1 We acknowledge that the term *limited English proficient* suggests a deficit perspective of students so labeled. We use it in this article because it is the official term used by the Department of Education to refer to students who are learning English.
students in academic skills and content areas, thus making Title VII less compensatory in nature. In addition, several new funding categories were added, including SAIPS, which provide instruction in English. Although most Title VII funding continues to go to programs that use students’ native languages, the addition of SAIPS as a funding category has allowed districts to reemphasize bilingual instruction in favor of instruction solely in English. The arguments for funding SAIPS were (a) that bilingual programs are not feasible in districts with students of many different language backgrounds, especially if very few students speak the same language, and (b) that qualified bilingual teachers are not available in large enough numbers to staff bilingual programs for all LEP students.

Although the original rationale for SAIP funding was expressed in pedagogical terms, both political and pedagogical factors underlie the designation of SAIPs as a category for federal funding. From the political perspective, the addition of SAIPs can be seen as one reflection of the movement to limit the use of languages other than English in U.S. schools, which gained support in the 1980s, as indicated by the success of the English Only movement (see Secada & Lightfoot, 1993). This unspoken and unacknowledged political motivation for allowing instruction only in English is suspect. If all instruction is provided in English, students who are not fluent in English cannot hope to successfully compete with those who are. Thus, this situation perpetuates the power differences that already exist between native-born speakers of standard (middle-class) English and others. As Villegas (1988) has pointed out, “The manipulation of language in the struggle for power is evident in school . . . . The school is not a neutral ground for proving talent . . . ; it functions to maintain the advantage of the socially powerful” (p. 260). Considered from a pedagogical perspective, however, SAIPs represent one practical approach to educating students who are not fluent enough in English to succeed in the regular academic program in contexts where students speak several different native languages and where qualified bilingual staff are not available.

The role of SAIPs in the education of LM students, then, is complex. For some, SAIPs represent a way to prevent the use of languages other than English in U.S. schools. For others, they represent a practical way to provide some special services for LM students when native language instruction is not possible. In many districts and schools, SAIPS exist side-by-side with bilingual programs. In some, the bilingual program serves Spanish-speaking students, and the SAIP serves speakers of all other languages. In others, the SAIP is for students whose English language skills are intermediate—that is, those who are more likely to benefit from instruction in English—and the bilingual program is
The motivation for designing a SAIP instead of or in addition to a bilingual program and the symbolic meaning of that SAIP for a particular district depend upon a variety of contextual factors, including “the backgrounds and training of school and district staff; the nature, size, stability, educational backgrounds, countries of origin, and recency of arrival of the [language minority] students and their families; the history of and attitude toward linguistic and cultural diversity in the community, the district, and the school; the history of programs for LM students in the district and the school” (Lucas, 1992, p. 115). District policy grows out of such factors as these. Because the exclusive use of English is likely to be “rooted in a particular ideological perspective, [to] rest on unexamined assumptions, and [to] serve to reinforce inequities in the broader social order” (Auerbach, 1993, p. 9), educational policy makers, researchers, and practitioners must carefully consider the motivation for and symbolism of a program that does not provide opportunities for students to use and develop their native languages. For example, if district policy makers decide to place all LM students in linguistically heterogeneous groups and offer only an English-based program even when there are enough speakers of one language to make a bilingual program feasible, their reasons for making this decision should be carefully examined (see Lucas & Schecter, 1992, for a fuller discussion).

BEYOND THE LANGUAGE-OF-INSTRUCTION DEBATE

The emotional and political nature of the debate between linguistic and cultural pluralists and assimilationists makes it all the more important to gather evidence from research to help in understanding the roles of students’ native languages in schooling. A 3-year study of exemplary SAIPs funded in 1988 by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (OBEMLA), gave us the opportunity to do so. The primary purposes of the study were to identify, describe, and analyze significant features of exemplary SAIPs. Because most English learners in U.S. schools are not in full bilingual programs, knowledge of effective programs that use English as the primary language of instruction is sorely needed.

On our visits, we found that most of these programs, thought of as English-only programs, were characterized by the pervasiveness and
variety of uses of students’ native languages. We knew that native languages in schooling can give English learners greater access to content knowledge and to their own prior knowledge and experiences, offer opportunities for social and academic interaction, and support the development of their English language skills as well as their self-esteem. We decided, therefore, to examine the data to determine in what contexts, to what extent, for what purposes, and in what ways students’ native languages were used in these English-based programs. The classes we observed were not, for the most part, either bilingual or English-only. Students’ native languages were used to various extents and in various ways, depending on such factors as the participants in the interaction, the immediate situation, the purpose and content of the communication at hand, the needs of individual students and of the class as a whole, and school and community attitudes and circumstances. Many exemplary SAIPs have risen above the tired issue of the best language of instruction to address more substantive issues, providing English learners with some of the benefits of native language use even without full bilingual programs.

METHOD

We identified nine SAIPs across the country as exemplary through the following process: 147 educators involved in various aspects of the education of LM students were asked to nominate SAIPs they believed were exemplary in terms of student outcomes. SAIPs were defined as “preschool, elementary and secondary school projects designed specifically for language minority limited English proficient students in which children’s native language is not a primary instructional tool” (Tikunoff et al., 1991, p. 11). The nominators were 19 people in the Title VII Evaluation Assistance Center and Multifunctional Resource Center network; 59 representatives of bilingual departments at State Education Agencies; 59 directors of SAIPs; and 10 Desegregation Assistance Center directors. This open nomination process allowed for consideration of the widest possible range of programs.

The 147 educators nominated 70 SAIPs (24 funded by Title VII), which were then contacted and asked to submit information about program features and student outcomes. Thirty-nine SAIPs responded with sufficient amounts of information to be considered. A Site Selection Panel of five educators used that information to rank the programs in terms of the quality of their program results. The study staff then visited the 17 most highly rated SAIPs to verify the information that had been submitted and to gather further information. Based on these
site visits, the 9 most exemplary sites were selected, along with 2 alternate sites.

Two sets of data were collected at the nine sites. First, contextual, demographic, and descriptive information was collected at the district, program, and school levels for each site from documents submitted and from teacher and administrator interviews and classroom observations conducted during three site visits. From this information, a prose portrait of each SAIP was compiled.

Teachers were interviewed before and after they were observed. Preobservation interviews elicited information about class makeup, the activities planned, and the teacher’s goals, background, experience, and instructional philosophy. Postobservation interviews asked whether the class had met the teacher’s expectations and clarified particular events, strategies used, and decisions made. In addition, observers filled out a postobservation checklist to record comments regarding student behavior, involvement of aides, specific uses of different languages by the teacher and students, and teaching strategies used.

Second, classroom observation data were collected using three instruments: the Instructional Environment Profile (IEP), the Student Functional Proficiency (SFP) profile, and the Description of Instructional Practice (DIP) profile. The IEP focused on 18 features of the organization of instruction, including the number of languages spoken by students; the number of and criteria for instructional groups; and the language(s) used by the teacher, aide, and students. The SFP focused on three general areas: student engagement, task completion, and task description. Specific aspects of these areas that were coded included students’ contact with the teacher or aide and the mode of their responses to tasks (oral, written, nonverbal, no response). The DIP focused on the teacher rather than the students, providing an overall impression of the extent to which the teacher engaged in several aspects of instruction that research has identified as indicative of effective teaching, including encouraging high levels of student engagement, allowing/encouraging students to interact, exhibiting sensitivity to students’ languages and cultures, emphasizing meaning rather than the structure of language, and allowing/encouraging students to use their native languages.

Researchers spent a minimum of 5 days at each site. Classroom observations using the three instruments were conducted by pairs of observers who spent an entire day in each teacher’s classroom. During a class period (or its equivalent), one person observed and coded with the IEP while the other used the SFP. To code the IEP, the observer watched the classroom activities, paying attention to the 18 factors included in the IEP, and filled in the coding sheet at 2-min intervals.
For the SFP, the observer watched four students, one student at a time, stopping after 30-s intervals to code the sheet before moving to the next student. The four students were observed five times before the coder moved on to another group of four students. Once these two instruments had been completed for one period of classroom instruction, both observers completed the DIP.²

The findings presented here were drawn primarily from the interviews and classroom observations conducted during site visits. These qualitative data allow us to describe how students’ native languages were used in the programs and classrooms. We also present some summary quantitative data on the use of languages other than English gleaned from the results of the IEP and SFP.

FINDINGS

The nine SAIPs selected for study were located in six states (California, Oregon, Texas, Florida, New York, and Massachusetts). They varied in degree of urbanness, size, percent and number of LEP students, number of languages, and specific languages represented. For the most part, the SAIPs were serving multilingual populations, reflecting one of the pedagogical rationales for this Title VII funding category. Thirteen percent of the classrooms were bilingual; that is, all students spoke the same non-English language. All of the remaining classrooms, or 87%, were multilingual environments in which from 3 to 10 languages were represented among the students.

As SAIPs, these programs, unlike traditional bilingual education programs, were designed to provide instruction primarily in English. In practice, however, the classrooms were multilingual environments in which students’ native languages served a multitude of purposes and functions. They gave students access to academic content, to classroom activities, and to their own knowledge and experience; gave teachers a way to show their respect and value for students’ languages and cultures; acted as a medium for social interaction and establishment of rapport; fostered family involvement; and fostered students’ development of, knowledge of, and pride in their native languages and cultures. Across sites, native language use emerged as a persistent and key instructional strategy realized in very site-specific ways.

Drawing on observations across sites, we illustrate below the variety of ways the SAIPs used students’ native languages to create environments in which learning could take place. In the following sections

²See Tikunoff et al. (1990) for a more detailed description of data collection and for information pertaining to interrater agreement in the use of these instruments.
we present three different, yet representative, learning environments ranging from urban to suburban to rural. Across the different sites, the policy for using native language varied, and, not surprisingly, so did classroom practice. Each site addressed the issue of providing appropriate instruction to student populations in unique ways. Our intent is not to evaluate the practices found within each but rather to illuminate the linkages among context, policy, and practice.

**Contextualized Uses of Native Language**

**Site 1**

**Context.** Located in the Southwest, Site 1 (names of programs and individuals are pseudonyms) had a downtown where boarded-up stores shared the avenues with cooperatives under construction. The people of this city lived, played, and shopped in its 150-plus neighborhoods fanning out from the city’s center, each distinct in character and reached by relatively free-flowing highways. Agriculture-oriented industries from its frontier history, like major livestock marketing, grain, and agribusiness services, existed alongside aerospace industries, high-technology electronics manufacturers, and automakers. The fifth fastest growing center for immigrants in the state, the city had the second largest rate of Asian immigration in the state and the fastest growing Hispanic population, the largest segment of which was Mexican.

At the time of our visit, almost 68,000 students were served by district schools. The third largest school district in the state, it served a multiethnic student population that was 40% African American, 30% Hispanic, 8% Asian, and 22% other. About 12% of the students enrolled in the district were identified as LEP. Approximately 52 minority languages were represented, with Spanish, Cambodian, and Vietnamese the most common.

One way the district addressed LEP students’ needs was through the Center for Language Development Program, the program identified as exemplary by our study and offered by five middle schools and three high schools. Each Center operated as a school-within-a-school. That is, each program was housed at a school site but operated as an individual educational unit, physically separated from the rest of the school and offering a special program serving the needs of LEP students in the district.

**Policy.** The program coordinator in the district described the role of students’ native languages in the SAIP as varying from site to site depending on the capability of the teachers. The native language was used for explanation, she pointed out, rather than instruction as there
were students from several language groups in each class. She emphasized, however, that it was not a district policy but rather up to the teacher to make a decision about the use of students’ native languages. “We don’t discourage it,” she explained, for either social or instructional purposes, for example, pairing students with the same native language for tutoring.

Practice. The school we visited, approximately 15 min by uncrowded freeway from downtown, was located in a Hispanic section of town, near a shopping mall centered around Sears and J. C. Penney stores and reached by streets lined with small, brick bungalows edged with aluminum awnings. The school sat alone on a large, sloping piece of land, a red-brick building framed on either side by parking lots. Like that of the school district, this school’s student population reflected the city’s ethnic diversity. Seventy percent of the students were Hispanic; of the remaining students, 10% were Asian, 10% African American, and 10% Anglo. Thus, the mainstream was Hispanic. Many of the Anglo students served by this school were transient, the sons and daughters of seminary students who stayed at the school generally for about 2 years.

The program we visited was staffed by three teachers and two aides—including two Spanish-English bilingual teachers and two Spanish-English bilingual aides. As a result of their fluency, these teachers and aides could check comprehension or explain an activity to Spanish speakers with beginning-level proficiency in English. The following vignette illustrates this use of native language:

The math period is about half over; after a class review of how to add mixed fractions, these sixth-grade students are working at their desks on a problem from the board. Carolina, their teacher, moves from desk to desk, checking each student’s progress. At Felipe’s desk she stops, squatting next to him as they both examine how he is working out the problem. Leading him through the process for converting mixed denominators into common denominators, Carolina asks him questions softly in Spanish, and he answers, tentatively, in Spanish with occasional key math words in English.

Although a large percentage of the students in this center’s classrooms were Spanish speakers, students speaking other languages also had opportunities to use their native languages in classroom activities, as the following vignette illustrates:

Tables with groups of four students sitting around them crowd the classroom. The walls are covered with graphic material: commercial posters for books, words, animals, even punctuation marks; teacher-generated posters displaying editing guidelines, class rules, and encouraging words for coop-
erative behavior; student work, some displayed under the heading *Master-piece Gallery*; and notices of student recognition, for example, the Student of the Week award. At their tables, students write silently in their journals as soft music plays. In this beginning segment of the lesson students write about three things they learned the day before. Thus, what is important is content rather than language. Tran, a Vietnamese eighth grader whose English language skills are still very limited, writes in Vietnamese. As those language skills improve, his teacher explains, he will use less and less Vietnamese. Students more proficient in English, like Teresa and Miguel, write almost entirely in English.

Teachers also utilized their students’ linguistic resources to enhance instruction for other students, pairing students with the same native language but different levels of English proficiency so that a more proficient student could tutor a less proficient student.

Norma, the second-period ESL teacher, has just finished a review of the Kennedy family history she has used as an exemplar of her students’ next project. She sets out the steps for the day’s lesson on the process of writing a family history. The class, a heterogeneous grouping of middle school students whose native languages are Spanish, Vietnamese, and Korean, watch quietly and attentively as Norma brainstorms the topic, scribbling notes about her family history on the overhead projector as a model of how this prewriting technique can help them begin exploration of this topic. Next, she turns to the chalkboard, writing her first draft as she explains the students’ task. When she is done, students turn to each other at their tables to exchange ideas for their own family histories. After about 5 rein, Ana leans over Rosa’s paper, already three-quarters filled with writing in Spanish and English. Rosa has only been in the program for 1 month even though it is the middle of the school year. Norma describes her level of English as low intermediate. Ana, on the other hand, has high-intermediate English skills. Norma has carefully constructed students’ groups to make sure each contains students with different skill levels so that students can help each other in either English or their native languages. Her brow furrowed, Rosa consults with Ana, discussing both what is on the sheet and what still needs to be added. She speaks quickly and quietly in Spanish, an occasional word from the sheet in English breaking the flow.

At times, student assistance was less formal, amounting to an occasional helping hand when needed:

Books line the chalkboard and fill rotating racks in this reading classroom for secondary-level students. Inez, the reading teacher, has just completed writing a student-generated summary of the first half of a previously read story on the chalkboard. The students are now supposed to finish the summary and write the main idea. Five min into this segment of the lesson, Inez realizes that Quong has written nothing on his sheet of paper. Today is Quong’s fourth day in her class, and Inez suspects that although he has sufficient proficiency in English for him to work at the assignment, he may
not understand all of her directions. Inez asks Pen to explain the task in Vietnamese. By the end of the class Quong has been able to generate a few sentences in English in response to the task.

We witnessed extensive use of students' native languages at this site, no doubt both because of a policy that viewed native language use as a medium for aiding academic understanding and because of such rich linguistic resources as bilingual teachers and aides. The other sites we visited utilized students' native languages in different ways, reflecting different contexts and policies.

Site 2

Context. West of a large metropolitan sprawl, Site 2 was located in a suburban area, characterized in a school district brochure as a locale of well-kept homes, successful businesses, active churches, and excellent recreational facilities. The district served two distinct populations living within its boundaries: children from homes whose prices ranged from $150,000 to more than $300,000, their green lawns and landscaped gardens protected from view behind solid walls; and children from newly constructed apartments, many of their families recent immigrants from other countries. Among the approximately 25,000 students in the district, the ethnic breakdown was as follows: White, 50%; Hispanic, 32%; African American, 10%; Asian, 8%. Of the students, 16%, the majority of whom were Spanish speakers, were identified as LEP.

The English Language Development Program (ELDP) provided intensive English instruction for all LEP students in the district at a central location. Located on a tree-lined, two-lane road, the white, modern building and its parking lots took up nearly half the block. Glass doors opened onto a wide terrazzo-floored entryway. Large glass cabinets along the side walls displayed colorful exhibits representative of the diverse student populations at the center.

ELDP students came from the six junior high schools and four high schools in the district. They were bused to the center, where they spent half of their school day; the other half was spent at the home school, where they received instruction in advanced ESL and regular or sheltered content areas. At the center, instruction varied for students depending on their level of English proficiency. Less proficient students spent all three periods taking ESL classes. More proficient junior high students, intermediate level and up, took social studies as well as ESL. More proficient senior high students took math and reading in addition to ESL.
Policy. Although a few of the teachers were fluent in other languages, instruction at the center was conducted entirely in English. Teachers, in accordance with program policy, tried to use only English in the classrooms. One notable exception was a seminar on self-esteem for students, conducted in Spanish by the community liaison who worked at the ELDP and, when needed, as a resource at the 10 home campuses. The curriculum specialist explained there was a strong rule at the ELDP that teachers should use only English except during these self-esteem seminars.

Practice. Although policy dictated an English-only approach, teachers generally were more open to allowing students to use their native languages than the rule would suggest, varying in the degree to which they allowed and encouraged their use. One teacher, for example, felt that students “get enough of it [native language]” outside of class. In her class, after the first day only English was allowed. She believed that “they need to be bombarded with the language [i.e., English].” Another teacher felt native language had a place in instruction although her own skills in other languages were limited. She explained,

I don’t speak Spanish, which I really think is a detriment. I’d feel a lot more helpful to the students if I spoke Spanish. I don’t hesitate to use it if I can—looking up words, for example. I think people are wrong to worry about using the first language in class . . . . I’ve sent students to another teacher to ask what a word means in Spanish sometimes.

Not surprisingly, then, students were permitted to use their native language in her class to have access to content. Another teacher felt that native language “absolutely” had a place in her classroom although she went on to say that she wished students would “actively” try to practice using English more. Several teachers noted that students used their native language in class among themselves. One pointed out that she “would dignify their own language and culture” by not discouraging the use of native language because a lot of students learned from each other. Because they believed that it was important for students to achieve academically as they were acquiring English language skills, these teachers ascribed a value to students helping each other in their native language.

In addition to instructional uses of the native language that crept into classrooms at this site, we witnessed the native language used for social interaction. Although at their home campuses ELDP students might have been somewhat isolated, for more than 3 hours a day they were grouped with other LEP students, many of whom spoke the same native language. In their courses at the ELDP, students remained in the same group for all 3 hours of instruction. Thus, students formed
social networks at the ELDP with students speaking the same native language. The following vignette illustrates the social interaction use of native language.

The students can be heard long before they are seen entering the rather large classroom furnished with a cast-off sofa and overstuffed chairs as well as the regulation desks and tables of most secondary schools. Although the language of instruction is clearly English, the only language used by their teacher, these students chatter away in Spanish, Vietnamese, or Taiwanese during the down time between classroom activities. For example, Alma talks with her friends in Spanish, catching up with news from other campuses and exchanging comments about the amount of work they are expected to do in a short amount of time.

Given the limited linguistic resources among the teaching staff and the stated program policy, native language use was more limited at the ELDP than at Site 1. Yet as many teachers pointed out, they considered native language use appropriate classroom behavior for giving students access to course content. Although the ELDP offered fewer officially sanctioned uses of students’ native languages than Site 1, students’ languages were still heard in the halls and classrooms.

Site 3

Context. Twenty miles west of an urban center and just beyond its suburbs, Site 3 sat in a valley surrounded by green, low, rolling hills. Historically an agricultural area, it had become a study in contrasts as a result of recent growth in high-technology industry and in population (then 33,000). This site retained many of the features of a small town, including a town square and a preponderance of tree-lined streets of single-family houses. Agriculture remained a major activity in the surrounding area, with thousands of migrant workers moving in each summer to pick strawberries, grapes, and many other crops. On the outskirts of town, however, industrial parks and headquarters of high-technology companies provided a glimpse of the future.

The school district was small by most standards with two high schools, four junior high schools, and nine elementary schools. It was a largely White district; in the spring of 1990, the ethnic composition of the district was approximately 90% White, 6% Hispanic, 3% Asian, and 1% African American. Of the 5,477 students in the district, approximately 3% were LEP students. Most of these were of Mexican heritage, but some were from China, Cambodia, Laos, Vietnam, Korea, and Russia.

Located a few blocks from the center of town and surrounded by tree-lined streets and single-family houses, the junior high school build-
ing where Site 3’s program was located was clean, well cared for, and spacious inside, with wide hallways and high ceilings. The great majority of students at the school were White native English speakers; minority students did not constitute a strong presence. The program classes met in the health, science, and social studies teachers’ regular classrooms; this meant they were located in three different parts of the school. The only place where we saw large groups of minority students was in the ESL classroom, prominently located beside the main office of the school.

The program we visited, the Content-ESL Prep Program, consisted of health, science, and social studies classes for eighth- and ninth-grade LEP students with intermediate to advanced English language skills in two junior high schools. The classes were designed not to substitute for mainstream classes in these subject areas but to prepare students for such classes, which they would take when they entered high school. According to the program director, students learned the “mystique” of how content classes work as well as learning vocabulary and content. “What we’re about,” he explained, “is making the incomprehensible comprehensible.”

Although the primary objective of the program teachers was to prepare students to succeed in health, science, and social studies in high school, they did not teach content alone. English language development was integrated into content instruction. “Probably the most innovative part of the program,” according to the director, was the fact that the classes were taught by content teachers who had received special training to teach LEP students rather than by ESL teachers who were teaching content.

The Content-ESL Prep Program was only one of several types of courses and services provided for LEP students in the school district, and it should not be considered in isolation from the other programs. LEP students also had access to beginning, intermediate, and advanced ESL classes; Spanish for Spanish speakers; a study skills class; before-and after-school tutoring; assistance with nonacademic needs and concerns such as translations for themselves and their parents, transportation to events, and information about health services, all provided by the bilingual Home/School Consultant; and help from bilingual instructional aides in their ESL and regular classes as needed.

Policy. For several reasons, teachers in this program did not use students’ native languages for instruction. First, students in the program were not beginning ESL students. To be placed in the content classes, students had to be sufficiently proficient in English to be able to handle the academic content of the classes. Second, the content instructors who taught these classes were not fluent in the students’ languages.
One teacher reported no fluency in any language besides English whereas another teacher reported enough fluency in Spanish “to get by.”

**Practice.** Students’ native languages still had a place in the classrooms of this program even though the design of the program and teachers’ limited linguistic resources suggested an English-only learning environment. First, teachers were receptive to their students’ use of their native languages, particularly to serve instructional purposes. Students used English to answer and ask questions of the teacher but often used their native languages among themselves. In a science class we observed, for example, students worked quietly in pairs, searching for planaria under a microscope, adjusting the instrument’s focus and lighting. As they scanned their slides, the teacher directing and assisting in English, they consulted each other in Spanish until they had located the elusive worms. The native language was also used as a vehicle to establish rapport with students. One teacher described her use of Spanish in the classroom as “kind of fun . . . for camaraderie.” She added, smiling, that “students like to correct my grammar and pronunciation.” We observed her asking students about Spanish vocabulary and pronunciation.

