How Languages Are Learned and Acquired through Content

This Chapter Will Feature

- How our assumptions shape our understandings about:
  - Language and language learning in academic contexts
  - Teaching language in academic contexts
  - Core principles that form the foundations of our text:
    - An interactive approach to content-based teaching and learning

In This Chapter, You Will Examine

- Sociocultural theories and practices
- Psycholinguistic theories and practices

What Does the Research Say?

We begin with our own assumptions about language and language learning as a way of showing that these assumptions underpin our practices, both unexamined and examined. As the field is constantly changing, we want to stress that this process of questioning one’s assumptions and reconstructing them on the basis of new knowledge is a key to maintaining updated instructional practices that are responsive to our learners. These important issues, which influence culturally responsive language learning and instruction, need to be considered in order to help teachers and learners address and transform social and cultural inequities that affect their ability to succeed.

Language teachers helping learners and themselves overcome previously held prejudices and stereotypical attitudes will promote better cross-cultural interactions. This necessary examination will develop understanding, tolerance, and respect between cultures and
a more sophisticated ability to negotiate cultural differences. As second- or foreign-language teachers, you will need to be well prepared to instruct in a demographically and technologically changing world in which cultures are increasingly interacting through various media. If we do not learn to handle these global connections, we will be faced with failures that Urbanski (1988; as cited in Huber, Kline, Bakken, & Clark, 1997 p. 184) describes:

The problem with today's schools is not that they are no longer as good as they once were. The problem with today's schools is that they are precisely what they always were, while the world around them has changed significantly. Schools must be restructured as centers of inquiry and reflection, not of unexamined tradition.

In the following sections, we (the authors) narrate our histories of language learning and teaching. We share our values and beliefs that we regard as important to learning and teaching. We'll begin with Marjorie.

When Marjorie started teaching, her interest in languages grew out of a fascination with words and sounds, accents and dialects. Growing up with parents from diverse backgrounds (New England Canadian French/Naragansett Native American and Virginia African American/Cherokee Native American) afforded her opportunities to be raised in a culture of people of many colors, dialects, and accents. She narrates her story here:

I began formally studying a foreign language (French) in the mid-60s, just as the Audio Lingual Method (ALM) was being proclaimed as “cutting edge” methodology. ALM focused predominantly on grammatical form within a sentence-level context. Along with ALM came the advent of language labs and small records that students could purchase for a nominal price, thus allowing extra practice outside of the classroom. Will any one of us who experienced ALM ever forget the dialogues we were required to memorize? At that time studying a foreign language was not only an elective but students were “selected” to take those classes—the major requirement was that one have an overall C average and no lower than a B average in English. Consequently, students enrolled in foreign languages were there, for the most part, because they wanted to be and not because they were required.

After three years of French, I decided that Spanish was another language I wanted to learn and I wanted to know something about the culture, so I took fourth level French and first level Spanish. I soon realized that my French was a tremendous boost in my ability to do well in Spanish. After all, they were both Romance languages and what I didn’t know I could sometimes figure out just by looking at the words. I should mention that my secondary teachers came from different methodological backgrounds. My Spanish teacher, new to the profession and in her second year of teaching, had been trained in ALM, while my French teacher, a veteran classicist, was most comfortable using grammar translation. He did not believe in interaction among students; reading and translating were the basis of his instructional strategies.

In the fall of 1970, I found myself entering college, where I confidently declared Spanish as my major and French as my minor. With my high school classroom experiences and opportunities, I assumed that reading and speaking in both Spanish and French more than qualified me for such an undertaking.

Much to my surprise, I was enrolled in classes with native speakers and students who had traveled and lived in countries of the target languages. My Spanish and French were both very “bookish” and my confidence suffered a great blow. It was then that I decided to take extra courses and to immerse myself in the presence of both peers and professors who spoke Spanish and French. I approached my student teaching during the fall of my
fourth year with great enthusiasm. Only after a few short weeks, I knew teaching was my niche and I wanted to excel at it. My undergraduate teacher training program far exceeded my expectations—my professors were supportive and always willing to help me improve my teaching. By 1974, I began my first teaching position with a public school system on the east coast of the United States. I taught Spanish, French, and Foreign Language Appreciation (FLA).