Thus, whereas English was the primary language used between teachers and students in this SAIP, we heard Spanish in the classrooms as one student helped another figure out the meaning of a science term and as another student quickly asked to borrow a pencil for taking notes on first-aid techniques. Students felt comfortable using their native languages to work together or exchange social information, for teachers had created classroom environments in which students’ native languages had respected functions.

**Uses of the Native Language Across All Sites**

The three site descriptions illustrate the uses of native languages in classrooms by students and teachers, uses embedded within a variety of contextual factors such as available linguistic resources, teaching strategies, district demographics, and district policies. To gain a fuller understanding of the variation in the use of native languages in SAIP classrooms as well as a sense of the broad patterns, we organized each of the uses of the native language we observed across sites into three categories: use of the native language by students, use of the native language by teachers and/or instructional aides, and native language support in the larger school context.

As Table 1 shows, students’ native languages were employed in a variety of ways and for a variety of uses across all the sites in the
TABLE 1
Use of Native Languages by Students and Teachers Across Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of native language</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To assist one another</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To tutor other students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ask/answer questions</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To use bilingual dictionaries</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To write in native language</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To interact socially</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To check comprehension</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To translate a lesson</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To explain an activity</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide instruction</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To interact socially</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native language support in the larger school context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content instruction in native language</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction in native language culture, history, and/or language arts</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library books in native language</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication to parents in native language</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents encouraged to read to students in native language</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following examples illustrate this taxonomy, providing glimpses of how teachers shaped instruction as they incorporated many of these uses of native language into the classroom. In this first set, teachers devised a number of ways to draw on the linguistic resources of their students so that their talk could function as a means of supporting academic development:

- Teachers set up situations or activities specifically calling for students to use their native languages with each other. For example, one teacher devised a group writing assignment using the native language. At another site, students read or told stories from their own countries to each other in their native languages and then translated them into English to tell to other students.

Note: We do not have data that allow us to quantify or rank these ways of using the native language. They were simply recorded as being used on at least one occasion at the site.
Less fluent or experienced students were paired with more fluent or experienced students of the same language background during classroom instruction and activities so that the more fluent student could help the less fluent one with language, to understand instructions, or with other classroom demands.

Teachers encouraged students to use bilingual dictionaries when they did not understand something in English and there was no one who could translate for them.

Students were encouraged to get help at home in their native language from family members. For example, at one site a teacher, knowing that a student’s father was more proficient in English than the student, instructed her student to ask her father to explain the social studies assignment to her in the student’s native language.

When they were fluent in students’ native languages, many teachers and instructional aides used their ability to help the students whose language they shared. The next set of examples illustrate how these teachers used students’ native languages:

- Teachers gave instructions in students’ native languages to make sure all students knew what they were supposed to be doing. To ensure that students had access to academic content, they clarified ideas and concepts originally presented in English and checked students’ comprehension.

- Teachers or instructional aides formed small groups of students to provide instruction in the native language. At one site, after the teacher introduced a social studies lesson dealing with Spanish explorers coming to the New World, an instructional aide relocated to another part of the classroom with a small group of LEP students to teach the rest of the lesson in Armenian.

- Teachers engaged in social talk with their students before and after class as well as during class when appropriate.

Students’ native languages were also incorporated into the structure of the programs serving them, sometimes into the curriculum, at other times into extracurricular activities and events supporting instruction.

- To keep students at academic grade level, teachers and/or aides provided instruction in the native language in language arts, mathematics, and/or content areas. At one site, all students received social studies instruction daily in their primary language. At another site, a Cambodian teacher and a teacher from the science department cotaught an ESL laboratory science course.

- To provide students with knowledge of the native language and culture, programs offered instruction in native language content.
and/or language arts that reflected students’ cultural diversity. At one site, Khmer speakers were offered three courses in Khmer: History of Cambodia, Literature of Cambodia, and Khmer Reading and Writing. At the same site, Spanish speakers were offered two courses in Spanish: Spanish Language and Culture, and History of Spanish-Speaking Peoples.

- Books in students’ native languages were provided and students were encouraged to read them.
- Communications to parents were written in or translated into their native languages, and students’ parents were encouraged to read to them in their native languages.
- Awards were given for excellence in languages that are not commonly studied (e.g., a senior award in Khmer language skill).

The amount of time English and other languages were used varied across teachers and students and across grade levels, as illustrated by the data from the IEP presented in Table 2. Teachers spoke only English 90% of the time they were observed whereas students spoke only English 58% of the time they were observed. As for language use across grade levels, teachers used only English in greater proportions in the higher grades whereas students used only English in greater proportions in the lower grades.

Three features of the organization of instruction (student grouping, length of student responses, and number of steps for task completion) help to explain how teachers managed to provide rigorous instruction while they and their students were often speaking different languages. The following shows the percentage of time students were observed in different classroom groupings:

- as a whole class: 40%
- in small groups: 28%
- as individuals: 32%

**TABLE 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade level</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary school</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle school</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All grades</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Based on IEP observations conducted at 2-min intervals for a class period or its equivalent.
Thus, for 60% of the time we observed, students worked either by themselves or in a small group, giving them opportunities to use their native languages in the classroom. Group work was a key teaching strategy used across sites by the teachers we observed. When they were part of a group, students were required to collaborate with one, another to complete tasks. At these times, as the vignettes suggest, students were more likely to be using their native languages, particularly in the higher grades, as they negotiated meaning, solved problems, or created texts. Whether they were working as a small group, as a whole class, or alone, tasks demanded responses consisting of more than a single word or phrase and requiring multiple steps, as Table 3 shows. Given the range of uses of native languages and many teachers’ encouragement of the use of a common native language to complete tasks, it is not surprising to find task structures that permit this kind of interaction. Students were engaged for the majority of classroom time in complex tasks that encouraged the use of language—both English and their native languages—to develop their academic competence.

**TABLE 3**

Features of Student Tasks, by Time Observed (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Time observed (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of written or oral response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No words</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few words</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many words</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of steps for completion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One step</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many steps</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONCLUSION**

These brief portraits of exemplary programs in which English is the primary language of instruction illustrate a range of uses of students’ native languages. Our results show that alternatives to bilingual education need not be English-only programs. There is no reason to assume that programs for students who speak many languages must use only English in ESL classes and content classes. We observed the use of students’ native languages in English language development classes (e.g., through journal writing and oral interactions) and in content classes. Indeed, Auerbach (1993) argues that teachers should incorporate students’ native languages into ESL classes in ways that help stu-
dent students develop English abilities and consider the implications of and motivations for not doing so.

In the situations we observed, students, teachers, and instructional aides used English and languages other than English for a variety of purposes, depending on various features of the contexts within which the programs and individual classes operated. Some of these programs (e.g., Site 1) might more appropriately be called partial bilingual programs (Dolson & Mayer, 1992) in that they use students’ native languages as much as resources allow. Indeed, our findings suggest that the use of the native language is so compelling that it emerges even when policies and assumptions mitigate against it.

Research indicates that it is most appropriate for teachers to speak the languages of their students, but our findings show that monolingual English speakers or teachers who do not speak the languages of all of their students can incorporate students’ native languages into instruction in many ways to serve a variety of educationally desirable functions. For example, teachers can have students work in groups or pairs of students with the same native language. They can utilize LM students as linguistic resources for the class or involve LM community members in classroom activities. These creative ways of tapping native language resources are important given the shortage of bilingual teachers. They allow teachers to draw on a variety of linguistic resources for ensuring that students master academic content as well as develop English proficiency.

Because the study did not compare SAIPs to any other type of program, we cannot address the question of whether SAIPs are as effective for language and content learning as programs in which students’ native languages are an integral part of instruction. As we discussed in the introduction, other research indicates that native language development and instruction constitute the best approach to teaching LEP students. These findings should not, therefore, be interpreted as giving policy makers free reign to abolish or discount bilingual programs. On the contrary, they should lend support to the necessity of including students’ native languages in programs for students learning English. In contexts in which it is impossible to provide bilingual classes and programs, educators can establish policies and institute practices that incorporate a variety of uses of students’ native languages even when teachers use primarily or exclusively English. In contexts in which it is possible to provide bilingual instruction to some or to all students, educators should do just that.

We believe these findings suggest a need to reconceptualize programs for LM students. It would be productive to focus less attention on language and more attention on “more fundamental questions” (Pease-Alvarez & Hakuta, 1992, p. 4) about “academic development
[and] broader social and instructional dynamics” (Moll, 1992, p. 20). If that is to be accomplished, the perception that bilingual programs and other types of programs for LEP students are diametrically opposed to one another must change.

The SAIPs we have described show that language choice in and of itself does not have to be the key educational issue. The question should be: What circumstances and strategies will provide the best opportunities for particular students to learn in a particular context? When students are not proficient in English, educators must consider those students’ native languages as a key resource for teaching both content and English. Beyond that, when students see that their languages are valued for their communicative power and when they have the opportunity to develop their native language abilities, their self-esteem and identity are strengthened. The decisions about when, how, and how much to incorporate students’ native languages into schooling, however, must be made within particular contexts, taking into account such factors as the language abilities of educators and students, the number and variety of languages represented in districts, schools, and classes, and the community resources available.

If educators and educational policy makers take up the challenge of educating LEP students in good faith, giving serious and informed consideration to all strategies and resources that can contribute to meaningful educational experiences, perhaps they can move beyond the emotional and politically heated debate that opposes English-only instruction to native language instruction. Multilingual programs like the exemplary SAIPs, which foster communication and interaction, provide one set of examples of partial bilingual programs that can meet students’ and educators’ needs in some contexts when designed and implemented thoughtfully.
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An innovative intensive ESL program in Quebec is the focus of this article. As a background to the presentation of research carried out within this program, the context and conditions of ESL teaching in Quebec’s French-language schools are briefly described. In these schools, where all subject matter instruction is normally provided in French, the program gives some students in Grade 5 or Grade 6 access to intensive instruction in ESL. For 5 months of 1 school year, the students spend virtually full school days engaged in English language activities. They do not receive subject matter instruction through English but participate in communicative activities and projects whose goal is to develop their ability to understand and speak English. This article reports on the findings of some research in these intensive ESL classes: descriptive studies of patterns of classroom interaction and instruction, the development of fluency and accuracy in learner language, and the long-term effects of the program. In addition, experimental studies have explored the effects of introducing some greater focus on form within or in addition to the communicative activities typical of most of the classes.

The teaching of ESL in Quebec takes place in a social and political context that is probably unique. On the one hand, English might appear to be the majority language as it is the language of work and education of more than 20 million of Canada’s 27 million people. However, French is the principal or only language used in the daily lives of some 80% of the 6 million residents of Quebec. Because most of Quebec’s English speakers live in or near the city of Montreal, the majority of Quebec schoolchildren study English at school, virtually as a foreign language, in the sense that it is not a language frequently encountered in the community. Because of social and residential patterns, even children in Montreal may have very limited contact with
speakers of English. To be sure, English is available on television almost everywhere in the province, but most francophones prefer to watch French language broadcasts. Thus young people may have considerable exposure to “American” culture through U.S. television programs, but not to the English language, as they tend to watch these programs in French-dubbed versions (Normand, 1992).

The political context of ESL teaching is also unusual. Many people outside Canada are aware that the federal government of Canada has a policy of official bilingualism, promising federal government services in both French and English. However, since the mid-1970s, the only official language of Quebec has been French. English-speaking Quebeckers still have access to many provincial government services in English, and in some schools, hospitals, universities, and other public and private institutions English is the principal language. Nevertheless, much has changed in Quebec since the enactment of the legislation making French the only official language. This legislation (called the Charter of the French Language) specifies, among other things, that nearly all students in Quebec’s primary and secondary schools will receive their education in French, regardless of their mother tongue. The exceptions include (a) children whose parents had their early education in English in Quebec or another Canadian province and (b) children of immigrants who had their education in English in another country and who were resident in Quebec when the legislation was passed.

In this context, English is simply one subject among others to be taught in the regular school program. It has no special status. And French-speaking parents who might once have chosen to send their children to an English language school for a few years to improve their English may no longer find it possible. Nor has it been permitted, in the French language schools, to use English as a medium of instruction for other subject matter, on the models of “content-based instruction” or “immersion” (see Brinton, Snow, & Wesche, 1989). Thus, for most students, the only opportunity to learn English is in the ESL classes offered in their French language schools.

Typically, and in conformity with the curriculum set by the Ministry of Education of Quebec (MEQ), the ESL programs in the French language schools begin at Grade 4 (when students are about 9 years old). In Grades 4, 5, and 6, students are expected to have 120 min per week of ESL instruction; in the 5 years of secondary school, 150 min per week. Until recently, these expected time periods were not widely respected, and many school boards chose, for various reasons, to offer less ESL instruction. Even where the recommended instruction is given, the total number of hours for the 8-year period is just over 700, which may seem to be a very small amount if anything approximating functional bilingualism is the goal. Compare, for example, the several
thousand hours of French that a child in French immersion will have been exposed to over a comparable period.

Although the MEQ sets curriculum content and some aspects of pedagogical practice for primary and secondary schools, local school boards may, for a period of time, offer innovative or experimental programs that differ from the standard programs mandated by the MEQ. One innovation for ESL that emerged in 1976 and has grown rapidly since about 1985 is the model of intensive English, or, as it was called in one of the first experimental programs, the *bain linguistique* (literally, language bath) (Billy, 1980). For a number of years, these classes were offered in only 2 school boards, but that number has now grown to more than 30 boards (Lightbown, Conan, Bolduc, & Guay, 1988; Watts & Snow, 1993). Over the years several variations on this model have been developed, but in the typical program students in either Grade 5 or Grade 6 study only English for 5 months of 1 school year. During the other 5 months of that school year, they complete the requirements for the other subject matter appropriate to their grade level (in French), with the emphasis on the language arts and mathematics programs.

Within Quebec’s political context, with its strong public concern for the protection and preservation of French, there has sometimes been strong opposition to the intensive programs. Some individuals and groups argue that early intensive exposure to and instruction in English pose a threat to the continued development of francophone children’s L1 (see Lightbown, 1992, for one response to this position). However, parents of school-aged children are increasingly concerned that the very limited time available for ESL in the regular programs will not lead to levels of English proficiency that will enable students to make the range of postsecondary education and career choices their parents wish them to have, and there is considerable support for programs that will lead to greater proficiency in English as long as they do not interfere with the children’s development of French language proficiency. Many parents and educators see the intensive ESL courses as such a program.

In school boards offering the intensive ESL courses, there are typically more students wishing to participate than spaces available. In some boards students are selected on the basis of relatively strong academic performance in the years preceding the year of intensive English, but not all school boards limit access in this way. Most boards exclude students who have already developed an advanced knowledge of English (students from English-speaking families or those who have become bilingual while living in English language environments), and many exclude students with serious learning disabilities or behaviour problems. Even when restrictions are placed on access, however, most
boards must resort to drawing lots among students who are considered qualified and whose parents have given their permission and support for their children’s participation in an intensive ESL class.

Because this program is innovative or experimental, begun on the basis of local initiatives, no ready-made MEQ curriculum nor materials were readily available for them. When local boards undertake experimental programs, the MEQ requires only that they achieve the objectives of the regular programs they supplement or replace. This arrangement leaves a degree of flexibility in the implementation of the courses locally. The school boards that set up the first classes depended on the teachers and curriculum advisers to plan the courses and create the materials for them. The resulting courses were, for the most part, expansions of the MEQ programs developed for the regular 120-min-per-week courses. As such, they emphasized meaning-based activities, pair and group work, oral fluency and comprehension, and communication strategies. Form-based activities and error correction were specifically discouraged in some cases and simply not mentioned in others. As in the regular programs, the main goal was to give students a positive experience in the language and to help them develop confidence in their ability to cope with the language if they encountered it outside the school setting. Thus the themes or topics that formed the content of the activities were drawn from an analysis of the interests of students in their age group, for example, family, friends, pets, life at school, music, and food.

RESEARCH PROGRAM

In 1984, one of us was invited by a school board that had been offering intensive English since 1976 to carry out a study of the achievement of students in their classes. The request was not for a formal program evaluation but rather for some assistance in assessing and interpreting the learning that was taking place. This invitation led to some preliminary observations and student interviews and eventually to a large-scale research project that, over the years, has involved more than 50 classes of more than 1,500 students and their teachers. The research team, with the authors as principal investigators and with the involvement of a large number of students and colleagues, has observed classroom activities extensively, assessed students’ developing knowledge of English formally and informally, circulated questionnaires probing students’ contact with English and their interest in learning it, and devised experimental interventions aimed at investigat-
ing the role of certain types of instruction in some specific aspects of students’ English performance.

**Classroom Observation**

A modified version of the COLT (Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching) Observation Scheme (Allen, Fröhlich, & Spada, 1984; Fröhlich, Spada, & Allen, 1985) was used to describe the instruction in the intensive courses. This scheme measures such features as the extent to which classes are teacher centred or learner centred, the amount of instructional time given to a focus on form or meaning, the amount of time spent on skill areas (listening, speaking, reading, writing), opportunities for students to produce extended speech, and the extent to which teachers ask genuine versus pseudo questions. Some of the COLT observations are carried out by observers during the classroom activities; others are based on tapes or transcriptions of classroom activities. (See Spada & Fröhlich, in press, for more details about the use of this observation instrument.)

Descriptions of the intensive classes were derived from the COLT observations. The classes observed in this part of the research were characterized by instruction based on the approach mandated by the MEQ for ESL at the primary level: The emphasis was on oral/aural skills, and most teachers devoted very little attention to reading and writing. Instruction typically focused on meaning-based activities combining listening and speaking and a variety of both teacher- and student-centred activities. Very little time was devoted to grammar or accuracy. When teachers did focus on features of the language being learned, it was most often in response to a student’s query or to an error common to many students that interfered with comprehension. The feature selected for correction was more often vocabulary than anything else, and all corrections or other form-focused activities tended to be contextualized within a communicative activity. (See Lightbown & Spada, 1990, and Spada, 1990a, 1990b, for more detailed descriptions.)

In a study of the materials used in teaching the intensive ESL classes in some schools, Weary (1987) observed that although the materials were stimulating and entertaining, they did not appear to be very challenging intellectually or academically. Indeed, the students themselves in a self-report questionnaire rated several regular classroom activities (7 of 15) as higher in enjoyment value than in learning value.

---

1 A complete project bibliography is available from the authors. The bibliography includes publications, research reports, and student theses and monographs.
Furthermore, both teacher-centred and group-work activities were overwhelmingly based on oral interaction and made little use of written material. This appeared to be due in part to the fact that the materials and procedures were essentially expanded versions of the materials intended for the regular classes that meet for short periods of time a few times a week. It also reflected the prohibition on teaching the curriculum content of the students’ current grade level in any language other than French. The resulting materials, in any case, tended to focus on topics such as food, music, pets, and family rather than topics from social studies or science areas, for example. However, in recent observations we have seen that some of the programs developed in recent years have moved toward more challenging material and have also introduced a far greater emphasis on reading and writing.

**Learner Language**

We investigated the learner language using a variety of comprehension and production measures and compared it with that of learners in the regular ESL program. As a pretest, we administered a simple listening comprehension test. At the time of the pretest, both groups had had minimal instruction in ESL. At most they had had the 120 min per week in Grade 4 or, in the case of students in Grade 6, 120 min per week in Grades 4 and 5. This test confirmed that no significant differences existed between the ESL proficiency of students who entered intensive courses and that of those who continued in the regular programs. The same listening comprehension test as well as one with both listening and reading comprehension components was administered in class at the end of the instructional period.

Learners’ oral production abilities were also measured at the end of the period of ESL instruction. The elicitation task is one we have used with hundreds of francophone learners of ESL in Quebec over the years and is referred to as the Picture Card Game. In a modified “screen” task, each student describes a series of pictures so that the interlocutor (who cannot see the student’s picture) can guess which of four similar (but not identical) pictures the student is describing (Lightbown & Spada, 1978, 1990).

Although no significant differences existed in the listening comprehension abilities of the intensive and regular program learners on
the pretest, the intensive program learners significantly outperformed their peers in the regular ESL program at the same grade level on all posttests. This result was not surprising as the intensive program learners received considerably more hours of instruction. A more interesting result was that, on the listening and reading comprehension test, the Grade 5 and 6 students from the intensive classes also outperformed a group of Grade 9 regular ESL program learners who had received approximately the same amount of instruction but over a longer period of time. Furthermore, performance on the Picture Card Game showed the intensive program learners to be considerably more fluent and more confident speakers of English even though their language, like that of the regular program learners, was by no means free of grammatical errors (Spada & Lightbown, 1989).

**Contact With English and Attitudes Toward English**

Students in both regular and intensive ESL had very limited contact with English at the beginning of Grade 5 or 6. The attitudes students held toward English, however, were different at the outset. The intensive program learners were more favorably disposed toward English than those in the regular program. It is impossible to know where the cause and effect of this finding lie. Students with more favorable attitudes may have chosen intensive English because of those positive attitudes. On the other hand, their attitudes may have become more positive once they knew, some months before beginning their intensive English course, that they had been chosen for the program.

Following the period of ESL instruction in Grades 5 and 6, both groups of learners reported more contact with English than they had had at the beginning. However, only the intensive program learners’ contact had increased significantly, mostly as a result of watching more television in English. In addition, the intensive program learners’ post-instruction attitudes toward English remained significantly more favorable than those of students in the regular program.

**Long-Term Effects**

Although the overall findings of the observational research were encouraging, a number of areas required further investigation: One important question was whether learners would be able to maintain the benefits of their intensive experience and continue to learn on their own or whether these gains would disappear as the learners were reintegrated into regular ESL programs. The experience of previous experimental programs might have led to the expectation that the gains evident at the end of primary school would have disappeared
by the end of secondary school (see, for example, Burstall, Jamieson, Cohen, & Hargreaves, 1974).

A study on the long-term effects of the program was carried out with 60 Grade 11 students. Half had taken an intensive course when they were in Grade 5 or 6. Following that course, they had been reintegrated into regular ESL courses, usually with no special program or activities appropriate to their level. Some postintensive students had done an accelerated course that had permitted them to complete the requirements for 5 years of secondary ESL in the first 3 years. The comparison group was composed of students who had received ESL instruction in the regular program throughout their primary and secondary schooling (i.e., 60–120 min per week in Grades 4, 5, and 6 and a maximum of 150 min per week in Grades 7–11).

We asked students to complete a questionnaire designed to investigate the amount of contact they had with English both inside and outside school and their attitudes toward learning English and their English language instruction. We examined the students’ oral performance in an interview and on two communicative tasks. The interview consisted of a series of predetermined questions designed to encourage students to elaborate on information they had provided in the questionnaire. The first communicative task was the Picture Card Game (described above), and the second was one in which the students asked the interviewer a series of questions about herself.

The analysis of the questionnaire data revealed that students who had received intensive ESL instruction in primary school had significantly more contact with English outside the classroom than students who had followed the regular program. Although none of the students lived in English-dominant or bilingual environments, they were more likely to have English-speaking friends and part-time jobs in which they used English and to watch English language television programs or films more often. Both the regular-program students and the postintensive students expressed dissatisfaction with the level of English they had achieved. The two groups differed, however, in their explanation for not having achieved levels of English they had aspired to. The postintensive program learners were inclined to assume responsibility for their weaknesses in English (e.g., “I didn’t practice the time I’d like to”), whereas the regular-program learners tended to see their shortcomings as the fault of the school (e.g., “They don’t teach English very well in secondary”).

An analysis of the language produced in the interview showed that the postintensive subjects produced more extended turns (longer uninterrupted speech segments) in their conversations with the interviewer as well as more lexical verbs than did regular-program students. They were also more accurate in their use of particular verb forms (e.g.,...
simple past, present, and third person singular) than students who had received their instruction in the regular programs.

Similarly, in the Picture Card Game the postintensive learners produced more words to describe each picture than the regular-program learners, and their accuracy in the use of several grammatical forms (e.g., progressive -ing, genitive pronouns, plural -s) was also higher.

On the second communicative task, the two groups of learners asked the same number of questions. There were, however, differences in the developmental level and the grammatical accuracy of the questions. The postintensive learners tended to be more accurate in their use of yes/no questions and significantly more accurate in their production of wh- questions. Overall, the findings from this study of the long-term effectiveness suggested that students who had experienced the intensive ESL program in Grade 5 or 6 continued to develop their English language proficiency in ways that permitted them to maintain their superiority, in both fluency and accuracy, over learners whose instruction in English was limited to the regular program. These students also sought out more opportunities for contact with English. Apparently this was both a result of and a continuing cause of their greater proficiency in English (see Lightbown & Spada, 1989, 1991, for details of the study).

As positive as the findings are, it is important to acknowledge that we do not know how much better they might have been if the secondary schools had been ready to offer postintensive students a program suited to their more advanced knowledge and performance in English. Furthermore, because this was not a longitudinal study, we cannot know how these two groups of learners might have compared to each other before either had an opportunity to participate in an intensive ESL course. Although evidence from the questionnaire and interview data suggested that they were essentially similar in most respects, it is certainly possible that the students already differed from each other in terms of knowledge of English, motivation to learn, overall academic ability, and so forth. It should be borne in mind, however, that all students who participated in the follow-up study were volunteers. That is, students were free to participate or to refuse to participate in the data-gathering activities of this project. Many students did refuse, and it seems reasonable to infer that both students from the regular program and those from the intensive program who agreed to participate in the study had fairly positive attitudes toward learning English and felt more confident in their ability to meet the challenges of the proposed research tasks than those who refused. Furthermore, a number of regular program students said in the course of the interview that they had sought to join an intensive class in Grade 5 or 6 but had missed out on the opportunity because their names simply had not
been drawn in the final lottery. This finding seems to support the hypothesis that differences between the groups are largely attributable to their participation (or lack of it) in the intensive programs.

Although the students in the postintensive group may in some ways have been different from the typical Quebec student, the students from the regular programs who chose to participate in this study may also have been different. Both groups of students expressed strong motivation to learn English and sought opportunities to do so. The difference between the groups may be that the period of intensive instruction prepared students to take better advantage of those opportunities when they encountered them. In fact, when we looked at the subjects in terms of the amount of contact they had with English, it became clear that continued or sustained contact with English was the best predictor of performance on the measures of English ability. The fact was that a larger number of the students who had had the intensive class experience reported such sustained contact.

**Focus on Form**

As indicated above, our observations of the intensive program classes revealed that overall the instruction focused on meaning-based activities, and teachers gave little attention to grammar or accuracy. Our observations also indicated, however, that some teachers responded to learners’ errors more often than others and that, in some cases, this response appeared to be related to the achievement of higher levels of accuracy. For example, learners in one particular intensive program class were found to correctly use the verb *be* rather than the verb *have* in their introducer forms when describing pictures in the Picture Card Game (e.g., “There *is* a classroom” or “There *are* two boy and one girl” rather than “We *have* a classroom” or “*Have* two boy and a girl”).

This usage was unusual because the overwhelming majority of intensive program learners used the verb *have* on this task and in other speech. Although the observation data revealed that these learners were from a class in which the teacher had spent a greater amount of time on form-focused instruction than the others, the data did not indicate that introducer forms were given any particular attention. Because we did not observe the classes every day, we may have missed something. Indeed, when we questioned the teacher, she reported having reacted quite strongly to this particular error and was pleased that her corrections had benefited the students (Lightbown, 1991).

Because our observation data showed this teacher to be one of the most form-focused instructors,4 we were interested in knowing

---

4It is important to emphasize that, although this teacher spent more time on form focus than most other teachers, the focus in this class was on meaning, not form, for more than
whether the learners in her class were more accurate in their use of other linguistic forms. To investigate this, we compared the learners’ use of four additional features (plural -s, progressive -ing, adjective/noun placement, and possessive determiners) with that of learners in three other classes in which the instruction was characterized as less form focused.

The analysis showed that learners in the class that had received the most form-focused instruction were more accurate (and more developmentally advanced) in their use of some (but not all) of the forms investigated. Furthermore, even though accuracy was relatively low on most inflectional morphology, a greater number of students had at least begun to use the forms occasionally. A more detailed analysis of the classroom observation data indicated that some teachers who paid little attention to form in general nevertheless emphasized a particular set of linguistic features and had greater expectations for their correct use. Such an emphasis was effective in some cases but less effective in others. The overall findings of this study led to the hypothesis that form-focused instruction and corrective feedback might be effective for some linguistic features, particularly if provided within a communicative context. (See Lightbown & Spada, 1990, for details).

**Experimental Studies**

We have investigated the hypothesis arising from the observational studies in a series of experimental studies. Some have examined the effects of form-focused instruction and corrective feedback on adverb placement; question formation was the feature selected for investigation in others. In the initial experimental studies, learners in the experi-

70% of the observed class time. Furthermore, the form focus was usually combined with a meaning focus. The *behave* example is a case in point. Although students were being corrected for a formal error, the correction was based on the teacher’s pretending not to understand when someone said, “You have a book” when what was intended was “There’s a book.”

This finding is worthy of note in light of the position taken by a number of second language acquisition researchers that it is at least as important to identify the point at which features emerge in learner language as it is to identify the point at which high levels of accuracy are reached. This is based on the principle that acquisition may be said to have occurred once learners are able to incorporate the feature in their speech even if they do not use it in all required contexts. Emergence would be taken as evidence that the learner has the processing capacity to use the feature; the level of accuracy of its use may reflect the learner’s interest in conforming to the target speech community, the amount of practice the learner has had with the feature, or some other phenomenon of attention or speech style (Pienemann, 1985).

A recent study by members of our research group gives evidence that students in these mostly meaning-based instructional environments seem to reach a plateau in the formal accuracy of their language use while their communicative effectiveness continues to grow (Turner & Upshur, 1993).
mental group were given focused instruction on the target feature, and their performance was compared with a group of learners who received no instruction on the target form. The research design included pretesting learners before they received their instruction and posttesting learners immediately following instruction, 4 or 5 weeks later, and again 6 months to a year later.

Over a 2-week period the experimental classes received instruction in the target form for approximately 1 hour a day. A variety of activities and tasks focused the learners’ attention on the target structure, and teachers were asked to correct student errors. The research team developed the instructional materials in consultation with several intensive program teachers. The comparison classes were given a set of instructional materials consisting of a similar set of activities and tasks so that they would be equally familiar with the activity and task types used in the testing procedures. The difference was that the activities and tasks for the comparison classes did not include any instruction or correction of the target forms. To provide us with a record of whether the instructional materials were implemented consistently across the classes, the teachers audiorecorded the classes while teaching the experimental materials. Outside the 2-week period of instruction, the intensive teachers continued with their regular program although, having been alerted to the structures in question, they may have continued to give some corrective feedback.

To measure the learners’ knowledge, use, and development of the target structures, both written and oral tasks were administered. Learners who had received instruction and corrective feedback on adverb placement and question formation improved far more on these forms than the comparison groups who had received no form-focused instruction or who had received instruction on other features of language. This was true for both immediate posttests and those administered several weeks later. There were, however, differences in the long-term effects on the learners’ use of these forms. Learners who had received instruction in question formation maintained their gains and, in fact, continued to improve in their use of questions, but the positive effects of instruction on adverb placement seemed to disappear. One interpretation is the difference in the amount of exposure to questions and adverbs that students may be assumed to have had outside the experimental period. Classroom observations indicated that adverbs occurred very infrequently in intensive classes, except when the experimental materials were being used (Trahey, 1992). In contrast, questions had a very high frequency in the teachers’ speech in virtually every classroom activity we observed. Thus, students continued to hear and use question forms even though they had been the focus of instruction for only a few hours. Although there maybe other
explanations for the difference between students’ long-term retention of the improvements in adverb placement and question formation, we hypothesize that, had learners continued to receive exposure to and occasional reminders of the restrictions on adverb placement, their gains on this structure might have been maintained as well (Spada & Lightbown, 1993; White, 1991; White, Spada, Lightbown, & Ranta, 1991).

A further experimental study was developed to follow up some of the findings on adverb placement. In light of the observation that adverbs were rare in the classroom input, we could not rule out the possibility that the original improvement on the experimental students’ performance was due not to instruction and correction but simply to the greater exposure. In a second study students engaged in a variety of activities in which they simply read or heard many adverbs. The adverbs were inserted in sentences in all the possible correct places in a large number of stories, poems, games, and other media (Trahey, 1992). Although teachers did provide some instruction on the meaning of the adverbs, they did not focus on or correct the placement of adverbs in sentences. The results showed that although students exposed to this “input flood” began to use sentences that placed the adverb between the subject and the verb (“The dog often chases birds”), they continued to accept sentences in which the adverb appeared between the verb and object (“The dog chases often birds”) (Trahey & White, 1993). This finding confirmed the hypothesis (White, 1987, 1991) that, although some features of language may be learned through simple exposure to the language (in what Krashen, 1985, terms comprehensible input), other features, especially those that are congruent with the learner’s previously learned language(s), may require corrective feedback to be eliminated from the learner’s interlanguage. Future studies will continue this line of research.

CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The innovative intensive ESL program in which we carried out the classroom-centred research summarized here has been a great success. Between 1976 and 1993, nearly 22,000 students had the opportunity to spend 5 months of 1 school year working on English (Watts & Snow, 1993). The growth of the program’s popularity since 1984 has been dramatic. More than 30 school boards have responded to the increasing demands for such programs. A valuable secondary development has been the establishment of a dynamic group of dedicated and active teachers who support each other professionally, share materials, and offer information to teachers and school boards that are planning and
implementing new intensive classes. More and more school boards are seeking to respond as well to the need to provide appropriate follow-up ESL programs to students at the secondary school. Such programs will benefit not only students who have completed intensive ESL programs but also students who have developed advanced ability in English at home or in contact with English in other environments.

In light of this level of activity and involvement on the part of local school boards, teachers, and parents, it is encouraging that a policy statement from the MEQ has recently proposed further support for this model of instruction. On the one hand, this development is very positive, offering the possibility that the intensive classes will be less vulnerable to local political struggles in which the opposition of some parents and teachers has led to limitations on the number of classes or, in some cases, to the discontinuation of the program for some schools. On the other hand, it is essential not to lose sight of the fact that intensive ESL has been a voluntary program, one that both students and teachers chose to participate in and that parents asked for and supported. Some of its success has no doubt come from this voluntary nature and from the sense of a need for mutual support that has grown from it. As the program becomes more widespread, it is hoped that the enthusiasm can be retained.

Our research has confirmed that the opportunity to spend a period concentrating on English is more effective than an equivalent amount of time spent in what Stern (1985) terms *drip-feed* programs. Nevertheless, our research has also shown that an exclusive focus on meaning-based activities, to the exclusion of form-focused activities, may set a limit on the success of the programs, which could be passed if there were a better balance of attention to form and meaning.

In the same recent policy statement in support of intensive ESL, the MEQ has proposed that French language schools now consider teaching subject matter (e.g., mathematics, social studies) through the medium of English, along the lines that have become well known in French immersion programs (Genesee, 1987; Lambert & Tucker, 1972). The proposal limits the amount of time francophone students could spend in such subject matter instruction to a total of 225 hours in the primary school (Grades 4, 5, and 6) and 450 hours in secondary school (Grades 7–11). Such an approach might have the advantage of introducing an element of intellectual challenge that we found lacking in some of the materials used in the intensive programs. However, evidence from French immersion research suggests that such an intellectual challenge will not necessarily lead to improvement in the students’ accuracy in using their L2. As Swain (1988) has argued, subject matter teaching is not always good language teaching. There is evidence that not all language features can be acquired when learners’
attention is focused exclusively on meaning. At times a focus on form appears to be necessary. The challenge in intensive and content-based L2 classes is to find the right balance.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Funding for the research reported in this article has come from the Fonds pour la Formation de Chercheurs et l’Aide à la Recherche, Ministère de l’Éducation du Québec (Direction générale du développement des programmes) through the Société pour l’enseignement de l’anglais, langue seconde, au Québec, and the Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada. Some of the experimental studies were carried out with our colleague Lydia White as principal investigator. Research assistants and associates who have contributed immeasurably to the work include Leila Ranta and Randall Halter, who have been involved for many years, and Martha Trahey, whose contributions to the experimental studies were particularly important. We thank the many other students and colleagues who participated in the studies and the students, teachers, principals, and curriculum advisers who welcomed us into their schools and, by their enthusiasm, made the data-gathering activities enjoyable.

THE AUTHORS

Patsy M. Lightbown is Professor of Applied Linguistics in the TESL Centre, Concordia University, Montreal. Her research focus is second language acquisition in the classroom. With Nina Spada, she is coauthor of How Languages Are Learned (Oxford University Press, 1993).

Nina Spada is Associate Professor in the Department of Education in Second Languages, McGill University, Montreal. In her research she has emphasized the importance of detailed observation and description of classroom interaction in studies of classroom L2 learning.

REFERENCES


NEW IN ESL
FROM ST. MARTIN'S PRESS

MAKING PEACE:
A Reading/Writing/Thinking Text on Global Community
ELAINE BROOKS and LEN FOX, Brooklyn College, City University of New York
Combines readings—on resolving conflict and creating a more peaceful world—with pedagogy to help students integrate development of both English-language and analytical and critical thinking skills. A text at the forefront in providing content-based language instruction that deals with issues of global community, multiculturalism, and other peace education topics
Just Published!
Instructor's Edition available

CHOICES
Writing Projects for Students of ESL
CAROLE TURKENIK, New York University
Thematically organized process approach to essay writing at the intermediate level. Stresses involving students directly in their own learning. Features five writing projects on topics of interest to international college-level students. Includes an editing section.
Just Published!
Instructor's Edition available

THE INNER WORLD OF THE IMMIGRANT CHILD
CRISTINA IGOA, Hayward (CA) Unified School District and College of Notre Dame, Belmont
Tells the story of one teacher's work with immigrant children. Portrays the immigrant experience of uprooting, culture shock, and adjustment to a new world. Describes cultural, academic, and psychological interventions that facilitate learning as immigrant students make the transition to a new language and culture. Engages readers in observation, reflection, and inquiry, and applications to practice. Includes the voices and artwork of many immigrant children.

St. Martin's Press • College Division
175 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY 10010
1-800-446-8923
Fax: (212) 780-0115
Expanding Middle School Horizons: Integrating Language, Culture, and Social Studies
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This article reports on findings from the first phase of an ongoing research project that is investigating English language learners in middle school social studies classrooms. This phase examined the academic language of American history classes and implemented a series of lessons designed to integrate language and content objectives with the development of critical-thinking skills and information about the cultural diversity of colonial America. The article analyzes features of social studies academic language from text and classroom discourse and reviews cultural diversity as it is represented in popular textbooks. Also highlighted are successful strategies teachers used to facilitate students’ comprehension of the subject matter and improve their academic language skills. Many of these strategies are adaptations of ESL techniques that have been applied to content-area lessons. The conclusion is that an integrated language and social studies course may be an appropriate placement for English language learners who are preparing to enter mainstream classes.

Language educators in the U.S. are very aware of the major demographic changes that have occurred in the K–12 educational system over the past decade as schools have enrolled ever-increasing numbers of linguistically and culturally diverse students. Analysis of the 1990 U.S. Census reveals that the numbers of school-aged children and youth who reported they did not speak English very well rose 83% above the figures of the 1980 census (“Numbers of School-Agers,” 1993). Researchers have projected from current immigration and birthrates that, by the year 2000, the majority of the school-aged population in 50 or more major U.S. cities will be from language minority backgrounds (Tucker, 1990). This burgeoning level of diversity has important instructional ramifications. New programs have been designed and existing ones modified to accommodate the needs of En-
glish language learners who must develop their language skills and master the academic content of their classes.

Traditional ESL programs that focus on language development with little attention to subject-area curricula have not been able to serve the current influx of language minority students very well, especially at the secondary level. As Cummins (1980) and Collier (1989) have shown, most English language learners require 4-7 years of language instruction before they achieve a level of proficiency in academic English that is on par with that of the average, native-English-speaking student. Secondary students, in particular, need instruction in content concepts and academic tasks early in their educational experience. Secondary students, as opposed to elementary students, are at risk, not only because the time available in the K–12 structure runs out sooner for them but also because a large number of the new secondary students immigrating to the U.S. are underprepared for grade-level schoolwork. Some enter high schools, for example, with less than 4 years of formal education. Consequently, educators cannot expect a high degree of transfer of academic skills and knowledge once students have learned enough English to be placed in mainstream courses.

Because of the demographic changes and limited time to prepare students for the academic language demands of mainstream classes, integrated language and content instruction has become a popular and valued addition to elementary and secondary school curricula. A recent study by the Center for Applied Linguistics identified 1,462 schools from 1,544 questionnaire respondents out of a total of 2,992 mailed questionnaires as teaching at least one course that integrated language and content objectives. These courses are present in bilingual, ESL, sheltered, and regular mainstream programs. Quite frequently, but not always, language and content-area educators work together to design lessons and curricula that teach academic skills and content knowledge before students have fully mastered English.

When language educators integrate language and content objectives, it is often referred to as content-based ESL or content-based language instruction. The language educator maintains a primary focus on language skill development but has a subsidiary goal of preparing students for the mainstream classroom (Cantoni-Harvey, 1987; Crandall, 1993; Mohan, 1986; Short, 1989). Content-based ESL classes appear in various forms. Some teachers, often at the elementary level, refer to this integration as thematic instruction, in which they base math, science, language arts, and social studies lessons around a common theme, such as Native Americans or the environment. Some teachers prefer

1 I use the term Native American in this context because it reflects what is used in the materials I developed and in other materials of the social studies profession.
to integrate only one subject area with the language instruction whereas others might select lesson topics from a range of subject areas but do not necessarily follow a theme. At the postsecondary level, content-based language courses are often adjunct classes, that is, they are designed specifically for English language learners to complement a subject course, such as psychology, in which they are enrolled (Brinton, Snow, & Wesche, 1989). Language educators implementing content-based instruction must provide practice in the academic skills students will need and the tasks they will encounter when they are placed in mainstream classes (Adamson, 1990; Chamot & O’Malley, 1987; Mohan, 1990).

Regular and content teachers also integrate language and content instruction. This approach may be termed sheltered instruction if the students in the class are all English language learners, or language-sensitive content instruction if the class is heterogeneous, with both English-speaking and English-language-learning students. The main focus of these classes is content comprehension; however, the teachers are often trained in ESL techniques to make their instruction more accessible to students learning English (Crandall, 1993; Short, 1989; Spanos, 1990).

As the field of content-based instruction has grown, two areas of interest to educators have come to the forefront: (a) the acquisition of academic language by the English language learners and (b) the ways classroom teachers implement content lessons that are sensitive to the cultural and educational backgrounds of these students. This article will describe an ongoing research project that is investigating integrated language and content classes in a single subject area, social studies. The project, part of the National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning, seeks to identify the academic language and culture demands of social studies in U.S. middle schools and the instructional strategies and techniques that lead to student success.

The project chose to examine social studies for several reasons. First, most students study American history as part of their middle school social studies curriculum. As more content-based language courses and sheltered instruction courses are designed for English language learners at the middle school level, it is more and more likely that they will be asked to study social studies. Second, social studies on a motivational level is inherently interesting to many English language learners. The teaching of social studies provides opportunities for the
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students to reflect on their heritage and the role their countries and peoples play and have played in the world. Through social studies lessons, students also learn about their new country.

Third, many language educators enjoy incorporating some history and culture into their ESL lessons, so social studies is a potential area for implementing content-based instruction. Language educators also find the underlying narrative structure of many social studies textbooks appealing. By telling a story to relate historic events, successful teachers engage student interest, dramatize conflicts and resolutions, and describe the characters and the setting. Because this storytelling is a universal teaching method, all children are familiar with it in home and school settings. The final reason has a research perspective; we chose to study the academic language of social studies in order to extend earlier work conducted on the language registers of mathematics (Halliday, 1975; Spanos, Rhodes, Dale, & Crandall, 1988) and science (Lemke, 1982).

RELATED RESEARCH

A review of the literature from the perspective of social studies research and pedagogy reveals little published on the academic language of social studies as it applies to English language learners. Freeland (1991), for example, in his book on the social studies curriculum, includes a chapter on special-needs students but does not discuss linguistically or culturally diverse students. National organizations, such as the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS), have neither issued guidelines nor recommended strategies for teaching these students, although they have acknowledged the importance of multicultural education. NCSS (1992) published its Curriculum Guidelines for Multicultural Education to “reaffirm its commitment to educational programs and curricula that reflect the racial, ethnic, and cultural diversity within the United States and the world” (p. 274). The only discussion of language learning, however, frames the issue in terms of learning two languages and studying about languages from a sociolinguistic point of view, not in terms of making social studies content comprehensible to English language learners.

Although the social studies profession has not focused on incorporating language development activities in the classrooms, other researchers have conducted related research on the reading demands of social studies textbooks. Beck, McKeown, and Gromoll (1989) have examined upper-elementary textbooks and measured student reading comprehension, finding that many texts lacked coherence, had poor visual organization and varied types of writing, and used headings and illus-
trations inappropriately. Brophy (1991) analyzed the student books and teacher’s guides of a popular elementary social studies series, finding undeveloped ideas and concepts, disconnected information presented as a series of facts, lack of coherence within the prose, no integration of skills and knowledge, and other shortcomings. Others who have studied social studies texts and instruction have advocated teaching strategies that activate students’ background knowledge and frame instructional reading assignments, such as vocabulary overviews, prediction guides, and graphic organizers (Alvermann, 1987; Armbruster, Anderson, & Meyer, 1990; Beck & McKeown, 1991; Franklin & Roach, 1992).

Language educators have examined aspects of social studies instruction for English language learners, particularly in terms of methodology and instructional materials. Freeman and Freeman (1991) address teaching social studies to English language learners through whole language techniques. King, Fagan, Bratt, and Baer (1987) provide a format for lesson planning and describe sample lessons with activities that integrate language and social studies objectives. In describing benefits of and strategies for using cooperative learning with linguistically and culturally diverse secondary students, Holt, Chips, and Wallace (1992) use social studies as a sample unit.

Chamot (1987), Short, Seufert-Bosco, and Grognet (1991), and Terdy (1986) have written history and government texts for English language learners. These books distinguish themselves from mainstream commercial materials by incorporating prereading activities to explain vocabulary, providing background information or relating concepts to student experiences, utilizing graphic representations of social studies information, adapting reading passages by modifying the vocabulary and sentence structure, using listening and speaking tasks to complement reading and writing activities, and including critical-thinking and study-skill activities.

RESEARCH DESIGN

In the research project Integrating Language, Culture and the Social Studies, the project staff hypothesized that social studies would be academically more challenging for English language learners than other subjects because it demands high literacy skills and is predicated on students’ being familiar with extensive background knowledge. In terms of Cummins’ framework (1981), social studies, in general, represents cognitively demanding and context-reduced communication.

The project is examining how social studies knowledge is constructed
in middle school classrooms with ESL students and what linguistic and cultural competencies students need to engage effectively in this domain of discourse and learning. Specifically, in this project, we have been investigating how classroom teachers of social studies strengthen the academic language competence of English language learners, develop and implement lessons sensitive to the cultural and educational backgrounds of the students, and explore the knowledge students bring to the social studies classroom to help them act as multicultural informants. The study is also identifying effective instructional practices teachers use to guide students to accomplish socially and academically meaningful tasks.