For the next few years I sought opportunities to travel abroad. My first trip was to visit Seoul, South Korea. It was during that time I first understood the relevance of pedagogy. While in my own classes, I would experiment with an interactive, more student-centered approach—a communicative language teaching approach. Communicative language teaching allows students to be actively involved in information-exchange tasks that they can complete by working in pairs or small groups. This approach was very successful and my students and I both were learning a lot and having fun. During my academic years, I would pay particular attention to instructional strategies used by university professors and teaching assistants.

I organized my classes so that students were not just memorizing dialogues and regurgitating drills. My students were quite anxious to practice new activities and they were very appreciative of having real and concrete ways to construct meaning with the language. During each of these summers, my own language skills increased exponentially. My self-confidence returned and once again I felt an amazing degree of comfort and ease in being able to move in and out of mixed cultures and languages and I understood cultural mores and social norms. What I didn’t realize at that point was that I had been completely drawn into making teaching a lifetime career.

I would happily spend the next fourteen years teaching at the secondary level. From my high school and university experiences as a language learner, to my years as a language teacher, I have witnessed second-/foreign-language instruction move to a focus on communicative proficiency—the ability to communicate in the target language in real-life contexts.

My notions about teaching are derived from:

- My experiences as a student in secondary and graduate-level education
- My experiences as a teacher/professor in secondary and graduate-level teaching

As a second-/foreign-language teacher at the secondary level, I felt very confident in knowing how to be a highly effective teacher. I attended conferences, presented workshops for staff development, and wrote curriculum guides for my school district. In addition, I stayed closely connected to graduate-level coursework and I constantly sought to stay abreast of current methods, trends, and pedagogy.

The same holds true for the past twenty-four years I have spent at the university level. I am actively involved in brain-compatible teaching and learning as well as conducting research that focuses on critical need language teacher development and training. I continue to question and reflect on my own practice. Finally, I am always looking for ways to share my experiential background with teachers and colleagues, hoping that they too will enlighten me with their diverse views and experiences.

Teaching has been a small window to the world through which I have been able to “see” the powerful impact it can have on the lives of students. While teaching at the secondary level and striving with adolescents working to learn a second/foreign language, it was a given that my role would be teacher, mentor, surrogate mother, counselor, confidant, and friend. I accepted those roles as part of my job description. What came as a surprise was moving from teaching at the high school level to teaching graduate students—amazingly, I find myself assuming those identical roles. And I do so with great pride. I champion the causes of teachers who are stressed beyond belief, who work under unimaginable circumstances, and who absolutely love what they do. My self-imposed charge is to continue
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providing them with the tools, enthusiasm, and “stick-to-it-ness” that is required of every
teacher. Second/foreign language teachers’ classrooms are indeed a microcosm of the
world, for it is there that students actualize the commonalities of language and culture that
connect us all.

Theresa’s experiences as a person of multiracial ethnicity as well as of multicultural
experiences (moving among different groups of relatives and communities) piqued her
interest in how schooling in different states and countries could be compared and con-
trasted. Her father was in the military and she attended classes in different countries while
he was stationed abroad on military bases. Her first encounter with learning language
through a content area was as a fourth grader. In a Spanish class, she was expected to inter-
act with native speakers in lessons that involved geography, math, and social studies.
Five school districts and eight years later, as an undergraduate Spanish major and Japanese
minor at the university, she started learning linguistics and literature. At that time she also
taught English as a second language (ESL) in private classes. Then, as a graduate student,
she moved into teaching Spanish language and ESL at the college level. During this time
frame she also taught adult literacy classes in Spanish and English, and foreign languages
at the elementary school level. She tells her story here:

As a relatively successful learner in school, I felt that everyone could learn a language if
they put enough individual effort into it. I conveniently forgot how my experiences living in
various Spanish-speaking communities had given me a sense of urgency to learn the lan-
guage to talk to classmates, relate to people, and to understand my new environment. When
I began formal study in a high school, Spanish was familiar, not “foreign.” With relative
ease I completed my book exercises, memorized the dialogues, and took the fill-in-the-
blank tests. I even joined the honors club in Spanish to continue studying after school. This
success lead to my declaring a Spanish major at the university. My placement as a freshman
into a university course at the fifth-semester level shook my confidence. At this level, I was
expected to read short stories and essays and write term papers in Spanish. Moreover, unlike
my high school, the classes were with native-speaking peers and conducted entirely in
Spanish. After considerable struggle and meeting tutors for extra help, I survived the first
two years of heavy reading and writing in Spanish literature and culture. Determined to
become a better learner, I opted for the traditional junior year abroad to study in Spain. This
study abroad experience plunged me into a formidable life-changing experience that
cemented my bond to the Spanish-speaking world and gave me confidence to see myself as
a Spanish language user. When I returned, my writing and speaking abilities had grown
tremendously. I felt emboldened to continue for my master’s degree in the same depart-
ment. Shortly after my admission to the graduate program, I was offered a teaching assis-
tantship (TA) to instruct undergraduate courses.

Previous to my appointment as a TA, I had tutored students in ESL and in Spanish.
However, when I began teaching in a formal classroom, I no longer had the freedom to base
my instruction on what the learners indicated as their needs, which up to then had been to
fulfill language assignments at school. In the Spanish and Portuguese department at my
university at the time, methodology wars were occurring between two linguistic approaches
being advocated by different professors: the Direct Approach, and Programmed Instruction
through audiolingual-based exercises. Proponents of each claimed superiority due to their
“scientific” procedures, which emphasized oral over written language and which made
them superior to the translation method of just learning to translate written texts. Although
both methodologies defined language as consisting of rules of syntax, morphology, and
phonology, each placed different emphasis on different aspects of language and levels of
thinking. The Programmed Instruction methodology began with phonological drills and
exercises to ensure that the learner replicated the sounds and structures of the language in the correct manner. Rules for phonological and morphological structures were explained formally in English and all students were expected to fill in written and oral exercises to practice the discrete and otherwise unrelated structures that were taught in an identified sequence, progressively moving from simple to more complex linguistic structures. The curriculum was organized by contrastive sounds and tenses; there was little connection to actual writing or speaking. Memorization was key to success. Although the Direct Method, as implemented in our department, shared the similar notions of moving from simple to complex structures, emphasis was on immersing the student in Spanish from the beginning. The idea was to allow the students to experience a controlled encounter with the targeted structure, then to inductively determine the rule governing the structure. Since students were called upon individually to respond to a question, they had to actively listen to the teacher to make sense. It was argued that this was more authentic and involved more higher-order thinking analysis and synthesis than Programmed Instruction. Both approaches rewarded accuracy in reproduction of the structures and vocabulary. Assessments consisted of filling in the blanks (“supply the appropriate X tense”), substitution of morphology (“change present to the present perfect”), or responding in writing to oral questions. Rarely in the beginning two years were students expected to do any reading of extended texts in the target language, beyond the dialogs, or write extended texts beyond a paragraph. In the Direct Approach, the instructor was required to use the target language throughout the class and attempt to maintain students’ use. In the Programmed Instruction approach, however, the instructor used English to explain and organize the class and the target language was used in the drills.