**A Two-Phase Design**

This research project has two phases with several components to each phase. In the first phase we studied middle school American history as it was taught in Grades 6–9. The second phase involves a similar study in world social studies classes. The phase components include reviews of relevant literature, classroom observations, and interviews; analysis of academic social studies language from classroom discourse, textbooks, and student assignments; materials development; and teacher training. Below I describe some of the findings from the first phase. Because the study is ongoing, however, the findings may be clarified, added to, or altered as the second phase of the investigation unfolds.

The project began in 1991 with a literature review, analysis of middle school American history textbooks, and initial observations in social studies classes with English language learners. These observations yielded general information about social studies instruction without specific treatment or project materials. In the summer of 1991, ESL social studies teachers worked with project staff to develop an integrated language and content curriculum unit, Protest and the American Revolution. During the 1991–1992 school year, the unit lessons were piloted in sheltered social studies classes in northern Virginia so project staff could observe frequently and interview teachers and students. Most of the classroom observations during this year and subsequent years were audiotaped and transcribed for analysis.

In the summer of 1992, the project was expanded to include social studies teachers from Maryland, New York, and Florida. A training institute held for the teachers demonstrated techniques for teaching content to English language learners and prepared the teachers to implement the integrated unit. Revisions to the materials, based on the first year’s pilot, also took place that summer. During the 1992–1993 school year, the materials were field tested in sheltered and
mainstream classes in Virginia, Maryland, Florida, and New York by project-trained teachers, and in Nebraska and California by teachers who learned about the project through other means. Project staff traveled to several of the sites to conduct observations and interviews and to gather samples of student work. Participating teachers also kept a log of the implementation process, describing students’ reactions to lessons, modifications to the planned activities, suggestions for improvement, and so forth.

**Materials Development**

A discussion of the materials development process will be useful for language educators interested in integrating language and content instruction. First, as we developed, field tested, and revised the instructional unit Protest and the American Revolution, we kept in mind the findings from the literature review and the textbook and classroom discourse analyses and their implications for English language learners. In brief, some of the findings included making the reading process more comprehensible through vocabulary previews, graphic organizers, and so forth; improving the cohesion and coherence of the reading passages; activating background knowledge; implementing activities that integrate language functions and study skills with content knowledge; explicitly teaching linguistic cues of text structure; and making connections between key vocabulary words and related terms. Second, we considered research on content-based language instruction that suggested using cooperative learning, incorporating hands-on activities, exposing students to authentic materials, relating information to student experiences and knowledge, providing depth of knowledge rather than breadth, and developing critical-thinking skills (Cantoni-Harvey, 1987; Crandall, 1987; Short, 1991).

Our next task was to choose a theme for the unit. We wanted to make connections between the theme as applied to American history and to the middle school students’ lives, experiences, or knowledge. Because many students immigrate from countries that have experienced wars and other forms of civil disturbances, we chose the theme of protest. By relating students’ knowledge to the relevant events and philosophies of the American revolutionary era, teachers could help students understand the development of the U.S. democratic tradition. Furthermore, we reasoned, the theme of protest would generate active communication among the adolescent students.

Protest and the American Revolution was designed to incorporate content, language, and thinking/study skill objectives with student-centered activities in order to make American history more accessible for English language learners. The lessons gave students a chance to
acquire and enrich their knowledge individually and cooperatively through reading tasks of authentic and adapted texts, role plays and interviews, physical movement, art projects, process writing, and library research. The content objectives were drawn from commercial textbooks, curricula, and documents such as *Lessons from History: Essential Understandings and Historical Perspectives Students Should Acquire* (Crabtree, Nash, Gagnon, & Waugh, 1992) and the California *History-Social Science Framework* (California State Department of Education, 1987). The language objectives were selected to be compatible with the content and to promote development in listening, speaking, reading, and writing, with specific attention to language tasks required in a social studies class, such as reading for specific information, taking notes, listening for details, presenting an oral report, and writing a comparison essay. Thinking and study-skill objectives also matched the content objectives and led teachers to pose more higher-order questions and require more integrated tasks.

The following samples should help clarify how the objectives fit together. The 3 lessons occur near the end of the 15-lesson unit. In Lesson 10, students study the Declaration of Independence. They work on listening and outlining skills, using sentence strips to create an outline of the Declaration. In Lesson 11, students work on library (or classroom-based) research. Beginning with a tree diagram, they gather information on a chosen protester and then prepare an oral report. For this lesson students may work individually or in pairs. In Lesson 12, students compare and contrast the rides of two revolutionary messengers, Paul Revere and Sybil Ludington, using authentic poems written about them. Students analyze the poems, create a Venn diagram comparing and contrasting the two historical figures, and prepare an essay.

**Lesson 10: The Declaration of Independence**

**Language Skills**
- Students will listen for the main idea.
- Students will read and write an outline.
- Students will extract the main idea and supporting details from an outline.

**Content Skills**
- Students will identify the principles of the Declaration of Independence.
- Students will recognize some sources of ideas in the Declaration of Independence.

**Thinking/Study Skills**
- Students will generate an outline to summarize important points.
- Students will classify subtopics for an outline.
Lesson 11: People Who Protested in Prerevolutionary America

Language Skills
- Students will ask and report information about historical figures.
- Students will read and record information about historical figures.

Content Skills
- Students will identify major protesters of the revolutionary period and analyze their roles.

Thinking/Study Skills
- Students will take notes and organize information.
- Students will do library research.

Lesson 12: Revolutionary Messengers: Paul Revere and Sybil Ludington

Language Skills
- Students will listen for details.
- Students will read poems and discuss poem interpretations in groups.
- Students will complete a Venn diagram.

Content Skills
- Students will explain the different roles people play in war.
- Students will identify the actions of Paul Revere and Sybil Ludington.

Thinking/Study Skills
- Students will compare and contrast two historical characters and their actions.
- Students will interpret and analyze poems.

We considered it important to expose students to a mix of authentic and adapted materials because a major goal for language teachers who integrate content in their instruction is to prepare students to read mainstream textbooks. Through these lessons, teachers can support their students as they work on comprehension skills. As can be inferred from the objectives listed above, the lessons rely on the original Declaration of Independence, reference and/or biographic material (from the library), and two authentic poems. Authentic materials are also used in some other lessons in which students learn to analyze political cartoons from the time period and contemporary songs. Another type of practice with authentic materials takes place in lessons in which students use their class textbooks to complete the activities.

The adapted materials were written to bridge gaps we found in the textbooks. As discussed later, few textbooks make an effort to integrate considerations of diversity into the main body of the narrative. We recognize that language educators are very interested in the diversity and cultures of their English language learners and often use such information to make connections between the content being taught...
and the students’ lives. In this unit, we wanted to present students with information about the men and women from different ethnic and racial groups who lived in colonial America. For example, Lesson 5 discusses revolutionary groups that formed during the time period. We wrote reading passages to describe the actions and motives of the Daughters of Liberty, the Sons of Liberty, the Loyalists, the Committees of Correspondence, and the Continental Army. The passages written for Lesson 13 discuss generals, spies, journalists, and other people from other countries who were involved in the American Revolution. To write these passages we consulted trade and reference books, museum materials, and ethnic and cultural resource organizations.

Besides the reading passages, activities created in several lessons reflect the roles Native Americans, African Americans, and women played during the revolutionary era and help teachers relate the information to student diversity. For instance, as mentioned above, one lesson examines two war messengers, Paul Revere and Sybil Ludington. In another lesson, students are encouraged to view the pending revolution from the viewpoints of African American slaves and Native Americans and list reasons for siding with the British or with the Patriots.

Hands-on activities were also designed to help reinforce content information and give students practice in communication skills. In a lesson that provides an overview of events that led to the American Revolution, for example, students preview protest events and read about them in their textbooks. Each student is then given a sentence strip with either a date or an event written on it. Students with event strips must match up the date strips; then all the students arrange themselves in a physical time line.

For most of the unit lessons we prepared graphic organizers to help students understand the content objectives and reading passages and to familiarize them with popular text structures. We were guided by the principle that representing information visually benefits language learners because it highlights important points and reduces dependence on written text. In creating graphic organizers, we drew from work conducted by Mohan and colleagues (Early & Tang, 1991; Mohan, 1986, 1990), who have developed a framework that provides graphic representations of text according to the type of knowledge structure embedded in the text. Some of the organizers in our lessons are intended to help students categorize and systematize the information they gather. Some lessons use flow charts to organize information presented in a cause-effect manner; others use time lines to show chronological progression. Venn diagrams are employed to help students become aware of comparisons, and tree diagrams help call attention to enumeration.
Our research has revealed that teaching social studies to English language learners is indeed a very challenging endeavor. By examining mainstream social studies classes, we determined several areas of mismatch between the requirements of the content area and the skills of beginning- and intermediate-level English language learners. First, as a discipline, the study of social studies is closely bound to literacy skills. Unlike mathematics courses, in which students have opportunities to use math manipulative like fraction bars and geoboards as instructional materials, or science courses, in which students perform hands-on activities in laboratory experiments, social studies in general relies heavily on the textbook (and teacher’s lecture) to present the bulk of the information students are expected to learn. Second, most of the readings are expository, not narrative, in style. The amount of reading and writing in social studies classes surpasses that in most math or science classes, and the reading passages are long and filled with abstract concepts and unfamiliar schema that cannot be easily demonstrated.

Besides the reading skills to comprehend textbooks, students in social studies classes need to be able to interpret maps, charts, and timelines. Social studies textbooks contain visual aids in the form of pictures and photographs of historical events and people, landforms, and other objects. These are somewhat helpful because they present students with a definite image, but sometimes the chosen pictures do not highlight the main concepts being discussed in the narrative and therefore can distract or mislead English language learners.

The writing tasks in social studies are also demanding, frequently requiring students to write comparison-contrast, problem-solution, or cause-effect essays. These types of essays also require considerable background knowledge, which places newly arrived students at a disadvantage. Further, because many social studies teachers consider writing part of the domain of the language arts teacher, they do not focus on developing essay skills. Yet English language learners frequently need assistance in organizing information within the context of an academic subject.

We also found that many K–12 curriculum frameworks pose difficulties for English language learners. Under the expanding communities approach in the elementary grades, concepts and objectives taught in first grade are reviewed and built upon in later years, so students who enter in third or fourth grade will have missed some of the
foundations of the curricula. Similarly, at the secondary level, curricula and textbooks expect a depth of knowledge that new students do not have. A case in point is the California History-Social Science Framework (California State Department of Education, 1987), which advocates teaching different segments of American history in different years, such as the mid-1400s to 1850 in the fifth grade and 1783–1914 in the eighth. This practice, however helpful for the mainstream class with increasing amounts of curricular material to cover, raises problems for English language learners. Moreover, because the K–12 curricula in the U.S. are very Eurocentered in their historical and political perspectives, even students with prior schooling have much new information to learn because many come from countries that teach non-Western, non-Eurocentered histories.

**Linguistic Features of Textbooks**

Because students in ESL and bilingual programs are exposed to regular textbooks when they are mainstreamed, we examined several popular American history textbooks used in the middle grades. Specifically, we reviewed the units and chapters that addressed the prerevolutionary and revolutionary period of American history, from the end of the French and Indian War to the end of the American Revolution (1763–1781). We compared several features of the textbooks, including the order in which they present historical events; the presence and usefulness of chapter and section previews; and the length of chapters, sections, paragraphs, and sentences. However, we will only report on the structure level of the texts, the treatment of vocabulary, and the ways in which the books represent diversity in American history.

Six types of structures are commonly referred to in discussions of expository text in all subject areas: sequential or chronological, cause-effect, problem-solution, description, enumeration, and comparison-contrast. (For detailed explanations see Herber, 1970, and Vacca & Vacca, 1993.) In the textbooks we analyzed, we found sequencing and cause-effect structures to be the most prevalent organizational features of the chapters. However, even if one supraordinate structure is present in a chapter, other structures are developed. For example, in *Exploring American History* (O’Connor, 1991), Unit 5, Chapter 3, “The Colonists Resist Taxation without Representation,” is predominantly organized around a cause-effect structure, although the author uses
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sequence markers to guide the presentation of events. The historical time frame represented is the prerevolutionary period between 1765 and 1773. Most of the presentation centers around the British actions, the colonists’ reactions and actions, and the subsequent actions by the British.

The textbooks use language to enhance the logical connections of the structures framing the narrative. The following excerpts from *Exploring American History* (O’Connor, 1991) illustrate the cause-effect relationship:


The word choice (e.g., refused to obey, increased their protest, voted to end, caused more and more colonists to protest) and the transition markers (e.g., however, because) reinforce the concept that the colonists reacted to British actions in the hope of changing the situation. Furthermore, because cause-effect relationships by definition proceed in a sequential order (i.e., a cause must occur before an effect), the text marks the passage with temporal words and phrases. Our classroom observations support the claim that these signal words can be helpful for English language learners when they are explicitly taught to recognize them and understand their functions. The students we observed were better able to follow the relationships among the concepts presented in their text reading passages. (See Coelho, 1982, for a related discussion.)

The treatment of vocabulary in these textbooks is inadequate for English language learners, according to our analysis. Several key terms per chapter (5–10) are highlighted in the text with boldface. Some texts define the terms within the narrative, but others rely upon the glossary for the definitions. The difficulty for English language learners is that many of the important words are not identified as key terms. For students who have received little schooling in the U.S. and therefore generally have limited background knowledge of these words, the vocabulary can be a major obstacle to comprehension. Unfamiliar with terms such as liberty, taxes, rebel, disguise, and protest, immigrant and refugee students new to the U.S. are disserved when the majority of the vocabulary items are not discussed in any depth in the textbooks. Only one of the six books examined lists words besides the designated key terms in the glossary. For most of the vocabulary items that are apt to be problematic, English language learners need to
use an outside source, such as a dictionary or teacher, to aid their comprehension.

**Cultural Diversity in Social Studies Textbooks**

We chose to examine the representation of cultural diversity in textbooks because it is related to a goal shared by language and social studies educators. Language educators seek to understand the cultural background of English language learners and make them feel comfortable in U.S. society. Social studies educators seek to help students understand the diverse peoples that constitute society and the influences they both exert and feel. As *Lessons from History* (Crabtree, Nash, Gagnon, & Waugh, 1992) states:

An understanding of society is indispensable to an understanding of human history. Basic to United States history, for example, is the story of the gathering of the many and diverse peoples and cultures that have created and are still transforming American society. (p. 28)

We interpreted these statements to mean that students not only should study about the activities of these diverse peoples but should also learn about their points of view and be able to reflect on history from their perspectives.

The main narrative of most textbooks, however, does not follow this view of social studies. All the textbooks, not surprisingly, tell the history of prerevolutionary and revolutionary America from the U.S. point of view, primarily that of the Patriots who decided to fight for freedom. Overall, the books present a Eurocentric focus, largely ignoring the roles and contributions of non-Europeans to the development of the U.S. Specifically, readers receive little information about the roles of women, African Americans, and Native Americans or about the Loyalists and the colonists who remained neutral during the war. Most of the textbooks do include some references to diversity, but such information is tagged onto the end of a chapter, placed in a sidebar outside the main narrative, or dropped into a new chapter, usually at the beginning or end of a structural unit. The overall impression is that information about diverse peoples is less important to American history.

Of the textbooks we examined, five make superficial reference to Crispus Attucks, an African American who died during the Boston Massacre. Four contain one sentence or less about him in the main narrative. The fifth has two sentences and a picture caption. One might speculate that he was included only to satisfy multicultural criteria on state textbook adoption lists, especially because he is the only person...
named from the Boston Massacre. The sixth, *The United States: Peoples and Leaders* (Abramowitz & Abramowitz, 1981), offers a full-page profile on Attucks. This book, however, is the only one to include no information about the role of women in prerevolutionary America. Native Americans are also rarely referenced in the main body of the text during that period of American history. When mentioned at all, it is usually only by their dress, described as the costume worn by the Patriots when they threw the tea into the harbor.

Women do not fare much better in the analysis. Although a few women’s names surface, notably Abigail Adams and Mercy Otis Warren, their discussion does not compare for space and thus apparent importance to that allotted to the men. Mercy Otis Warren, for example, is discussed in one paragraph in the chapter on prerevolutionary America in *Exploring American History* (O’Connor, 1991), but she is the only woman named in that chapter. However, more than 10 colonial men and several British generals are named and discussed.

**Academic Classroom Language Analysis**

We transcribed audiotapes of many of the observations in Virginia, Maryland, and New York and used them for our discourse analysis to investigate the academic language competencies students need to learn and be able to use in social studies classes. The analysis was also informed by student work that we collected from those classes and classes in Florida. By categorizing the language of social studies, we hoped to highlight for language and social studies educators specific areas they should emphasize when teaching English language learners.

During the course of our research we decided to define the academic language of social studies broadly to include semantic and syntactic features (such as vocabulary items, sentence structure, transition markers, and cohesive ties) and language functions and tasks that are part of social studies classroom routines. We anticipated identifying a restrictive social studies register but discovered instead that the academic language used in the American history classes was commensurate with much of the academic language in other humanities courses and, in fact, similar to the nontechnical language used in math and science classroom discourse when teachers and students are explaining, reviewing, discussing, and so forth. We concluded, therefore, that the language of social studies is less restrictive than that of mathematics and of sciences like chemistry and physics (Halliday, 1975; Lemke, 1982), in which technical vocabulary and specific patterns of discourse are more prevalent. It is worth noting that, although the language of social studies is similar to the language of other content areas and thus
may not be exclusive to social studies, it is nonetheless required for successful participation in a social studies class.

Figure 1 shows the types of language features, functions, tasks, and text structures that are apt to appear in social studies. The samples indicate those found in the period of American history that we studied. Certain instructional tools correspond closely to the social studies, such as globes and maps. The related language varies from key vocabulary words like north and south to general academic instructions like look at the bottom of page 25. Teachers usually teach these terms and instructions directly, and students learn them quickly. All disciplines have their famous people and events, though they may play a less important role in the overall curricula of mathematics and science courses. In social studies, they also engender related vocabulary, sometimes as hyponyms (e.g., Samuel Adams and rebel), sometimes as activities undertaken (e.g., Mercy Otis Warren and boycott), sometimes as causes and results (e.g., Stamp Act and tar and feather), and so forth. Teachers often taught these associated vocabulary terms with word webs, pictures, and demonstrations. The concepts, such as patriotism and justice, represent a more abstract use of the language and were difficult to demonstrate physically or visually. The teachers relied more on concrete examples from the students’ personal experiences and role-playing situations to help students comprehend the concepts.

The language functions and skills tasks were fairly consistent across the observed lessons and collected assignments. Several functions occur regularly in both student and teacher discourse whereas others fall much more into the domain of the teacher. For instance, both teachers and students are expected to define terms and give examples (although often the student is prompted by the teacher). Teachers, however, are more apt to rephrase student responses, review information, and give directions than are the students. In most classes we observed, in fact, teachers made considerable efforts to repeat, rephrase, and extend student responses and comments in order to help all students participate and follow the lesson activity. Other tasks found regularly in the social studies classrooms we visited are universal for all content areas, such as participating in a discussion and listening to a lecture.

Teacher Strategies in Social Studies

During the piloting and field testing of the unit Protest and the American Revolution, we observed many successful classroom prac-

See Snow, Met, and Genesee (1989) for a discussion of language that is obligatory for understanding the material taught a content course, such as the terms evaporate and condense in physical science, versus language that is nonobligatory but compatible with language objectives often developed in the ESL curriculum yet could be taught in the science course, such as if-then structures and because clauses.
FIGURE 1
Sample Features of Social Studies Language in American History Classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social studies tools and related language</th>
<th>Famous people/events and related/technical vocabulary</th>
<th>Concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Textbook: on page... at the top, chapter, illustration</td>
<td>Samuel Adams: rebel, speech</td>
<td>Propaganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map: north, south, east, west, landforms</td>
<td>Mercy Otis Warren: boycott, correspondence</td>
<td>Patriotism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globe: latitude, longitude, continents</td>
<td>Stamp Act: taxes, tar and feather</td>
<td>Self-governing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time line: years, dates</td>
<td>2nd Continental Congress: represent, delegates</td>
<td>Protest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graph, chart: title, percent, bar, pie, column, heading</td>
<td>Lexington and Concord: militia, minutemen, musket</td>
<td>Rebellion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Taxation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Liberty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language functions</th>
<th>Language skills tasks</th>
<th>Text structure</th>
<th>Syntax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students and teachers</td>
<td>Read expository prose</td>
<td>Macro (chapter level)</td>
<td>Simple past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain</td>
<td>Take notes</td>
<td>Cause and effect</td>
<td>Historical present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe</td>
<td>Conduct research</td>
<td>Sequential/chronological order</td>
<td>Sequence words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Define</td>
<td>Find main idea and supporting details</td>
<td>Problem-solution</td>
<td>Active voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justify</td>
<td>Present an oral report</td>
<td>Micro (paragraph level)</td>
<td>Temporal signals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give examples</td>
<td>Write a cause-and-effect essay</td>
<td>Compare and contrast Generalization-example Enumeration</td>
<td>Causative signals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask recall questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give directions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarify/restate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rephrase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The teachers who participated in our study carefully prepared the unit lessons to accommodate the needs of their particular English language learners and, in several cases, created additional activities to supplant or support those in the original design. They used many of the techniques practiced in the training seminar we held and modified others from their personal teaching repertoires.

For vocabulary development, the teachers selected and implemented strategies according to the content of the lesson. This was important because the lessons do not always provide specific instructions for teaching the vocabulary. Many of the strategies are excellent ESL techniques; the noteworthy point is that content and ESL teachers...
used them successfully in content-area classes. Sometimes the teachers opted for explicit vocabulary instruction, sometimes dictionary practice, and at other times they helped students learn to define vocabulary through context. Much of the explicit instruction involved developing word webs as a class, eliciting relationships among key words, and making associations with other known words. Demonstrations and illustrations were other effective ways to teach the vocabulary items. In defining different types of colonial protest, for example, visual representations helped the students associate the written word with its meaning. Using pictures from the textbooks, newspaper photographs, and pantomime, the teachers showed the students meanings of such terms as speeches, stamp burning, political cartoons, destroying property, marches, and forming armies. One teacher had her students perform an impromptu role play of the Boston Massacre, helping them act out the drama and supplying the key vocabulary words as they went along. Another reinforced both the vocabulary and the major historical events when she asked student groups to identify five types of protest conducted by colonists and draw them on five sides of a cube they were constructing. For the sixth side, she helped students make connections to current events by encouraging them to draw a scene of a protest situation in the world. During our unit revisions, we added these two hands-on activities to our lessons.

Teaching the abstract concepts was a little more difficult, so many teachers relied on examples from the students’ personal experiences and from current events to facilitate comprehension. To help understand representation, for instance, the teachers referred to the schools’ student councils and called on class representatives to explain how they make decisions for the class and how they inform the class about council meetings. While we were conducting the classroom research, the news reported riots and other current events of protest (e.g., the Los Angeles riots after the first Rodney King decision, the attempted coup d’état in Thailand). By drawing students’ attention to these events, teachers explained such ideas as point of view, oppression, and self-government. Similarly, the U.S. presidential campaign that took place during the research study period helped teachers discuss propaganda and symbolism in political cartoons.

One very successful strategy teachers used to help students complete the unit activities was modeling. Many of the teachers modeled the assignment, or a portion of it, with the class as a whole before breaking students into small groups. One teacher of a sheltered class, for example, helped students reflect on the points of view of Native Americans and African Americans. As mentioned earlier, in this lesson students were divided into small groups to list reasons for siding with the British or the Patriots. Before they started their cooperative work, however,
the teacher asked the whole class to generate one reason for each group. Another teacher, during the lesson on protest songs, began the class by having students listen to a recording of a modern protest song (from the Vietnam War era). She analyzed the song with the students in preparation for the revolutionary-era song activity they would complete later in the lesson.

Teachers with mixed classes relied on the English-speaking students as tutors and partners. For example, for the lesson in which students do research on revolutionary protesters, the teacher of one class paired the English language learners with mainstream students who were familiar with library research. As mentors, these mainstream students were excellent assistants and reported afterward that they enjoyed working as partners.

The teachers were also creative when they tried to strengthen their students’ higher-order thinking skills. While piloting the lesson on revolutionary groups, one teacher suggested a Plus-Minus-Interesting (PMI) activity as a supplement. This exercise engaged the students in critical thinking because they needed to decide on a positive aspect of the revolutionary group they were studying, a negative aspect, and an interesting fact they would like to share with the class. It worked so well that we incorporated the activity in the lesson, and it was field tested successfully.

**Student Ideas in Social Studies**

In conjunction with our classroom observations, we gathered student work for analysis. A few samples show some of the diverse activities that enabled the students to practice their language skills while learning the social studies content.

In the lesson about protest flags, students acted as multicultural informants by sharing flags from their countries and discussing the symbols represented. Later in the lesson they built on their knowledge of symbolism and designed protest flags for any of the revolutionary groups or other people they had previously studied. Figure 2 shows the draft a student group made before painting a protest flag for one Native American group.

Figure 3 represents a student’s work from a lesson, described earlier, about people who protested during the American Revolution. While conducting some research, this English language learner prepared a tree diagram about Mercy Otis Warren. Using the graphic organizer helped this student collate and categorize information she gathered from two different sources.

Figure 4 shows a Venn diagram prepared by a student to compare the information learned about Paul Revere and Sybil Ludington from
FIGURE 2
Worksheet for Designing a Revolutionary Protest Flag

GROUP NAME: **NATIVE AMERICANS**

Background color of flag: **white** representing: **They only want peace**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbols</th>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Representing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>arrow</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>killing the colonists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feather on head</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>Indians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>white</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>blue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>red</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>light orange</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Draw a rough draft of your flag
the two authentic poems in the lesson on war messengers. Again, the graphic organizer was a useful tool for channeling information the students received.

In one of the classes we observed, the teacher used the Paul Revere and Sybil Ludington Venn diagrams as rewriting guides and asked students to transform the information from their diagrams into a comparison-contrast essay about the two historical figures. Figure 5 shows an excerpt from one student’s essay. In this class, the teacher had explicitly taught some linguistic cues for writing about comparisons, and the student’s work reflects this in the use of expressions like One was... other was... , and both, and in the parallel sentence structure.

**EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS**

Despite the challenge that social studies presents to English language learners, there is reason to integrate the subject in content-based instruction. First, the subject is relevant and meaningful, so students can
Once there were two messengers. One was Paul Revere and other was Sybil Ludington. They both were different. For example, Paul was captured and Sybil wasn’t captured. I think why Paul was captured is because when he was riding horse the moon was full. The soldiers might saw him and he got captured. I think why Sybil wasn’t captured is because the night was dark and no one saw her. Also she was more earful because she knew if soldiers saw her then they would stop me because I am a girl. So she disguised lik a man. She wore pants. That’s why she couldn’t captured. Another thing is different that Paul went to Massachusetts to tell people and Sybil went to Connecticut.

use social studies topics to develop their communicative language skills. Second, with the teacher’s assistance, students can acquire and practice the academic skills that will serve them in the mainstream classroom. Because the academic language demands of social studies mirror many of the higher-level literacy demands of other content areas, an integrated language and social studies course may be an appropriate springboard for students who will make the transition to mainstream classes.

The project reported on here has provided examples of strategies teachers can use to present the academic language of social studies to English language learners in an interactive manner. The extensive use of graphic organizers assisted reading comprehension, retention of vocabulary and content concepts, thinking and study-skill development, and writing skills. Hands-on and cooperative learning activities, such as role plays, sentence strips, and art projects, gave students frequent opportunities to engage in communicative skills practice while they were learning social studies objectives. To help students understand the structure of text passages and develop cohesive use of academic language, teachers also conducted activities to teach and reinforce the use of signal words that cue relationships (e.g., cause and effect, sequential order, comparisons) in reading and writing. To compensate for the poor treatment of vocabulary in textbooks, teachers encouraged students to determine the definitions of new vocabulary terms through classroom discussion and in context. Furthermore, they concentrated on certain traditional social studies skills, such as interpreting time lines and maps, examining information from a historical perspective, and comparing and contrasting historical events and people. All of these teaching strategies aided students in comprehending and using the academic language of social studies and in strengthening their knowledge of American history.

Teachers should be aware, however, that middle school textbooks contain incomplete information. In order to portray American prrev-
olutionary society more accurately, teachers need supplemental texts. Yet one project teacher cautioned that the use of supplemental materials can produce a negative student reaction, sending the message, “It seems that they [minority and culturally diverse groups] are not good enough to be in the regular text. They’re an afterthought.” She added that her students were concerned that the information is not in the regular textbook.

Some researchers concurred with the impression that textbooks diminish the importance of diversity. Love (1989), for example, pointed out that the practice of sidebarring diversity is part of the hidden curriculum in which children learn to “evaluate society from the point of view of those in power” (p. 7). In light of these sentiments and the findings from our textbook analysis, language educators concerned with the education of English language learners may want to consider sitting on textbook adoption committees at the district level to encourage selection of materials that are culturally sensitive and historically accurate.

CONCLUSION

Language educators recognize that the integration of language and content instruction is, in the broader scheme of language teaching, a fairly new approach. As the survey by the Center for Applied Linguistics revealed, it is implemented quite differently across the U.S. One strong recommendation emanating from the field is for language teachers and content teachers to plan instruction and prepare materials together. The research study discussed in this article has shown that such collaboration can be quite effective. Two teachers with ESL and social studies experience worked with project staff to write the original unit. They also participated as trainers in the joint seminar we held for the other teachers—ESL, bilingual, and social studies—who would become our field testers and reviewers. The influence and expertise of these language and content educators enhanced the content accuracy, the practicality, the cultural information, and the language integration of the lessons. Through collaboration these lessons were designed to serve the curriculum needs of social studies students as well as the language development needs of English language learners.

The thematic framework was a critical tool for the curricular unit. Not only was the protest theme an underlying connection among the lessons, it favored reinforcement and repetition of vocabulary, review and extension of content knowledge, and most importantly, associations with students’ personal experiences and knowledge. Protest was an active feature in many of the students’ lives in their own countries.
as well as of their daily experience in the U.S. Although they may not have realized the historical significance that protest has played in the development of the U.S. democratic tradition, by drawing attention to their experiential knowledge teachers enabled students to grasp important historical principles.

Key features of this project distinguish it from most curricula and textbooks. First, language development was an integral component of the lessons, designed to let students practice their language skills in a systematic manner. Second, the project made a concerted effort to be inclusive and provide as much information as possible about the cultural diversity of the colonial population. Diversity was not relegated to the sidebars or to a lesson at the end. This decision was an important way to let our immigrant students understand that a multicultural U.S. existed from its inception. Third, the project materials strove to offer students some balance in perspective by examining the viewpoints of different groups in more than a cursory way. The advent of the revolutionary war was revealed as a complicated decision that involved more than the dichotomy of Patriot versus British soldier. Fourth, the project carefully included a combination of adapted and authentic reading passages: adapted, in part to supplement the scarceness of diversity material in textbooks and in part to provide language-appropriate text material that could convey essential content information to the learners efficiently and cohesively; and authentic, to correspond to and prepare students for regular reading tasks in mainstream classrooms.

As the second phase of the study continues, we will examine the academic language of world studies courses closely to determine if similar categories appear. We anticipate commonalities in the tools of social studies and in the language functions and tasks but expect to find differences in the concepts and technical vocabulary. Integration of cultural diversity may be easier in a course that examines countries and regions around the world. The prospect of making connections to the English language learners’ experiences, though, may be as challenging as in American social studies. However, the opportunities for teachers to view the students as cultural and historical resources and informants are more promising.

It would be enlightening to conduct research that follows a cohort of English language learners from an integrated language and social studies course into mainstream classes and to determine whether they are better prepared, in terms of background schema and familiarity with social studies functional language and academic tasks, than students who do not take an integrated course. Our research indicates that the academic language demands of social studies reflect many of the higher-level literacy demands of other content areas, so we posit
that an integrated language and social studies course would be a pivotal one in an articulated sequence that prepares English language learners for full transition to the mainstream.
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Supporting the TESOL organization’s mission to strengthen the effective teaching and learning of English around the world, I awaited publication of A. Suresh Canagarajah’s article on Sri Lanka (Vol. 27, No. 4) with eagerness, especially because I am also a Sri Lankan active in TEFL/TESL.

First, I must commend Canagarajah for continuing his scholarly activities in Jaffna. The civil war in Sri Lanka receives little attention abroad; nevertheless, it has been devastating. Since 1983, about 30,000 Tamil nationalists, Sri Lankan government troops, and civilians have been killed. Jaffna, where Canagarajah conducted his research, has borne the brunt of the war’s effects. Anyone aware of these conditions can only praise Canagarajah’s efforts.

In place of the dominant descriptive ethnography practiced in TESOL, Canagarajah advocates a critical ethnography, which he describes as

an ideologically sensitive orientation to the study of culture that can penetrate the noncommittal objectivity and scientism encouraged by the positivistic empirical attitude behind descriptive ethnography and can demystify the interests served by particular cultures to unravel their relation to issues of power. (p. 605)

I have reservations regarding his study, specifically with regard to its site, subjects (the students), and the textbook. I also question some of his observations and conclusions.

The research site and the subjects are crucial to ethnography because
they determine the extent to which the researcher’s conclusions may be considered representative of other environments. As Lauer and Asher (1988) so aptly state, “a researcher who studies a unique or unusual environment limits the extent to which the conclusions will be deemed significant in the field and worth further consideration” (p. 41). Canagarajah writes to an international audience that is largely unaware of his research site. He refers to life being “at a standstill in the Tamil region” (p. 610) and mentions government fighter jets screaming overhead and bombing the vicinity of the university while the students take the English placement test. However, these and other brief references do not paint a true picture of Jaffna at the time of his research. A description in Appropriate Technology is more vivid and accurate. Since the war began,

more than 200,000 people [out of a prewar population of 830,000] have left Jaffna . . . . Since June ‘90, the government has restricted transport to [Jaffna] of petrol, diesel, lubricants, batteries of all vehicles, spare parts, soap, sweets and confectionery, wax or candles . . . . People keep in touch with the outside world through their radios running off pedal power as there are no batteries. A dynamo is fixed to the bicycle and the electricity is fed into a depleted motorcycle/car battery which powers the radio . . . . Wood ash is used for washing clothes . . . . [Since the government has cut off the electricity supply], various types of bottle lamps have been made, using a glass jar containing coconut oil, or coconut oil floating in water . . . . The Red Cross arranged for a 100-meter Peace Zone around Jaffna hospital and lights this up at night. Some students sit under these lights to study . . . . It will take decades, once the war is over, for people to learn to cope with the trauma caused by seeing friends and relatives killed and living in a state of perpetual fear. (Pieris & Balasingham, 1992, pp. 14–16)

According to a recent survey, 50 percent of the adult population of Jaffna needs psychiatric help (Samath, 1993) because of the trauma caused by constant shelling, bombing, and a rigid rebel regime that tolerates no criticism (de Soysa, 1993, n.p.).

The Chronicle of Higher Education, reporting on the situation at the University of Jaffna in 1991, states that the rebels’ (Tamil nationalists’) philosophy includes the idea that young Tamils should forgo or at least postpone higher education so that they can take up the [nationalists’] cause. By intimidating academic officials, the rebels are effectively influencing a range of university policies from what is being taught to who is being admitted. Only a little more than half the university’s normal enrollment [of around 2000] has shown up for classes. [The rebels] are both ubiquitous

---

1 The Sri Lankan government claims that these items are used by the rebels to make explosives.
and omnipotent . . . [According to one faculty member], “freedom is elusive in all its forms.” (Le Vine, 1991, pp. A27, A29)

Indeed, a more unique or unusual research site would be hard to find. The students chosen for the study aggravate its unusualness. The students had failed the initial placement test and “fared the worst among new entrants for that academic year” (p. 609). Most of the students are from the “poorest economic groups” (p. 609), made to feel ignorant by other students who spoke “educated” Sri Lankan English. As a result, the students felt “disadvantaged, helpless, inferior, and uneducated” (p. 616). Although these terms show the extreme marginalization of the students, Canagarajah does not mention the main basis of division among Sri Lankan university students, the sharp distinction that exists between science undergraduates (who major in the biological and physical sciences, medicine, and engineering), and arts undergraduates, humanities majors. Less than 10 percent of the students who take the General Certificate in English (Advanced Level) examination qualify for university admission, and the competition for the sciences is the most intense. Thus, science undergraduates consider themselves the elite. Canagarajah’s students were from the arts.

The unusual nature of the research site and subjects is further exacerbated by the use of an inappropriate textbook. The students, who are reduced to a medieval, subsistence type of living, are forced to use a U.S. textbook that depicts “orchestra playing, air travel, department store shopping, and apartment living” (p. 615). Canagarajah admits that American Kernel Lessons (O’Neill, Kingbury, Yeadon, & Cornelius, 1978) sees the fundamentals of English as “autonomous, value free grammatical structures, ignoring the culture and ideologies that inform the language” (p. 608) and that it isolates students from their social context, with no consideration of how their own linguistic and cultural backgrounds can affect or enhance their learning (p. 608). If he knew the textbook had these shortcomings, one wonders why he chose it. I am surprised at his claim that limitations of time, finances, and printing materials force teachers to use such texts; Sri Lankan universities have been using locally designed, authentic material in ESOL classes since the early 1970s. (For instance, after an analysis of the students’ academic needs, I designed an ESP course and lesson material for science students of the University of Kelaniya in 1976.) If Canagarajah managed to unearth a 12-year-old U.S. textbook, he could have found reusable locally designed lesson material, as the private tutors of his students did.

The section titled Contextualizing Classroom Life, which describes Canagarajah’s research procedure, makes interesting reading. However, I find two of his interpretations rather naive. First, based on
responses to the precourse questionnaire, Canagarajah states that the students were highly motivated for English study at the beginning of the year but notes that class attendance dropped after 2 months and revived only toward the end of the year, as examinations approached. He interprets this as midcourse resistance, possibly “related to the oppositional response to the threats posed by the discourse inscribed in the language” (p. 621). But experienced teachers, especially of university-level ESOL classes, know that student absenteeism could be due to other reasons. For instance, when my students have midterm examinations in other subjects, they sometimes stop coming to English class. The reasons given by Canagarajah’s students (“to write tutorials for another subject, to prepare for a test, to attend funerals,” p. 612) appear to be quite legitimate and not necessarily the result of “oppositional response.” In fact, despite the hardships of a war causing a 50% drop in university enrollment (Le Vine, 1991), all the students stayed with the course until the end.

I also question Canagarajah’s interpretations of the students’ glosses in the textbook. The glosses, comments, drawings, and paintings, sometimes of an explicitly sexual nature, are seen as another indication of their “oppositional attitude” (p. 621). I find this observation naive; students gloss not only because of ideological opposition to a course but also because of plain boredom or frustration. When a group of young adults are compelled to sit for an academic year in a remedial type of class, subject to an alien textbook, while their lives are constantly threatened by bombings and shellings, they must find an outlet to express their boredom and frustration.

Canagarajah’s research begins with the precourse questionnaire, proceeds with observations of classroom activities (such as the interpretations of glosses and student absences noted above earlier), and concludes with postcourse interviews. The importance of these interviews, which ranged from 70 to 90 rein, is indicated by the fact that an entire section subtitled Postcourse Contradiction is devoted to them. However, seven students, a third of the class, did not turn up for the interviews. This does pose questions regarding Canagarajah’s conclusions.

Most of the students had been learning English at private tutories outside the university, and Canagarajah finds this surprising. However, as he would have observed during his stay at the University of Kelaniya, students have long attended private tutories that spring up around campuses. For instance, in the 1970s, the ESOL course for arts students at the University of Kelaniya emphasized grammar and reading exercises. In response, the students flocked to nearby tutories that offered classes in spoken English, the skill they most needed for social and economic mobility.
I am disturbed by Canagarajah’s curricular practices that emerge from the description of his research. He is the head of the university’s English Language Teaching Centre, with the power to design the curriculum, choose textbooks, and so forth. However, no attempt was made to determine the needs of the students before the course began, and *American Kernel Lessons* was chosen more for convenience than for appropriateness. Such courses and textbooks are useless to the students and, in the long run, detrimental to TESOL.

Canagarajah also states that the ambivalent behavior of his students “contain[s] elements of [both] accommodation and opposition in response to socioeconomic mobility . . . and cultural integrity” (p. 624). Granted, the ambivalence may be thus explained under normal conditions. But the extraordinary circumstances and the manner in which the study was conducted lead me to question these conclusions. A university in a war zone is unusual enough. But choosing students who are socially, economically, and linguistically marginalized, and imposing a last-resort, alien textbook, is stacking the deck. Such research does not make a critical ethnography from which the above conclusions can be drawn. Just as the research is flawed, the conclusions have little relevance beyond the borders of Jaffna. If, as Canagarajah claims, he attempted to “disentangle the conflicting strands in the classroom culture of marginalized students . . . in order to fashion a pedagogy that is ideologically liberating as well as educationally meaningful” (p. 625), he succeeds in neither.
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**The Author Responds . . .**

A. SURESH CANAGARAJAH  
*University of Jaffna*

I thank Braine for providing readers more information on the Sri Lankan scene (although at a second remove—from news reports, jour-
nals, and so forth rather than from direct observation), which I could not have described at such length given the focus of my paper on the classroom. There is, however, something ironic about expatriate scholars like Braine living outside Sri Lanka for years safely detached from the violence and chaos attempting to speak as authorities on the situation prevailing there, often contradicting the views of those living in Sri Lanka. Because Braine is suggesting that my presentation of the Sri Lankan scene is one sided (i.e., too negative), I must point out that within the scope of my study I do show the complexities—the frustration from the violence on the one side yet the determination of the students who trek jungles to come to classes on the other. It is such factors that cause the ambiguities I address in the paper. Furthermore, the political repression Braine describes is also more complex: Though certain liberated zones of Jaffna do come under the rule of the rebels, the university, which is funded and administered by the Sri Lankan government, faces little intrusion into curricular matters from the Tamil fighters. The challenge for the people is precisely that they have to live under two regimes—one de jure, the other de facto—which can be more complicated than living under a single totalitarian regime. (If Braine is interested in a broader description of the sociolinguistic life in Jaffna he should look elsewhere, e.g., Canagarajah, in press.)

Braine describes the “unusual nature of the research site and subjects” in order to argue that it will affect the generalizability of the study. Quoting a statement to this effect from Composition Research: Empirical Designs, he applies it to all ethnographic research. But ethnography has an unashamed commitment to the local, idiosyncratic, and unique, which tend to get filtered out in most quantitative studies. I would in fact go further than Braine in pointing out other features in my own (and any other) ethnographic study that make the research context unique. For instance, the mere presence of the observer/researcher is enough to alter the context and the relationships between subjects. A class with me is not the same as one without me—or with some other teacher/researcher. (This is why I discuss my own subject positions in the paper.) Furthermore, like the proverbial river into which you cannot step twice, the context of the study never remains the same: The Lankan ESL classroom I researched in 1991 is different from other Lankan classrooms the following (or preceding) years. But this notion of the ethnographic present does not mean that ethnography is unconcerned about relating its findings to other settings and subjects. At greater levels of generality (or higher levels of abstraction) one can always find avenues for making connections. In my article I make numerous connections with empirical studies of those like Ogbu...
(1985), Weis (1985), and Willis (1977), who identify similar ambiguities in other minority students, and the theoretical positions of Bourdieu and Passeron (1977), Freire (1970), and Giroux (1983), which relate to my findings. My specific story on the Jaffna situation is part of the general story of ESL, comparing and contrasting in insightful ways. However, theory building or hypothesis generation should proceed from the bottom up—for which enterprise ethnographic studies have much to contribute. Watson-Gegeo’s (1988) advice to potential ESOL ethnographers is useful to remember:

The ethnographer first seeks to build a theory of the setting under study, then to extrapolate or generalize from that setting or situation to others studied in a similar way . . . . [It] must be recognized that direct comparison of the details of two or more settings is usually not possible. Comparison is possible at a more abstract level, however. (p. 581)

Braine also wonders why I used a U.S. textbook when I knew the shortcomings and had alternative Sri Lankan texts to choose from. First, my study is not an experimental one that tries out new approaches or material but a naturalistic study on the typical Lankan classroom with the usual institutional and social constraints. I must stress that the Lankan ESL teaching situation is still heavily dependent on Western agencies for expertise, methods, material, and teacher development. In fact, each year a U.S. ESL consultant has to tour all the universities in the country to provide curricular advice, teacher training, and policy recommendations. Some years back a consultant specifically provided advice on how to use American Kernel Lessons (AKL), which had been supplied to all the universities and was widely used. Obviously, it is hard to resist such well-intentioned help, especially when it is officially sponsored by the Lankan Ministry of Higher Education and the Committee of the English Language Teaching Units (ELTUS) of all the universities.

Regarding alternatives, I think Braine underestimates the global hegemony of the Western publishing industry and academia. Although Sri Lankan textbooks are available, such as the textbooks currently published by the government for secondary schools, they are devised with considerable input from Western consultants. These texts are devised according to the latest task-oriented methods, but local teachers and students use them in a product-oriented manner (a matter that is commonly observed and needs further study). There is also a considerable difference between the textbooks printed at home and those printed abroad, which the students themselves realize and have re-
corded in my interviews with them. Because Sri Lanka lacks the infrastructure for such purposes, Sri Lankan textbooks lack color, attractiveness, and sophistication. They are printed on low-quality paper. They are also few in number, inadequate for all students. When I asked students for their choice of textbooks, most of them quite surprisingly preferred the U.S. textbooks to the local because they considered the former more interesting, attractive, sophisticated, impressive, and so forth. These features have implications for the affective dimension of language learning that cannot be ignored. Furthermore, the heads of the ELTUs are not always free to introduce their favorite texts. The university faculty, which must approve any changes in the curriculum, and the English instructors are considerably influenced by the Western scholarship and training they have undergone; therefore they do not always see the efficacy of anything local. Part of the Sri Lankan ideological subjection is the perception that anything local is inferior to the foreign/Western. For this reason more research is needed into the consequences of such teaching approaches and material in order to argue more authoritatively and persuasively for change. (For a more detailed discussion on how Western cultural agencies, experts, teaching material, and pedagogical approaches contribute to the linguistic imperialism of the English language in the periphery countries, see Phillipson, 1992.)

Braine further inquires why a needs assessment was not made. He forgets that my study performs this very function. It is an extended needs assessment conducted to understand in empirical terms students’ attitudes and motivation, which had previously been discussed vaguely or impressionistically. More systematic studies of this nature are needed to build a stock of local knowledge that will enable local teachers and researchers to provide a constructive alternative to the Western dominance in scholarship and research on ESOL. It has to be accepted that a reliable body of scholarship on the Sri Lankan ESL scene conducted by Lankan teachers/researchers themselves still does not exist.