The wars were political and had consequences in the department; the people who took sides on these methodologies were aligning themselves with one or the other of the professors who upheld each. Eventually one side prevailed, and those who did not accept this were not given renewed contracts to teach. I was fortunate because I learned how to teach using both methodologies and thereby ensured my employability. I enjoyed learning how to explain the constituent parts of language structures and getting students to practice producing these on my request. At that time, I perceived my students’ accuracy in these controlled situations as a sign of being a “good” learner and assumed that this meant that they could handle encounters with people who spoke the target language. Likewise, it was assumed that those who failed to accurately produce the forms at 65 percent or higher on our exams were just poor learners and were failed. Because we were not held accountable for the numbers of failures or successes, but rather were only expected to maintain the standards of the Department, I never wondered about the efficacy of my own practice in promoting learning. I enjoyed teaching and enough students gave me the impression that they did too. My student evaluations were good and I was rehired to teach until I graduated.

Before I graduated, I had the opportunity to teach adult ESL students and teachers who wanted to learn Spanish. From my successful university teaching experiences, I assumed I knew what “language” was and how to teach it. After all, I learned two different methodologies and I was an expert at explaining the formal linguistic structures in both English and Spanish. What I hadn’t learned became more visible to me as I encountered differences between my students’ needs and their perceptions of language and language learning.

Adults in my ESL classroom came from at least seven different nations and spoke at least one or two other languages. They arrived in my class after having already worked full days as laborers, maids, clerks, housewives, and mothers. I had such a variety of learners—some without even elementary schooling, some with two years of postsecondary education. Most were males, with a sprinkling of females included in the class. Most had less than secondary education experiences and came from Mexico or Central America. In the first
meeting of my “United Nations” class, I had fifty students to teach and still more were later admitted to the class. I was told that the cutoff point was sixty-five. This shocked me because I came from university classes that were considered overenrolled at twenty-five students.

Through teaching ESL to adults, I learned that my methods failed them. Their needs to negotiate their lives in an often hostile English environment required more than just helping them understand the structure of English in isolated and unrelated sentences. They were not motivated by grades because there were no grades that would affect their promotion to the next level. They were motivated to survive and progress in a world that they could choose to participate in marginally or fully, depending on the flexibility of the community and their own investment in learning. They needed to learn to build “new” identities as English users, to use the resources in their communities, to find better paying jobs, to further their education, to find safe housing, and to build social lives that were relevant and meaningful to them. If I were to be successful in this teaching setting, I had to learn to meet these needs of this diverse population—language, literacy, and cultural adaptation.

The other event that pushed my professional development even further than my formal studies was the opportunity to help teachers in the Los Angeles Unified School District learn Spanish to be able to better relate to and teach their bilingual students. I was contracted to help design, implement, and evaluate a language program for teachers who at that time were being paid to learn Spanish. Again, I was faced with a challenge—teaching mature men and women who were teachers. They were seasoned teachers who took pride in their ability to teach. Many saw their main issue as not having the language skills to communicate with their students. We started with the same assumption, and the program developers constructed a linguistically based curriculum. This time I felt that I was very familiar and comfortable with these twenty-five learners who had to be motivated to serve their students. I assumed they a shared purpose “to become bilingual,” but what I discovered rather early on was a heterogeneity in commitment and conflicting purposes. My learners had many assumptions about their students, how they should be taught, and what they should learn. But most of all, they were teachers, vocal and adamant about their own needs. I could see that the language learning sequence had to again be contextualized to the demands of their profession, be situated in the limited amount of time that they had to learn, and be relevant to how they could best learn after their long school day. Their assumptions about the “other” culture of their students and its relationship to learning needed to be critically examined. So, once again, my linguistic curriculum and my Direct Method of teaching had to be reconceptualized and embedded in content learning if I was going to be successful with my learners.

In 2000, I was asked again to provide a special course in Spanish for elementary-school teachers. This time I used a number of content-based approaches to give the teachers a sense of what it was like to learn in three different types of programs: Spanish immersion, Spanish as a sheltered language program, and dual immersion (Austin, 2011). The struggles felt by the teachers made them accurately aware of their ESL students’ experiences trying to learn both language and content at the same time. For me, it was gratifying to see teachers reflect on their experiences with the course and exhilarating to note how many of them become more sensitive to the formidable emotional, social, and academic needs of their learners.