Braine goes on to question the interpretation of students’ absenteeism and glossing as “oppositional response.” He would rather explain this as caused by “plain boredom or frustration.” I am reminded here of Giroux’s (1983) observation that mundane classroom happenings like the above take new meaning in the light of a new interpretative paradigm (or discourse) like critical pedagogy. Whether an act should be perceived as ideological opposition, social conditioning, cultural deviance, or cognitive deficiency depends a lot on the theoretical discourses brought into play. What Braine considers as “plain boredom or frustration” are not necessarily alternatives to my explanation but can be evidence for it; that is, boredom and frustration are possible oppositional responses to ideological domination.
But I call this opposition and not resistance in my article because I acknowledge that in the larger context of students’ culture their behavior is mixed with other attitudes that are positive toward the course and accommodative to the foreign cultural values. Grappling with this ambivalence is the thrust of my paper. Braine prefers to simply hold on to one side of the tension: He argues that “ESOL is popular in the country” by observing evidence that supports this position. But he acknowledges in other places that there could be “boredom and frustration” and that students do run away from university classrooms to private tutories. It is more challenging to keep both kinds of evidence and generate more illuminating hypotheses to explain this complexity. There is definitely scope for other explanations, and I welcome them as such ambivalence seems to characterize many other nonmainstream student populations (see Ogbu, 1985; Weis, 1985; Willis, 1977), including the African American students I observed in previous research (Canagarajah, 1990). This ambivalence might very well emerge as a crucial element in the attitudes of minority students that teachers might have to account for in order to teach effectively. A constructive contribution to ESOL would be to provide more complex explanations to such ambiguities and tensions in language teaching for linguistic minorities, rather than simplifying the problem by unconditionally upholding one position and sweeping aside everything else.
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Comments on Sarah Benesch’s “ESL, Ideology, and the Politics of Pragmatism”

A Reader Reacts . . .

DESMOND ALLISON
The University of Hong Kong

Sarah Benesch in her contribution to The Forum (Vol. 27, No. 4) criticises the accommodationist politics that she associates with “apparently neutral pragmatism in English for academic purposes” (p. 705) and offers “another challenge to the notion that ideology is avoidable in L2 education” (p. 710). This paper offers a response to Benesch’s comments and her charge that pragmatism in English for academic purposes (EAP) “indicates an accommodationist ideology, an endorsement of traditional academic teaching and of current power relations in academia and in society” (p. 711).

To take up this challenge is to acknowledge the increasing power of a currently influential academic discourse concerning ideology. I will refer to this discourse as ideologist discourse and argue that it assumes a particular ideological stance incorporating a priori judgements about the ideological natures of other discourses and discourse communities. Ideologist discourse is consequently metaideological. As a pragmatically inclined EAP practitioner, I choose to resist what I see as a current bid on the part of ideologist discourse to invade EAP discourse. I cannot therefore ignore that bid, nor can I afford to debate extensively on ideologist terrain as such participation already entails acceptance of a metaideological agenda.

I should state that my EAP experience has been mainly in African and Asian contexts rather than in the North American or British universities that have provided Benesch with her own immediate context of analysis. The questions that Benesch raises about pragmatism in EAP, however, reverberate far beyond one context alone. The international professional literature in EAP is still dominated by academic discussions that are largely framed and conducted in predominantly English-speaking settings and by native speakers of English (a group to which I too belong). Such dominance is characteristic of the periodical literature in many disciplines; ideological implications of this phenomenon are pointed out in the EAP literature by Swales (1985).

I shall present some evidence suggesting that EAP practitioners and writers do discuss ideological concerns and conflicts of value in international forums and that aspects of traditional academic teaching and current power relations are often called into question in the EAP
literature. I do not deny the existence of accommodationist thinking within EAP (it can be found in any discourse, paradoxically even in ideologist discourse); nor do I dispute the merits of warning against concealed ideological agendas. Benesch’s contribution in these respects is to be welcomed. I do, however, contest and reject the ideologist position that accommodationist thinking and agendas, and avoidance of ideological issues, can reasonably be attributed to all pragmatically inclined individuals and groups whose values and commitments lead them to give precedence to issues other than what Benesch terms “the question of ideology” itself (p. 710).

**IDEOLOGIST DISCOURSE AND COLONISATION**

Before resisting an ideologist move into EAP, I need to characterise the standpoint of what I am calling ideologist discourse and to suggest how this discourse operates. According to Kress (1989),

> A discourse colonises the social world imperialistically, from the point of view of one institution (p. 7) . . . . Discourses strive towards total and encompassing accounts in which contradictions are resolved, or at least suppressed. (p. 11)

Kress’s comments offer a vivid account of what discourses are, do, and seek. His account is presented in terms and metaphors that I shall take as representative of ideologist discourse, and it conveys the assumption that any discourse seeks to eliminate differences.

Scholars who set out to define and characterise the institutions or communities that compose discourses, or that are composed by discourses, can indeed find it difficult to incorporate diversity of viewpoints into an account of one community. If conflicts in views and values run sufficiently deep, this can imply the existence of separate discourses and discourse communities also. In working toward explicit and pragmatically motivated accounts of two key terms, *discourse community* and *genre*, Swales (1990) excludes differing ideological perspectives from his criteria for these definitional purposes (a procedure that, pace Benesch, does not carry the implication that ideology is avoidable in L2 education). To follow Kress, rather than Swales, in portraying any articulation of broadly shared interests and values that define discourse communities as an imperialistic colonisation of “the social world” by “institutions” pursuing “total and encompassing accounts” of reality or truth, is to make a particular set of ideological choices about discourses and discourse communities, the set that characterises ideologist discourse. These choices appear to describe quite
well the colonizing tendencies that are inherent in ideologist discourse itself.

Colonizing steps associated with ideologist discourse can now be presented in outline as follows:

1. Discourse in general, and discourse X in particular, is ideologically driven but is not usually recognised to be so within a discourse community, including community X.
2. All discourse communities, including X, aspire to monolithic accounts that eliminate differences.
3. Discourse communities, including X, consequently disguise the importance of ideology when they do not simply overlook it.
4. Discourse communities, including X, thereby support the status quo (which exists as a fixed set of the beliefs and power relations that currently prevail).

**EAP AND RESISTANCE**

If what I have presented as the colonizing steps of ideologist discourse are interpreted more cautiously, as warnings against complacency rather than as a priori accounts of what other discourses have become, negotiations across discourse frontiers may become easier. I believe this is a worthwhile goal, not least because ideological issues and concerns are too important to be left safely to the exclusive attentions of current ideologist discourse. However, the immediate colonizing incursion of that discourse into EAP discourse first remains to be countered.

With enough time and space, one could demonstrate beyond reasonable doubt that the EAP literature frequently raises ideological issues, does so overtly, discusses these differences rather than disguising them, and challenges many aspects and perceptions of the status quo in education and beyond. Among the issues much debated in EAP (and in English for specific purposes, ESP) are communicative language teaching and what it can mean for goals, approaches, and outcomes; evaluation of language teaching and learning; teacher-centred and learner-centred methodologies; teachers’ goals, learners’ goals and negotiated curricula; general-purpose and specific-purpose content in EAP teaching and learning; comprehension teaching, divergent interpretations of texts, and selection of texts for EAP/ESP classes; validation issues and other ethical issues in language testing; contributions and expectations of native-speaker and nonnative-speaker teachers; the place and claims of empirical, ethnographic, quantitative, qualitative, participatory, and action research perspectives in EAP; EAP
and subject disciplines; and local cultures and EAP. A fuller reply could document the above and other issues and would thereby show that many EAP discussants—not all of whom can then be conveniently identified with a new wave of critical EAP ideologists—have recognised the importance of value judgments on ideological matters in their debates.

Such a demonstration would be relevant, given that an ideologist construction of EAP seeks to downplay or disguise the debates and differences that occur within EAP pragmatist discourse. Consider, in this light, Benesch’s charge that EAP pragmatists locate authenticity solely in academic structures, a charge that conveniently ignores all EAP discussion of authenticity in terms of learner response. Yet this line of defence may still miss the main ideologist attack. It always remains open to ideologist discourse to trivialise the importance of debates within another discourse, claiming that these merely distract attention from fundamental questions about education or society that the other discourse fails to examine, thereby reinforcing an accommodationist ideology. This charge also forms part of Benesch’s critique of pragmatists in EAP.

On reading Benesch’s remarkable claim that the politics of pragmatism in EAP “leads to a neglect of more inclusive and democratic practices, such as negotiating the curriculum and collaborative learning because these are rarely practiced in non-ESL classes” (pp. 713–714), I was unsure where to begin. Does Benesch imply that negotiated curricula and collaborative learning are neglected in EAP itself? This is not the case in the (admittedly different) working contexts known to me or in a great deal of EAP literature. Or is the point that work initiated in the EAP curriculum does not really count against her charge? If so, why not? Is that curriculum not already part of an educational and social world? Why are concerns about power, responsibility, and participation in EAP classes not to be accepted as evidence of an overt awareness of the ideological in EAP and in L2 education? Is it, perhaps, because these are simply not the correct ideological questions, presupposing and challenging a greater educational and social monolith, that the colonizing discourse of a contemporary metaknowledge would dictate to us?

Any challenge to the significance of existing ideological preoccupations in EAP is precisely where stronger resistance is needed. Some EAP/ESP writers have documented processes of interdepartmental negotiation and dialogue undertaken by EAP and ESP units in developing their syllabuses, pointing to hidden agendas and awareness-raising implications of these negotiations for wider educational practices (see Barron, 1992, for discussion and an extensive bibliography). Others will point back to the EAP classroom in its own right. A lack
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of interest in what takes place within EAP classrooms is, after all, a response reminiscent of a very traditional conception of academic power relations, constructed within an elitist discourse that many EAP practitioners continue to contest. Concerns over roles and responsibilities of EAP teachers and learners in respect of what is learned, what texts are used, what activities are undertaken, or why and how assessment is carried out are not simply to be dismissed as trivial or myopic on self-evident grounds. An EAP classroom is part of an educational and social world, and it can offer a significant point of departure for learners’ own explorations and experiences of other issues. Perhaps explorations of the choices, conflicts, and cooperative tendencies in EAP classes could offer a basis for dialogue with those who are urging greater attention to relations of power and authority in society at large, if we all keep in mind that what counts as ideologically fundamental ought not to be uncritically given and accepted on any terms, including those of ideologist discourse.

Benesch and Swales (1990) appear to agree that EAP is typically marginalised within academia and that such a precarious and overly dependent condition should be resisted. In their own ways, both writers warn EAP practitioners against becoming too immersed in immediate practicalities, accepting their own marginalisation, and losing sight of fundamental questions about the role of language in the social construction (and the reconstruction) of knowledge and of power relations. These important and valuable warnings offer another basis for dialogue. Yet such messages also incur the danger of reinforcing the very marginalisation with which they are concerned. It does not require a particularly critical reading of Benesch’s closing remarks about critical EAP, for instance, to identify lexical choices that place EAP researchers, and by implication EAP teachers, in the familiar (but contested) marginalised position of worthy worker bees within academia (“an admirable devotion,” “carefully study,” “good intentions and hard work,” p. 773). Such condescension only reinforces existing academic power relations and is more likely to alienate EAP practitioners than to recruit them to some greater cause.

CONCLUSION

Whatever the limits of their interests in metaideological issues, pragmatically inclined EAP writers have not avoided ideologically laden debates and conflicts in order to fabricate some monolithic and all-encompassing account of the way things must remain in EAP and all education. Approaches to teaching/learning situations and issues will certainly operate at times within informally held assumptions about the way things are (for instance, about the reality of an external world
or about the likelihood that, despite well-known limitations, lecturing to large audiences will continue in some form in given situations). This does not suffice to convict EAP discourse of an accommodationist ideology that attempts to fit students without question into an unevolving and unchallengeable status quo. Perhaps the onus should be placed on ideologist discourse to justify, rather than assuming as given, the unreflecting orthodoxy that it imputes to EAP and other fields; ideological issues could then more readily be discussed through diplomatic discourse channels rather than provoking confrontational skirmishes or full battle. For what the gesture may be worth, let me in closing gladly concede that, in charging an ideologist discourse with imposing its a priori constructs upon EAP and the politics of pragmatism, my response to Benesch’s article has similarly mythologised ideologist discourse itself.
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The Author Responds . . .

SARAH BENESCH
College of Staten Island, The City University of New York

■ “ESL, Ideology, and the Politics of Pragmatism” was a response to Santos’s “Ideology in Composition: L1 and ESL,” the lead article in the premier issue of the *Journal of Second Language Writing (JSLW)* and winner of the JSLW Award for the best article published in that journal in 1992. I responded to Santos because her article seemed to be based on a false premise: L1 composition research is ideological whereas L2 composition research is not. I wanted to show that all composition research and teaching is ideological whether or not the politics are acknowledged, a point made by other L1 and L2 authors whose work I cited. My goal was to encourage further dialogue about the sociopolitical context of ESL composition, especially in English for academic purposes (EAP) settings. I did this by giving examples of L2 researchers
who openly discuss ideology, as well as L2 research whose ideology has not been explored, such as EAP.

In his response, Allison characterizes my discourse as “ideologist,” a label that circumvents discussion about the politics of EAP, including the following issues: the relationship between EAP and content teachers, a critical orientation to academic subject matter, the role of personal narrative in higher education, and the potential impact of non-native speakers’ (NNS) cultures and languages on college curricula. Although I agree with Allison that some of these issues have been raised in the EAP literature, they have not been treated as political issues, that is, as issues involving power relations within and outside the academy. Those who ignore questions of power participate in maintaining the low status of ESL students and faculty in higher education (Canagarajah, 1993; Pennycook, 1989).

Allison mentions my concern about the marginalized status of ESL on North American and British campuses. However, in his response it appears as a tangential issue whereas in my article it is the central question for EAP. That is, how can we develop collaborative and reciprocal relationships with our colleagues in other departments that challenge the traditional hierarchy of language as skills and content as information? How can EAP provide a critical perspective that balances the material and pedagogy of content courses rather than simply serving them? How do we make connections between students’ lives and academic subject matter across the disciplines to raise the profile of NNSs on college campuses? These are the questions that interest me, and I hope that other EAP teacher/researchers will also find them interesting.
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Teaching Issues

The TESOL Quarterly publishes brief commentaries on aspects of English language teaching. For this issue, we asked two educators to discuss what ESL teachers should know about the current debate on mother tongue maintenance.

Edited by BONNY NORTON PEIRCE
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education

624 TESOL QUARTERLY
What are linguistic human rights?

In a civilized state, there should be no need to debate the right to maintain and develop the mother tongue. It is a self-evident, fundamental linguistic human right (see the articles in Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson, 1994). Observing linguistic human rights (LHRs) implies, at an individual level, that all people can identify positively with their mother tongue and have that identification accepted and respected by others whether their mother tongue is a minority language or a majority language. It means the right to learn the mother tongue, orally and in writing, including at least basic education through the medium of the mother tongue, and to use it in many official contexts. It also means the right to learn at least one of the official languages in the country of residence. It should therefore be normal that teachers (including ESL teachers) are bilingual. Restrictions on these rights may be considered an infringement of fundamental LHRs.

Observing LHRs implies at a collective level the right of minority groups to exist (i.e., the right to be different) and the right to enjoy and to develop their languages. It implies the right of minority groups to establish and maintain schools and other training and educational institutions, with control of curricula and teaching in their own languages. It also involves guarantees of representation in the political affairs of the state and the granting of autonomy to administer matters internal to the groups, at least in the fields of culture, education, religion, information, and social affairs, with the financial means, through taxation or grants, to fulfill these functions.

LINGUISTIC HUMAN RIGHTS AND EDUCATION

One of the basic human rights of persons belonging to minorities is—or should be—to achieve high levels of bi- or multilingualism through education. Becoming at least bilingual is in most cases a necessary prerequisite for minorities to exercise other fundamental human rights. Because every child in a school has the right to be able to talk to an adult with the same native language, teachers should be bi- or multilingual. In this way, the teachers can be good models for the
children and support them in language learning by comparing and contrasting and being metalinguistically aware.

This demand is often experienced as extremely threatening by majority-group teachers, many of whom are not bilingual. Of course, all minority-group teachers are not high-level bilingual either. But it is often less important for the teacher’s competence in a majority language to be at an advanced level. In relation to pronunciation, for example, all children have ample opportunities to hear and read native models of a majority language outside the classroom whereas many of them do not have the same opportunities to hear or read native minority language models. High levels of competence in a minority language are thus more important for a teacher than high levels of competence in a majority language.

If all education were to adhere to principles honoring LHRs, high levels of multilingualism would most likely follow for both minorities and majorities. But today the education of both majorities and minorities in most European and Europeanized countries (including the U.S.) functions against most educationally sound principles promoting multilingualism (see, e.g., the references cited in Skutnabb-Kangas, in press-a, in press-b, in press-c). Education participates in attempting and committing linguistic genocide in relation to minorities (see Capotorti, 1979, for the United Nations’ definition of cultural genocide). In relation to linguistic majorities, current educational policies often limit their access to high levels of multilingualism (see Skutnabb-Kangas, 1994). Present reductionist educational policies do not support the diversity that is necessary for our planet to have a future.

LINGUISTIC HUMAN RIGHTS IN PRACTICE: GENERAL PRINCIPLES

I have drawn conclusions about general principles followed to a large extent in many experiments with positive results (i.e., high levels of bi- or multilingualism, a fair chance of success in relation to school achievement, and positive intercultural attitudes; see Skutnabb-Kangas, 1994). These have been formulated as eight recommendations:

1. The main medium of education, at least during the first 8 years, should be the language least likely to develop to a high formal level. For all minority children, this language is their mother tongue. Majority children can be taught through the medium of a minority language.

2. Children should initially be grouped with children having the same L1. Mixed groups are not positive initially and certainly not in cognitively demanding, decontextualized subjects.
3. All children, not only minority children, are to become high-level bilingual.

4. All children have to be equalized vis-à-vis their knowledge of the language of instruction and the status of their mother tongue. Nice phrases about the worth of everybody’s mother tongue and the value of interculturalism do not help unless they are followed up by changes in how the schools are organized.

5. All teachers have to be bi- or multilingual.

6. Foreign languages should be taught through the medium of the children’s mother tongue and/or by teachers who know the children’s mother tongue.

7. All children must study both the L1 and the L2 as compulsory subjects through Grades 1–12. Both languages have to be studied in ways that reflect what they are for the children: mother tongues or second or foreign languages.

8. Both languages have to be used as media of education in some phase of the children’s education, but the progression seems to be different for minority and majority children. For majority children the mother tongue must function as the medium of education at least in some cognitively demanding, decontextualized subjects, at least in Grades 8–12 and possibly even earlier. Majority children can be taught through the medium of an L2 at least in some (or even all or almost all) cognitively less demanding, context-embedded subjects, at least in Grades 8–12. For minority children the mother tongue must function as the medium of education in all subjects initially. At least some subjects must be taught through the L1 up to Grade 12, but these subjects may vary. The following development seems to function well: (a) transfer from the known to the unknown, (b) transfer from teaching in a language to teaching through the medium of that language, and (c) transfer from teaching through the medium of an L2 in cognitively less demanding, context-embedded subjects to teaching through the medium of L2 in cognitively demanding, decontextualized subjects.

Education that does not follow these principles does not respect LHRs. Well-intentioned, nice teachers participate every day in committing linguistic genocide and reducing the world’s linguistic and cultural diversity without being aware of it and without wanting to. It might be good to stop and think how and why.

THE AUTHOR

Tove Skutnabb-Kangas has worked in the areas of bilingualism, minority education, minority women and power, ethnic identity, integration, racism, linguistic
imperialism, and linguistic human rights and has published some 300 scientific articles and 20 books.
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Mother Tongue Maintenance and Multiculturalism

KAMAL K. SRIDHAR
State University of New York, Stony Brook

Most people would agree that, ideally speaking, all children have the right to speak their mother tongue and be educated through the mother tongue, and that every language deserves to be maintained. Language use in all domains (home, education, workplace, religion, etc.) ensures maintenance. Also, several studies have pointed out the benefits of learning through the mother tongue (see Annamalai, 1980; Grosjean, 1982; Hakuta, 1986). The benefits of learning through the mother tongue were recognized as early as 1957 in the UNESCO declaration, which explicitly stated the right of every child to be educated through the mother tongue. Although the importance of educating through the mother tongue and thereby maintaining it is accepted in principle, many practical issues have made the task somewhat difficult.

The issue of maintenance arises primarily with children who belong to minority language groups. Some minority languages have very few speakers scattered over geographical boundaries. A large number do not have a script. Many lack printed materials; still others lack literary traditions. Often these minority languages are spoken in third world countries where other pressing demands (such as food, clothing, and housing) must take priority over safeguarding and developing minority
languages. Further, different minority language groups have different attitudes toward their native language. Some have a strong attachment to their language and view it as a symbol of their identity, whereas others view it as a language of minimum utility (Sridhar, 1989). It is in such contexts that the maintenance of minority languages as mother tongues becomes difficult. Here I limit my discussion to practical problems that result from linguistic complexity and research findings from studies of language maintenance among ethnolinguistic minorities (i.e., those minorities who are facing problems with maintenance as migrants within their own home country as well as those who have immigrated to countries in Europe and to the U.S.).

In terms of linguistic complexity, a substantial proportion of the children in the world are growing up in countries where a large number of languages are spoken. The population of most countries includes one or several minorities. For example, in Papua New Guinea, arguably the linguistically most complex country in the world, more than 750 languages are spoken by a population of just over 3 million. Similar situations exist in other countries (e.g., Nigeria and the Philippines). To illustrate the problems linguistically complex nations face in trying to educate the masses in their mother tongue, I use an example from a country I am familiar with, India. According to the 1981 census, approximately 400 languages are spoken (Krishnamurthi, 1989). Out of these, only 58 languages are taught as subjects or used as media of instruction (Chaturvedi & Singh, 1981). The recently amended VIIIth Schedule of the Indian Constitution recognizes 17 languages, including Hindi (the official language) and English (the associate official language). The language policy in education mandates that every schoolchild learn three languages—the mother tongue (or the regional language), Hindi, and English. Most of the minority languages have no script, have small numbers of speakers, and are often distributed across state lines, thereby precluding political clout or official recognition. For these reasons, parents fear that their children will suffer (economically) if they do not learn the official language(s) of the country or the region. Minority languages are often thus sacrificed in favor of learning more “useful,” “powerful,” “prestigious” languages (Sridhar, 1989). This seems to be happening to the more than 300-year-old Marathi community in Tamil Nadu, South India. The language that has survived so long is now slowly being replaced by the regional language, Tamil. More and more Tamil words are being absorbed into Marathi. Soon Tamil will replace Marathi even in the home domain (Sridhar, 1994). These attitudes reflect the changing values of a rapidly industrializing society, such as India, where the culturally driven maintenance patterns are giving way to the economically driven shift patterns.
Research in language maintenance shows repeatedly that minority languages become extinct when communities come under the economic/political influence of a more dominant language. In such cases, people choose to switch to a language that is considered more powerful and prestigious and that will help them with upward mobility. Sometimes even languages with literary traditions meet the same fate, as in the case of Gothic and Hittite, which have extensive written materials from earlier periods but are classified as dead languages today. Similar was the fate of immigrant languages in the U.S. (Fishman, Nahirny, Hoffman, & Hayde, 1966; Veltman, 1983). Recently, young generations in search of their roots are showing an interest in reviving these languages (Cordasco, 1975; Fishman, Gertner, Lowry, & Milan, 1985). Studies of language maintenance among newer immigrant groups in Europe (Fase, Jaspaert, & Kroon, 1992) and the U.S. (Conklin & Lourie, 1983; Garcia & Fishman, in press; McKay & Wong, 1988) present a somewhat different picture. If they live in an environment where ethnic consciousness, pride, and multiculturalism are debated, will their patterns of maintenance be any different? In my own studies of language maintenance among speakers of Asian Indian languages in the U.S. (Kannada, Gujarati, and Malayalam), the majority of the children tend to bilingual, though more dominant in English (Sridhar, 1988, 1993). Selective adaptation and accommodation without assimilation, used by Gibson (1988) in describing the second- and third-generation Pujabi-Americans in Valleyside, California, seem to be appropriate here also.

A review of case studies of language maintenance and shift reveals that two types of forces are at play in the dialectic of preservation or loss. One is the obvious force of sociopolitical and economic power. The other, less recognized, perhaps because less powerful, force is that of a group’s commitment to preserving its ethnocultural identity and values. As long as language policy is purely market driven, weaker languages will be swallowed by the dominant ones. However, as the Indian case studies show, minority languages can survive and thrive even in economically weaker situations if the society as a whole respects, not just tolerates, differences. In short, the only hope for the survival of a linguistic or cultural minority is a genuine, positive commitment to multiculturalism.
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Kamal K. Sridhar is Associate Professor of Linguistics and Director of ESL at the State University of New York, Stony Brook. She has published extensively on Indian bilingualism as well as on nonnative varieties of English, language maintenance and/or shift, code mixing and code switching, and topics related to societal multilingualism.
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Erratum

In Thomas Ricento’s review of Linguistic Imperialism by Robert Phillipson (Vol. 27, No. 6), line 6 of page 421 should read “the English language teaching (ELT) profession” rather than “the English language training (ELT) profession” and line 9 should read “to a world order” rather than “to world order.”

We apologize for these errors.
RUSSIAN TEACHING ASSISTANTS PROGRAM

CALL FOR TWO- AND FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES TO RECEIVE TEACHING ASSISTANTS FROM RUSSIA

Accredited U.S. universities and colleges (including community and technical) are invited to apply to host instructors from Russia for six- to eight-month programs under the auspices of the Russian Teaching Assistants Program (RTAP), funded under the Freedom Support Act. RTAP is a new program initiated by the United States Information Agency (USIA) and administered by the International Research & Exchanges Board (IREX).

RTAP will bring up to 40 instructors from Russia to the United States in January 1995 to serve as teaching assistants for six-to eight-month programs. Participants will be graduates of pedagogical institutes and universities, primarily in the field of English as a foreign language. Departments where teaching assistants may serve include, but are not limited to, Education, ESL and Russian Area Studies. Participants may also be utilized as resource persons or guest lecturers in courses related to Russian society and culture, history, sociology, international relations and political science or via other innovative formats.

In addition to serving as teaching assistants at the host institutions, RTAP participants will enroll in two or three courses for creditor non-credit.

RTAP participants will receive USIA funding for international travel, domestic transportation to the U.S. host institution, modest monthly stipends, and medical insurance. US. institutions are required to provide cost-sharing in the form of tuition and fee waivers, as well as housing expenses.

Interested institutions should contact IREX for an application packet. Final proposals must be received by IREX no later than 5PM Friday October 7, 1994. Applicants will be notified in writing of the results of the review process in November.

International Research & Exchanges Board
1616 H Street, NW | Washington, DC 20006
Tel: (202) 628-8188 | Fax: (202) 628-8189
E-Mail: irex@gwuvm.gwu.edu
Focus on the Language Classroom: An Introduction to Classroom Research for Language Teachers.

Classrooms have seldom been considered potential contexts for inquiry. Many investigations are restricted to observed studies that record the pedagogical transactions in the classroom, judge the effectiveness of teaching/learning on the basis of data collected, and extrapolate the data to defend or disprove the theory or hypothesis being tested. However, teachers in general are sceptical about the applicability of such research findings, resulting in a wide chasm between teaching and research. It is therefore increasingly acknowledged that teachers should be encouraged to undertake their own reflective research in their classroom contexts. It is against this backdrop of current thinking about teacher education that I approach this review.

The book, “written specifically for language teachers” (p. xiv), aims at (a) bringing language classroom research to the attention of teachers of English, (b) exploring the implications of classroom research findings and procedures for language teaching, and (c) encouraging and helping teachers to become explorers themselves. In spirit, the book runs parallel to that of van Lier (1988).

It has six parts, each comprising two chapters except Part 6. The first part (Chapters 1–2) gives an overview of the “chequered history” (p. 2) of classroom research and the various changes it has gone through in the development of its concerns and research methods. It also asserts that what actually happens in the classroom, not what is planned, is crucial to language learning. A knowledge of the processes that govern what happens in the classroom, the authors claim, is imperative.

Exploring some of the major methodological issues that have domi-
nated classroom research to date, Part 2 (Chapters 3–4) highlights the problem of deciding what to investigate and the dynamic tension between theory-driven and data-driven ideas. It also looks into issues pertaining to the possible usefulness of quantitative and qualitative approaches for data collection and analysis.

Parts 3, 4, and 5, “the core of the volume” (p. xvii), deal with the findings of the major research projects carried out in the past two decades. Part 3 (Chapters 5–6) gives a great deal of background information related to the phenomenon of error in language learning and teachers’ reaction to it. Providing a plethora of practical suggestions for error treatment, it highlights that this issue lends itself particularly well to explorations by teachers themselves. Part 4 (Chapters 7–8) considers the important issues of input and interaction as they relate to classroom language learning and provides useful tips to teachers in matters of turn distribution, turn taking, and so on. Further, it brings out various aspects of classroom interaction—teacher talk, learning strategies, group work, and forced participation—with the caveat that “the increased breadth of coverage will compensate for the relative lack of depth in details” (p. 139). Part 5 (Chapters 9–10) outlines students’ receptivity (“not a common term in classroom research nor in language pedagogy,” p. 157) or lack of it to various aspects of classroom language learning. It reviews the literature on learners’ anxiety, competitiveness, motivation, and so on and discusses whether or not these issues matter in language learning. This hitherto neglected aspect of learner affect should provide a mine of information for teachers.

In Part 6, titled Epilogue, the authors provide a compendious account of what has been talked about in the previous parts, explain the notion of exploratory teaching, and exhort teachers to be researchers in their own classroom settings. Describing it “a little like anthropology” (p. 1) and “emit analysis vital to the ethnography” (p. 72), the authors explain that classroom research involves immediate practical problems facing teachers and learners (p. 37). Being a good teacher, the authors further observe, means being alive to what goes on in the “classroom moment by moment” (p. 194). Put differently, learner centeredness in the process of language learning/teaching assumes great significance. The authors caution that learners “have the power of veto over any of our [teachers’] attempts” (p. 19). The authors further remark, “only the learners can do the learning necessary to improve performance” (p. 99) and “it is the effort made by the learners to comprehend the input that fosters development” (p. 121). Teachers therefore are told that “to think that our learners really have nothing to do with their lives than to be our students” (p. 159) will be professionally disastrous.
The impact the book may have on the language teacher is difficult
to gauge. However, if one goes by the content, the book has met its
aim to pedagogically provoke the reader. Perhaps expecting anything
more from a single book “not intended to be a book of answers . . .
but . . . of explorations” (p. xviii) is unwarranted.

Designed in self-instructional patterns, the book’s refreshingly non-
technical approach distinguishes it from the rest in the field. Each
chapter ends with Discussion Starters, Practical Activities, and Sugges-
tions for Further Reading. The book, further, is replete with develop-
mental questions. Most of the subtitles are presented in this form.
Simple language and the conversational style of presentation, particu-
larly the use of personal pronouns, merit a mention here. And the
appendixes and bibliography provide useful information for teachers.

The book is well written and packed with practical suggestions for
teachers. However, as the authors agree, there is a “need for developing
further our rather embryonic classroom research” (p. 149) and a “need
for more replication studies to make more confident claims” (p. 183),
the research field being “still really in its infancy” (p. 2). Possession of
this book is imperative for any teacher in preparation, inservice
teacher, and teacher educator.
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**Joinfostering: Adapting Teaching Strategies for the**
**Multilingual Classroom.**

Joinfostering, according to Christian Faltis, “is the organization and
implementation of conditions to promote two-way communication and
social integration within the linguistically diverse all-English classroom”
(p. 1). One of the strengths of the book is that it provides a philosophi-
cally grounded framework for native-English-speaking teachers work-
ing in a multilingual classroom. The Faltis framework establishes the
need for (a) two-way communication, (b) social integration, (c) second
language acquisition (SLA) principles, and (d) parental participation
in all classrooms. Faltis does not question the superiority of primary
language teaching but recognizes the situation of many native-English-
speaking teachers. Many traditional classrooms are filled with nontradi-
tional students as the mainstream becomes multilingual. Faltis offers guidelines for modifying classrooms to provide access to curriculum for L2 students as well as improve social interaction for all students.

In *Joinfostering*, Faltis introduces teachers to cultural diversity in socialization practices while cautioning against the stereotyping of individuals. The book has seven chapters: the dynamics of change as English-only classrooms become multilingual (Chapter 1), a brief history of bilingual education and supporting theory (Chapter 2), the physical arrangement of a joinfostering classroom (Chapter 3), the integration of language and content (Chapter 4), the facilitation of communication within small groups (Chapter 5), a two-way parental involvement model (Chapter 6), and the relationship of joinfostering and empowerment (Chapter 7).

The rationale for the joinfostering classroom emanates from various research sources. The joinfostering classroom eliminates what Freire (1970) has referred to as the *banking concept* of education. Rather than have teachers persist in depositing knowledge in the minds of students, Faltis encourages his readers to actively setup classrooms that engage teachers and students in meaningful interactive discourse while promoting social interaction. This principle is also in keeping with the Vygotskyan (1978) concept of the social construction of knowledge within the zone of proximal development. In combining SLA principles with content instruction in an interactive setting, students generate their knowledge in the content areas as they become proficient in English.

The structure of the joinfostering classroom offered by Faltis reflects much of the framework for intervention posited by Cummins (1989) except in the utilization of the primary language of students in the classroom. However, the joinfostering classroom does value bilingualism, and Faltis encourages teachers to recognize the resources of their bilingual students, drawing on cultural experiences to facilitate learning. Faltis applies theory in practical examples of classroom interaction, placing major emphasis on balancing rights of participation so that students have the most opportunities to exchange and generate ideas and information. Following the framework of Cummins, joinfostering also encourages mainstream teachers to welcome and facilitate parental participation in school as well as the classroom. Faltis offers suggestions for including parents in the educational process so that the community begins to recognize the school as a valuable resource. In what follows we will expand on the Faltis framework.

**TWO-WAY COMMUNICATION**

According to Faltis, one way to effect meaningful and positive change is to promote two-way communication that balances the rights
of all students. The balance of rights recognizes the knowledge students bring with them to the classroom and promotes two-way communication between teacher and students. In the joint fostering classroom this means joint control of turn taking, topic selection, and opportunities to talk. It is the teacher’s responsibility to establish interactive exchanges for all students regardless of their level of English proficiency.

Au (1993) recognizes that the participation structure of the conventional recitation classroom does not allow for the norms and values of many ethnically diverse groups and is therefore an inappropriate structure for classrooms with a diverse student population. Utilizing the joint fostering principles in the classroom involves a change from the teacher-directed recitation classroom to one in which participation is more balanced. According to Faltis, the teacher must allow L2 learners the opportunity to participate in lessons to the fullest extent possible. The balance of rights encourages students to engage in a more natural form of communication than in the question-and-answer routine of the conventional classroom. Topic selection by students helps to ensure their interest and genuine purpose, which also encourages communication. Balance of rights in talk opportunity encourages all students to talk to each other in their own language in order to generate knowledge and make meaning of the curriculum.

SOCIAL INTEGRATION

In addition to balancing the rights of all students, Faltis states that joint fostering teachers guarantee collaboration and a shared discourse within the classroom. Small-group activities in which all students are able to share their thoughts in meaningful dialogue also facilitate the language acquisition process for L2 learners. As noted by Faltis, small-group activities are beneficial for language acquisition as they provide learners with an environment conducive to conversation, allowing for greater exposure to language used in context—if students have been prepared for collaborative work so that the exchange of ideas is more or less equal. Faltis cautions teachers to take time to develop positive interdependence among students so that small-group learning will improve the quality of interaction and learning in the classroom.

SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

In his text, Faltis provides an All-English Teachers Questionnaire (pp. 26–27) that can be used with preservice and inservice teachers. In our experience with this questionnaire, the overwhelming response of the participants has been frustration with their lack of knowledge.
of SLA principles. They realize the need to understand these principles but in many cases do not know where to turn for information.

Faltis includes research by Wong Fillmore (1982) indicating that native-English-speaking teachers in a linguistically diverse classroom tend to tailor their speech to students who readily understand the dominant classroom language. This practice favors those who have acquired more English while excluding those who are still in the acquisition phase. Research in SLA (Ellis, 1990; Faltis, 1990; Long, 1987; Scarcella, 1990) reveals that in virtually every case of successful SLA, learners had been exposed to regular and substantial amounts of modified language input and modified verbal interaction.

Extralinguistic support in content areas, where instruction usually relies more upon oral and written language to explain abstract concepts, facilitates language acquisition. Concepts may be made comprehensible by presenting them in context with support in three realms: (a) paraverbal, by changing the pace and emphasis of words; (b) nonverbal, using gestures and facial expressions; and (c) visual and sensory, utilizing visuals such as maps, diagrams, and timelines, as well as objects brought into the classroom.

PARENTAL PARTICIPATION

In a jointfostering classroom, it is the teacher’s responsibility to contact parents and to share information with them. Involving parents, especially non-English-speaking parents, and other family members in educational activities at home and in the school is no simple matter (p. 143). Teachers need to be aware of cultural diversity, which affects how families approach their role within the educational process. Faltis cites a broad range of research that demonstrates the high correlation between parent involvement and students’ academic achievement.

CONCLUSION

Jointfostering is a valuable resource for native-English-speaking teachers who want to provide equal access for L2 students and promote social interaction in the classroom. This resource would not be as effective for bilingual teachers who also bring primary language methods to a jointfostering classroom. It is unfortunate that Faltis did not include processes in which bilingual and monolingual English teachers can join together to foster a broader range of English and primary language methods. However, for English-speaking teachers who work with diverse communities of learners and who ask, “What can I do with my multilingual students?” Faltis provides a framework and multiple answers. New and experienced teachers alike have found in this book
theoretically grounded classroom approaches that they can implement upon reading the book. Fortunately for classroom teachers, Faltis lays the foundation for his joint fostering classroom through two-way communication, social integration, SLA, and parental participation within the Faltis framework.
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**Lexical Phrases and Language Teaching.**


■ Several publications in the past 15 years have highlighted the importance of formulaic language chunks (i.e., multiword phrases and routines treated as single lexical units) in both L1 and L2 use. Although these chunks are variously referred to by different authors as *gambits* (Keller, 1979), *conventionalized language forms* (Yorio, 1980), *lexical
phrases (Nattinger, 1980), conversational routines, prepatterned speech (Coulmas, 1981), lexicalized sentence stems (Pawley & Syder, 1983), partially pre-assembled patterns (Widdowson, 1989), or formulaic constructions (Pawley, 1992), all these authors agree that such chunks play a more significant role in language production than is normally acknowledged. Native speakers of a language are in command of thousands of language chunks and use them as building blocks in their speech. The retrieval of these chunks is cognitively relatively undemanding, which allows the speaker to attend to other aspects of communication and to plan larger pieces of discourse. L2 learners, on the other hand, often put sentences together from scratch, that is, word by word, which takes up their cognitive capacity and does not let them achieve nativelike fluency.

Given the assumed importance of formulaic language chunks, it is surprising that, until the recent publication of Nattinger and DeCarrico’s *Lexical Phrases and Language Teaching*, no comprehensive study had been written offering a systematic and empirically based analysis of the issue. Nattinger and DeCarrico’s high-quality work in *Lexical Phrases and Language Teaching*, coupled with the fact that it has filled such a noticeable and long-existing gap in applied linguistics, led to the books being awarded the Duke of Edinburgh Prize in 1992, the foremost British award in TESOL and applied linguistics.

*Lexical Phrases and Language Teaching* is a classic applied linguistic work as it contains (in Part 1) a thorough linguistic introduction to and analysis of the issue as well as (in Part 2) a detailed discussion of how the teaching of foreign/second languages can benefit from the theoretical insights. The authors base their arguments on a review of the existing literature, analysis of a broad corpus of spoken and written English, and their own experience in the teaching of lexis. They claim that formulaic speech is typical of every language, not just English, and convincingly demonstrate this in a 12-page appendix containing lists of lexical phrases in Chinese, Spanish, and Russian.

What are lexical phrases, the key units of Nattinger and DeCarrico’s analysis? According to the authors, they are

form/function composites, lexico-grammatical units that occupy a position somewhere between the traditional poles of lexicon and syntax: they are similar to lexicon in being treated as units, yet most of them consist of more than one word, and many of them can, at the same time, be derived from the regular rules of syntax, just like other sentences. Their use is governed by principles of pragmatic competence, which also select and assign particular functions to lexical phrase units. (p. 36)

A key element of the definition is that lexical phrases are different from idioms, clichés, and other types of collocations that are purely
lexical; they are “collocations . . . that have been assigned pragmatic functions” (p. 36). As we will see later, this distinction is a fruitful one.

Perhaps the most significant achievement of the book is that the authors go beyond talking about language chunks in general to provide a detailed categorization of them. In line with their conception of lexical phrases as form/function composites, they classify them according to their structural and functional dimensions. In Chapter 2, they posit four structurally different types of lexical phrase: (a) poly-words (short, invariable phrases that function very much like individual lexical items), (b) institutionalized expressions (canonical lexical phrases of sentence length, usually functioning as separate utterances), (c) phrasal constraints (short- to medium-length phrases that allow variation of lexical and phrasal categories), and (d) sentence buddies (often discontinuous lexical phrases that provide the framework for whole sentences, containing slots for parameters or arguments, allowing considerable variation). The authors do emphasize, however, that “there is no sharp boundary separating these categories, but rather the differences among them are frequently ones of degree rather than kind” (p. 46).

In terms of their functional roles (Chapters 3–4), lexical phrases are discussed under three categories: (a) social interactions (e.g., conversational maintenance such as parting and conversational functions such as complimenting), (b) necessary topics (e.g. autobiography, weather, quantity), and (c) discourse devices (e.g. temporal connectors, relators, summarizers). These categories are compatible with the traditional notional-functional basis of communicative language teaching as well as with the concepts of oral discourse theory; thus lexical phrases provide an interface between more linguistic and more pragmatic/communicative approaches to language analysis and instruction. Furthermore, the composite nature of lexical phrases allows them to be integrated into various directions of linguistic research as units of measure, for example, discourse analysis, communicative competence research, language acquisition, and lexicography.

The usefulness of lexical phrases as basic language units is further evidenced in Part 2 of the book, which is devoted to implications for language teaching. In three chapters, the authors discuss how to use lexical phrases for the teaching of spoken discourse (conversational skills and listening comprehension: Chapters 5 and 6) and written discourse (reading and writing: Chapter 7). These sections provide both practical suggestions and food for thought for practitioners; they also outline a potential shift in language-teaching methodology toward a more lexically based approach. Indeed, there have been recent indications in EFL/ESL methodology that this shift is more than a mere theoretical possibility (Lewis, 1993).

The last chapter of the book (Chapter 8) explores fields in which
researchers have already started to employ units of measure that resemble lexical phrases and outlines necessary areas for further research. An important issue to be investigated in more detail is the fact that many lexical phrases are subject to unique syntactic and sociolinguistic restrictions and constraints. The result is that many grammatical sentences generated by language learners sound unnatural and foreign, a point also highlighted by Pawley and Syder (1983). Further research is needed to map the particular grammars of lexical phrases and, based on this, to refine the formal and functional categories. This issue is closely related to the question of how to conceive of a dictionary that would contain the whole range of lexical phrases with their individual grammars.

Lexical Phrases and Language Teaching is an important book that is likely to be extensively quoted in the future. It is a long-overdue summary of an issue that has been gaining increasing importance and that is potentially central to future developments in applied linguistics. The richness of the data the book contains, the original insights the authors make, and the systematic approach they follow make Lexical Phrases and Language Teaching a valuable contribution to applied linguistics and language teaching and essential reading for theoreticians and practitioners alike.
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Techniques and Resources in Teaching Reading, by Sandra Silberstein, is the latest addition to the Oxford University Press series Teaching Techniques in English as a Second Language, edited by Russell Campbell and William Rutherford. It successfully complements other books in the series that address the teaching of vocabulary, writing, testing, and grammar. Each of the seven chapters in the book has a useful summary of the major points covered, a series of activities to promote discussion, and suggestions for further reading. There is a comprehensive bibliography at the end of the book as well as a detailed index.

Silberstein’s approach to the teaching of reading is informed by the conception of reading as an interactive process that focuses on the productive relationship between text and reader. In Chapter 1, “Introduction to Second Language Reading,” Silberstein reviews fundamental principles of reading theory such as schema theory. She introduces the chapter by assuming the identity of an ESL teacher enticing her readers into her ESL classroom by beginning the lesson with a short poem by William Carlos Williams. This engaging style is a hallmark of the book, making it both enjoyable and informative for readers.

As Silberstein notes, no book about teaching techniques can provide a set of how-to recipes, to be followed uncritically by teachers. For this reason, in Chapter 2, “Teaching as Decision Making,” Silberstein focuses on the kinds of questions reading teachers can ask about their students to ensure that they address those students’ needs. She also provides some helpful suggestions on how to evaluate texts and adapt them to the classroom. Chapter 3, “Nonprose Reading,” focuses on the classroom use of nonprose material such as classified advertisements, bus schedules, signs, labels, and instructions. With reference to two sample lessons—a survival English class and an English for academic purposes (EAP) class—Silberstein describes how the teacher can use a range of formats to help students read material that is relevant to their communicative needs.

In Chapter 4, “Expository Prose,” Silberstein focuses on reading components of EAP classes. She discusses the usefulness of such activities as prereading and semantic mapping and examines ways of recognizing rhetorical patterns in texts. She demonstrates how students can be taught to recognize inductive and deductive arguments and how they can learn...
to evaluate the validity of the claims authors make. In Chapter 5, “Editorializing and Opinion,” a logical extension of Chapter 4, Silberstein discusses how teachers can help students develop critical-reading skills. Her sample lesson addresses the topic of AIDS, and she draws on *Scientific American* for reading texts. Silberstein discusses how students can be taught to draw inferences, distinguish fact from opinion, recognize an intended audience, and evaluate a point of view.

Silberstein changes direction in Chapter 6, “Fiction, Poetry, and Songs.” In what is perhaps the most innovative chapter in the book, Silberstein discusses how to incorporate poetry, fables, mysteries, songs, and children’s literature into the reading class. She argues that such texts have universal appeal and are highly motivating for students. In particular, she demonstrates how these texts can provide cultural information for students and help them master English rhythm. Confident in her position that it is better to teach people to fish than to feed them for a day, Silberstein devotes her final chapter, “Developing Instructional Materials,” to helping teachers generate their own classroom reading activities. She demonstrates how activities can be constructed as realistic, authentic, and integrated.

*Techniques and Resources in Teaching Reading* is true to its title. Although it provides many useful techniques for the teaching of reading, it also assumes that teachers are creative, critical practitioners who would not be content with a set of formulas for the reading classroom. For this reason, Silberstein has not neglected to address how teachers can use their own resources to make the teaching of reading a rewarding activity. The book is a worthy addition to a successful series.

**BONNY NORTON PEIRCE**  
*Ontario Institute for Studies in Education*


This volume is a collection of collaborative research reported at the 1989 National Council of Teachers of English research roundtable. The book demonstrates a variety of collaborative teams, approaches, methods, and reporting formats. It is of particular interest to TESOL because several of the studies reported here involve ESOL students and because this type of research—long-term, personal, human—is ideal for teachers of ESOL students to carry out in their classrooms.

The seven studies reported here are almost incidental to the exploration of the collaborative processes. All of the studies reported in this book are characterized by connections among people, between the collaborating authors and between them and the students. All of the students are treated and reported as real people, not as faceless, nameless human subjects. Their individual voices are heard and treated as important. Introspection...
and self-reflection are tools these researchers use with themselves as well as with the people they study. The studies recognize the importance of context and include that as part of the study itself.

The first chapter, by Carole Edelsky and Chris Boyd, sets forth some questions about collaborative research; in a sense, the remaining chapters address some of these and raise others. What does it mean to collaborate in research? If a university professor and an elementary school teacher collaborate, does one have more status than the other, more power in making decisions about the research itself? What problems do potential collaborators face? What are some ways these problems are resolved? What advice do collaborative researchers have for other prospective researchers?

In reflecting on their 2 years of working together, Mackinson and Peyton, authors of the next chapter, list three characteristics that made their collaboration successful: First, their search was mutual and they shared ownership of the research questions, methods, analysis, and dissemination; second, there was mutual respect and a recognition that each one made unique contributions; finally, they both spent the necessary time—always more than they had planned or could spare—because of their mutual commitment to each other as well as to the project.

In the third chapter, Buchanan and Schultz wonder if collaboration is the right term for their “shifting partnership” (p. 50). “The foundation of our collaboration rests on the trust and respect we have for each other as teachers and researchers—something we developed before we began our work together” (p. 51). Both recognize that their work together is valued differently: As a university faculty member, Schultz has time to carry out research and receives status and money for publishing scholarly articles reporting that research; as a classroom teacher, Buchanan receives no release time for this research, nor does she receive higher status or pay as a result of her work with Schultz.

Next, Mangiola and Pease-Alvarez report on how they collaborated on a cross-age tutoring project in Mangiola’s fifth-grade classroom at Fair Oaks School, a school noted for its multicultural student body and its whole language philosophy. They conclude that they learn more as teachers (and researchers) when they focus on classroom experiences, reflecting and critiquing; moreover, including students in reflective inquiry helps both students and researchers.

The first of the remaining three chapters is a report by Crafton and Porter of a study instigated by Crafton and carried out in Porter’s junior high class. Both Crafton and Porter believe they were strengthened personally as well as professionally by the collaboration. “Learning to Do Research Together,” by Alvermann, Olson, and Umpleby, is an ambitious chapter; it summarizes the history of their research and then explores factors of collaboration that influenced the research: “common purpose, autonomy, incentive, trust, shared vision, and diversity” (p. 112). Fecho and Lytle frankly admit the problems they encountered. Using collaboration as “both the subject and method of study” (p. 137) in a cross-visitation project that involved administration and teachers, inevitable philosophical differences among participants threatened to become divisive at times.
This problem will affect any research project involving more than one teacher in a school, I believe; I am grateful to Fecho and Lytle for mentioning it. They recommend “a willingness to negotiate openly, to tolerate uncertainty, and to be creative in surmounting obstacles” (p. 139), good advice for any research.

PAT RIGG
Private Consultant


■ Reading, Writing, and Learning in ESL (RWL) offers a wealth of practical suggestions for promoting reading and writing development for students at the beginning and intermediate levels of English proficiency. The intended audience includes mainstream, bilingual, ESL, and preservice teachers. This book is written in an accessible style to involve “readers in a friendly conversation that will open their eyes to worlds of possibility in second language classrooms” (p. xii).

The assumptions about learning that form the foundation of this text are grounded in current theory and research on L2 literacy development. Learning is viewed as a social process that is promoted through interaction involving students and teachers. During collaborative activities, “oral and written language uses proliferate, and opportunities for language development abound” (p. 202).

RWL assumes that instruction should build on the prior experience of students. “When students have input and choice in the direction of their own learning, they become motivated to pursue ideas and information” (p. 39). The role of the teacher is one of facilitator who guides “the direction of social interaction and curricular content” (p. 202). Additionally, language instruction based on a theme or topic enhances “opportunities for broader conceptual understanding” (p. 202).

In the first two chapters, background information on L2 learners is provided. Chapter 1 discusses the characteristics of L2 learners. Chapter 2 focuses on the processes involved in second language acquisition. In the remaining three chapters, approaches and strategies for promoting literacy development are presented. Chapter 3 deals with process writing. Chapter 4 involves literature-based instruction. In Chapter 5, content-area reading is addressed.

A clear strength of this text lies in its establishment of a connection among research, theory, and practice. Readers are provided with theoretical insights in order to guide instruction based on students’ age, experience, and language proficiency. There are numerous examples of classroom teachers modifying their lesson plans to promote L2 literacy development while involving all students. The strategies for teaching school-based literacy tasks are culturally sensitive and value the knowledge
and experiences of learners. Additionally, Peregoy and Boyle’s emphasis on literature-response groups encourages critical engagement with stories and the belief that there is “no single interpretation of any story you are reading” (p. 118).

Overall, RWL is a valuable contribution to the growing body of literature for those who teach in a multilingual-multicultural setting. Mainstream teachers with non-English speakers in the classroom would particularly benefit from the many useful strategies and approaches presented in this book. Readers are provided the knowledge and insights “to make all classroom learning activities accessible to students who are still learning English, firmly based on a welcoming social-emotional environment” (p. 202).

ROBIN STERGIS
Boston University


Given the substantial number of recent articles and books justifying content-based language instruction, a handbook designed to help administrators and teachers implement a content-based approach in their own schools and classes is long overdue. The CALLA Handbook is meant to fill this gap.

The first section of the book, Introducing CALLA, outlines the theoretical foundation of CALLA and its three fundamental components. The curricular content component deals with essential aspects from the grade-level curriculum. The academic language component consists of the academic language and skills needed to explore and learn curricular content. The learning strategies component includes strategies to help students cope with academic language and curricular content demands. The authors discuss why it is important to teach each component and how to select and teach appropriate content, academic language, and learning strategies. Each chapter concludes with a set of application activities.

The second section of the book, titled Establishing a CALLA Program, provides the reader with guidelines for planning, monitoring, implementing, and administering a CALLA program. The basic methodological tenets of CALLA are outlined, and alternative assessment procedures appropriate for a CALLA program are reviewed. Using CALLA’s three fundamental components as a structure, the authors explore how CALLA fits into a variety of instructional contexts including bilingual classrooms, community college ESL programs, and university intensive English classrooms.

In the third section, titled Implementing CALLA in the Classroom, the authors show how CALLA can be applied to four subject areas: science,
mathematics, social studies, and literature/composition. Each subject-specific chapter begins with a brief description of the curriculum for that subject area, an overview, and the particular challenges the discipline poses to ESL students. Each chapter includes a summary of learning strategies for the discipline, guidelines for selecting priority content and appropriate activities, teaching guidelines, suggestions for applying the CALLA instructional sequence, and a model unit.

The CALLA Handbook addresses a pressing need in the area of content-based language instruction. However, whereas the book focuses on applying CALLA as a method, it generally does not detail the specific techniques teachers might use in realizing CALLA objectives and carrying out the various stages of its instructional sequence. The few techniques discussed in the final section already exist in the activities sections of most grade-level texts for the subjects discussed. The authors have attempted to relate CALLA to a variety of language-teaching contexts when it is perhaps most appropriate for teachers working with ESL students at the junior and senior high school levels. By trying to address the interests of a wider audience, the authors may have sacrificed detail that would have made the book more practical. Despite these minor shortcomings, the book does indeed begin to fill the need for materials and handbooks designed to help classroom practitioners implement content-based language programs.

CRAIG DICKER
United States Information Service, South Africa


Focus on American Culture is part of the ABC News ESL Video Library, an interactive, task-based integrated skills package targeted for intermediate-level adult learners. Each text comes with corresponding video segments from such ABC News programs as “Business World,” “PrimeTime Live,” “20/20,” “Nightline,” “The Health Show,” and “World News Tonight,” providing authentic language through videotapes of current events that are of interest to students and teachers.

The text is divided into four units: The Family in America, Work in America, Education in America, and Trends in America. The topics, chosen by the author to represent four different aspects of the U.S. lifestyle, provide a background for the development of analytical, communicative, and grammar skills.

The chapters or segments in each unit are divided into five parts: Previewing, Global Viewing, Intensive Viewing, Language Focus, and Postviewing. In Previewing, students try to uncover what the segment is about. This section helps to assess where students stand with regard to the subject content and introduces vocabulary students may need to
understand the given segment. It also helps to gauge student reactions to the topic. Global Viewing encourages students’ overall understanding of the subject matter through exercises and follow-up discussions in which main ideas are stressed. Intensive Viewing focuses on specifics as students look and listen for details in activities such as note-taking and cloze-style transcriptions of key passages. Language Focus develops vocabulary and idiomatic expressions as well as certain aspects of language structure. Finally, Postviewing wraps up the chapter with discussions, readings, and other materials, bringing skills and content together into a cohesive whole.

As the introduction suggests, an interactive approach is encouraged, with ideal conditions for use geared toward group involvement in which students learn from one another. The teacher functions more as a facilitator, leading students through a series of exercises that foster autonomous learning through discovery. Many activities have been incorporated to reinforce interaction, such as discussion topics, team tasks, and field work. With the exception of grammar, all skills are adequately covered.

The text and exercises are well designed and cover a wide range of skills assessment, but the topic choices may for certain audiences leave something to be desired. The segments covering college entrance and bilingual education may be of general interest to L2 learners. However, subjects such as The Joys and Risks of the “Daddy Track” and Mid-Life Moms, and the segment titled The Perfect Baby: A Follow-Up, which discusses in vitro fertilization, though disguised in a newslike format, appear somewhat sensationalistic. Given our pluralistic society, this particular focus seems an odd way to introduce U.S. culture. And the cover, which features a baseball, seems out of context as there is no mention of sports whatsoever.

Despite the drawback of topic choice, the author does a detailed job in her theme-based exercises, providing the student with a range of tasks in order to facilitate comprehension. Each segment provides running times for videos and VCR starting points. Henly has created an incredibly teacher-friendly text as well as a format that might work well for independent study.

LISA MARIE HENSCHEL
California State University, Los Angeles


One goal of On Your Way to Writing is “to teach the important concepts students will need to be successful throughout the composition process” by encouraging students to use “creativity and imagination while doing real-world writing” in a “workshop atmosphere that creates opportunities for collaborative learning” (p. ix). The text is divided into an introduction

BOOK NOTICES
and 11 chapters, each highlighting an element or skill of writing that builds on previous information and provides the foundation for subsequent information.

The introduction briefly discusses audience awareness and the differences between speaking and writing. Chapters 1 and 2 focus on recognizing and practicing sentence structures and the parts of speech. Exercises include caption writing, sentence completion, identification, and error detection and correction. In Chapter 3, students learn about focusing and identifying main ideas by writing headlines for and summaries of articles in the text. Students practice analyzing and writing instructions, explanations, and descriptions in Chapters 4 and 5. Rules, organizational questions, and models are provided for each activity. Chapter 6 centers on learning to write dialogues by reading a play, writing conversations and quotations, interviewing peers, and writing a report. In Chapter 7, students combine skills learned in Chapters 3 and 6 and guided writing and editing techniques to summarize and parody a children’s story. How to write reviews, notes, memos and letters, and chart comparisons is explained and modeled in Chapters 8, 9, and 10. Finally, Chapter 11 discusses how to create a class magazine out of students’ written pieces.

In On Your Way to Writing, students, working mainly on the sentence or paragraph level, manipulate information and write pieces that conform to the guidelines. Although the idea of a writing process is foregrounded in both the preface and the blurb, few activities focus on having students discover and express meaning or on prewriting/drafting/revising/editing. Occasionally students use their imagination to generate information (childhood fairy tales or instructions for some procedure); however, issues of intent, purpose, and audience are glossed over, if mentioned at all. True, the writing students do is found in the real world—captions, headlines, directions, memos—but student writers are provided with little real reason to write other than to practice the forms being taught. Although the final activity, creating a magazine, is collaborative, only about 25 percent of the rest of the activities use this format. Perhaps if this activity had been highlighted from the start, and students had been writing with a specific purpose and for a particular audience, the goal of students writing “meaningful, interesting, and practical” (p. xi) texts would have been better met.

VIRGINIA L. A. QUASNY
Central Arizona College


Instructors of ESL writing courses are frequently trying to find ways to improve their students’ grammar without resorting to traditional methods. By the time students reach upper-level writing courses, content and orga-
nization are often satisfactory, but grammar sometimes lags behind. Designed to help ESL students proofread and edit their writing, *Focusing on Editing: A Grammar Workbook for Advanced Writers* can be implemented as a reference guide to accompany a writing text and used for skill practice. Although not a comprehensive grammar book, it offers numerous activities on final-form revisions that students can complete to fine-tune their grammatical ability by drawing their attention to skills identified as problematic for ESL writers.

In helping students correct errors, Fox focuses on the following: articles, nouns, noun phrases, verb forms, punctuation and sentence structures, word forms, and prepositions. In presenting these aspects of grammar, he includes adapted excerpts from college texts and other material. The predominant subject matter is the many dimensions of U.S. culture, yet information about countries and cultures across the globe is included. Certain writing assignments require students to discuss school-related topics.

An outstanding feature of this workbook is its effective selection of basic and sophisticated exercises, including sentence revision; sentence completion; sentence construction based on using particular forms; paragraph writing; text conversion; error correction in the form of annotations, identification, and explanation; and structure identification. The main approach of these exercises is bottom-up; because most global aspects have already been addressed and corrected at the advanced level of writing, students need to focus on the discrete grammatical elements of their writing by deductively analyzing their work.

The layout of this workbook is logical and effective. The units are sequenced in such a way that students improve in stages. An introduction containing commonly used correction symbols and a sample essay are provided. Units contain a What Do You Know? section that tests students’ knowledge about the material to be introduced, a Grammar Review section that includes rules and examples, a Check Your Understanding section that provides students with practice, a Proofreading and Editing section that includes questions regarding certain grammatical structures, and an Additional Practice section that offers more exercises for review. Other features of this book include a complete answer key and a review page of focused editing questions.

The major strength of this text is its variety of exercises, which provide numerous applications for features that are introduced. The text also advocates grammar refinement as an aid to communicating accurately in written discourse and encourages writers to move from process to form. The degree of difficulty of some tasks in this workbook may be its only weakness; more challenging essays need to be incorporated for finer scrutiny by ESL writers. Nonetheless, this workbook is a useful additional text from which advanced-level ESL learners can benefit.

**ANNETTE LYN DOBLER**

*The Pennsylvania State University*
The theoretical perspective of this book appears to be one of learning by discovering. The authors feel that the long-standing division between literature and language teaching is unwarranted. In this book, instead of approaching literary text with “a spirit of humility (the how-will-I-ever-understand-what-such-a-great-writer-has-written approach),” the authors aim to have the student explore literary texts “in a spirit of discovery” (p. 2). As Bassnett and Grundy explain,

As the reader explores literature, so not only do new worlds open up in the imagination, but new layers of language used and new examples of linguistic dexterity are exposed . . . . [In this book, students learn to] understand literature by working creatively with texts. (p. 2)

Activities in *Language through Literature* are provided for every level of language learning, from early beginner to very advanced. Although all the exercises are aimed at L2 learners, there is no doubt that many of them could be used in native-speaker literature classrooms as well. This book is not aimed at any particular age group. My own opinion is that it would work best with young adolescents and adults because of the amount of concentration and thinking required in the activities. This is not to say, however, that these activities could not be used equally successfully with young, elementary school language learners. The activities could easily be slowed down or modified to fit the young language learner’s attention span. All activities are designed for classroom use in a typical language-learning classroom; however, many of them require homework or some sort of preparation on the part of the student.

The teacher’s role in this book appears to be one of facilitator, responsible for organizing the activities, giving clear instructions, and supervising the students’ progress in the activities. The greatest part of the work is done by the students themselves, usually in groups or pairs. Many of the activities conclude with discussions or writing exercises to do at home, so it is also part of the responsibility to lead these discussions and give feedback on the written work. The role of the student, on the other hand, is to make a concerted effort to participate in the activities, reading passages, writing exercises, and discussions that follow.

The content of this text is based on using literature to teach English. Bassnett and Grundy explain the rationale behind this:

Once we have begun to acquire some knowledge of a language, we need to know something about what we can do with that language. One of the best ways to explore these possibilities is by looking at the works of writers who, at different moments in the history of a culture, have explored that language to their best ability and so have extended the boundaries of its use. When we teach literature, what we are actually teaching is highly skillful language usage . . . . we are not only teaching a language, but we are also
teaching students about what that language can do. It may seem a long way from learning how to ask for a cup of tea to learning how to write a poem, but once the process is underway, the gap between those two activities narrows. (p. 7)

The authors do not believe that literature should be used to teach spoken English. In their view, “writing . . . is a natural, creative, original and perhaps primary use of language” (p. 9) and therefore belongs in any language classroom. Almost every unit in this book has a writing activity attached to it, either one that is part of the activity itself or one that is a follow-up to the activity. In addition, the activities are so varied, engrossing, and thought provoking that they are sure to capture the interest of every participant.

There is no stereotyping in this book. In fact, every effort is made to alert the students to possible stereotyping in the literature they are reading. Many of the exercises deal with gender and cultural differences, and even more of the activities are designed so that each student’s viewpoint will be brought out for later discussion. If anything, the authors have gone to great lengths to use activities that will show the normalcy of differing interpretations and viewpoints.

Language through Literature is clearly appropriate for its intended audience, the L2 teacher. I would also recommend it to teachers of literature who want their students to move away from searching out hidden meanings and begin exploring their own interpretations of text. Furthermore, many of the activities could easily and successfully be used as introductions to writing activities.

DEBORAH LEVY
University of Arizona
UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
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**Laredo Publishing Presents...**

**Krashen’s Theories of Second Language Acquisition and Other Hypotheses**

**Fundamentals of Language Education**

Krashen presents his theory of Second Language Acquisition which includes 5 hypotheses: Acquisition-Learning, Natural Order, Monitor, Input, and Affective Filter. He demonstrates how language can be used to stimulate cognitive development.

**Softbound  1-56492-088-7   US $7.95**

**The Input Hypothesis**

Summarizes the evidence supporting the Input Hypothesis, discusses some of the controversies surrounding it, and reviews its applications in a variety of language teaching situations.

**Softbound  1-56492-089-5   US $7.95**

**The Power of Reading**

Discusses how reading increases the ability to comprehend, acquire vocabulary, write, spell, and read; the positive effects of reading aloud, of light reading, and of reading nontraditional forms of literature. Advocates a print-rich environment and a program of Free Voluntary Reading (FVR) in schools.

**Softbound  1-56492-090-9   US $14.95**

**New!**

**TESOL Publications**

**Books for a Small Planet:**

*A Multicultural/Intercultural Bibliography for Young English Language Learners*

Dorothy S. Brown

A sequel to her popular *A World of Books*, Brown’s newest bibliography includes books with diverse ethnic settings and characters appropriate for young people from preschool through high school. All entries are currently in print. *Books for a Small Planet* can be used as a guide to selecting appropriate books for ESOL students to read outside of class or to supplement the workbooks, basic readers, and abridged texts commonly found in ESOL classrooms.

**1994, ISBN 0 939791 53 6. $18.95 (member $14.91)**

Use order form in this issue or call 703-518-2522.
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TESOL Quarterly readers are invited to contribute review articles and evaluative or comparative reviews for consideration for publication in the Review or Book Notices section of the Quarterly. These should be sent to the TESOL Quarterly Review Editor H. Douglas Brown, San Francisco State University, at the address listed in the Information for Contributors section.
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TEACHERS OF ENGLISH TO SPEAKERS OF OTHER LANGUAGES, INC.
The Twenty-Ninth Annual Convention and Exposition

A joint conference with the California Association of Teachers
of English to Speakers of Other Languages (CATESOL)

TESOL '95:
Building Futures Together

March 28-April 1, 1995
The Long Beach Convention Center
Long Beach, California USA

World-known Speakers,
Preconference Institutes, Papers,
Workshops, Colloquia, Poster
Sessions, Educational Visits,
Fun Run, Swap Shop, Discussion
Groups, Breakfast Seminars,
Interest Section Events, Affiliate
Events, Exhibits, Employment
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POWER AND INEQUALITY IN LANGUAGE EDUCATION
James W. Tollefson, Editor
Thought-provoking articles by twelve noted scholars examine the relationship between language policy, wealth, and power. This original research covers such timely topics as the growth of official language movements, the role of language teachers in reinforcing social inequality, and misconceptions of how first versus second language competence is related to financial success.
Hardcover 46366-5 $47.95
Paperback 46807-8 $19.95

UNDERSTANDING COMMUNICATION IN SECOND LANGUAGE CLASSROOMS
Karen E. Johnson
Drawing on transcripts from a variety of instructional settings, this book offers an integrated view of communication in second language classrooms. The author builds a conceptual framework that clarifies how patterns of classroom communication are established and maintained and how these patterns affect students' acquisition of a second language.
Hardcover 45355-0 $42.95
Paperback 45968-6 $16.95

APPROPRIATE METHODOLOGY AND SOCIAL CONTEXT
Adrian Holliday
This is essential reading for anyone wishing to address the needs of students in the context of their cultural backgrounds. Holliday uses an ethnographic framework to describe the varying cultures of classrooms, teacher communities, and student groups in different countries and educational contexts. He argues that these differences must be acknowledged in the design and implementation of more appropriate teaching methodologies.
Hardcover 43156-5 $42.95
Paperback 43745-8 $16.95

ACADEMIC LISTENING
John Flowerdew, Editor
This collection of original research papers examines the often neglected area of second language academic listening. Aimed at teachers of academic preparation courses, the papers cover relevant research, cognitive processes, and ethnographic approaches relating the theory of listening comprehension to practical, pedagogical concerns.
Hardcover 45544-8 $47.95
Paperback 45551-0 $19.95

Recently Published:
REFLECTIVE TEACHING IN SECOND LANGUAGE CLASSROOMS
Jack Richards
Paperback 45803-X $17.95

EDUCATING SECOND LANGUAGE CHILDREN
Fred Genesee
Paperback 45797-1 $18.95

PERSPECTIVES ON PEDAGOGICAL GRAMMAR
Terece Odlin
Paperback 44990-1 $19.95

To order, please contact:
CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Dept. MAH
40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011
Fax 212-691-3239
Books from TESOL for K–12 interests

Books for a Small Planet
A Multicultural/Intercultural Bibliography for Young English Language Learners
Dorothy S. Brown
Includes books with diverse ethnic settings and characters appropriate for young people from preschool through high school. An invaluable guide to supplemental reading.
1994, 7" x 10", 94 pp. ISBN 0-939791-53-6. $18.95 (member $14.95)

Kids Come in All Languages
Reading Instruction for ESL Students
Karen Spangenberg-Urbschat and Robert Pritchard, Editors
An excellent source of practical information on teaching reading to young ESL students. The comprehensive text offers background information on reading, ESL instruction, and ESL learners as well as specific instructional strategies recommended by experts.

All Things to All People
Donald N. Flemming, Lucie C. Germer, Christiane Kelley
Teacher trainers and teachers new to the field of English as a second language will find in this book an illuminating description of what it is like to be responsible for the education of language minority students. Excellent for pre- or in-service training.

Common Threads of Practice
Teaching English to Children Around the World
Katharine Davies Samway and Denise McKeon, Editors
This book reveals the diverse realities experienced by teachers of English in South Africa, The US, China, Austria, Brunei Darussalem, Russia, Estonia, Botswana, and the Philippines. Contributors offer compelling glimpses of primary grade (K–8) ESOL teachers in their classrooms and a level of common practices and beliefs in extremely different contexts.
1993, 146 pp. ISBN 0-939791-47-1. $15.95 (member $13.95)
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