Reflecting on both of our stories, we agreed that second- and foreign-language teachers can benefit from viewing teaching as a social interaction that is subject to the influences and forces of the societies in which it takes place. What we have tried to illustrate through our personal stories are some of the moments when the notion of “language” and “language learning” warranted careful deliberation to respond to different purposes in
learning and different learning situations, which may be numerous and may compete with each other. We indicated through our narratives that our experiences as learners and teachers were influenced by political and ideological factors in our particular geographic areas and we reflected on what directions we took. Similarly, all language teachers will shape their beliefs, about their work and the everyday methods they use in their classrooms, under political influences of some kind and they will need to critically reflect on alternatives.

Today we are faced with making language study a vehicle for learning content areas and displaying one’s ability to understand those areas. To be able to analyze our actions as instructors, to construct justifications for taking those actions, and to consider alternative ways to instruct are essential processes for continual professional development and fulfillment of our commitment in a democratic society to teach all learners. We would like to highlight that our assumptions about these issues grow out of our past teaching and learning experiences, which tend to shape what we consider “normal” and what is to be expected in the language classroom. As a start to critically understanding our assumptions and where they come from, we provided part of our histories as language educators in particular institutions that provided us with different types of support and constraints.

By demonstrating that interpretations of linguistic theories have been predominant in shaping what should be taught and how, we will demonstrate a need to include a discussion of other social and cultural theories that also provide significant directions for conceiving language and language learning that occurs in content classrooms. Noticeably missing from both of our narratives were influences that have subsequently caused us to address issues of racism, poverty, and social justice (e.g., sexism, classism, sexual orientation biases). In the past, these issues were not given much consideration, though it was clear even then that they influenced how learners interacted with members of targeted language communities (Cummins, 2000; Kozol, 1991; Nieto, 1992).

In schools across the nation, all teachers of second-language learners, particularly bilingual and ESL students, face formidable instructional tasks: In addition to helping students learn structures of language, they are also responsible for helping learners adapt to and contribute to transforming both classroom and societal cultures, to solve problems in their daily lives, and to develop their intellectual, emotional, and social well-beings in their schools and their communities. Students must also learn how to behave in literate ways to acquire knowledge and demonstrate their abilities in the second language across all subject areas. Consequently, this means that second-language learning shapes students’ identities as learners. For second-language learners, there are high-stakes consequences, both academically and socially (No Child Left Behind, 2001). Academically, promotion and graduation are resting on making demonstrable progress in the second language across content areas. Socially, using language to build friendships and participate meaningfully in classroom and school interactions will influence whether learners perceive themselves as being welcome and validated (Valdes, 2001). These feelings affect persistence, graduation, and ultimately the human resources communities have for social, economic, and political development. For foreign language learners, the consequences of not learning another language well enough to handle complex ideas and texts are significant as well. On a personal level, success in a second language is necessary for some students to take advantage of postsecondary opportunities either in higher education, government, military, or business. On a social level, lack of success positions the learners at a disadvantage in the world’s ever-increasing multilingual contexts.
It is important for all language teachers to gain an understanding of the role language plays in shaping learners’ thinking and construction of academic and social knowledge, how language is a reflection of our identities, and how language works to develop our relationships with the groups into which we are socialized.

The Interactive Approach: Making Learning Meaningful

Interactive Learning in Content-Based Language Classes

From a technical viewpoint, it is widely acknowledged that conducting an analysis of learner needs will allow teachers to gather student background information prior to or at the beginning of instruction. Although surveys of students’ interests can indicate tentative directions for instruction, creating language-learning opportunities with a substantial connection to students’ communities and their learning in content areas can build literacy and further learning both about language and about content areas. For these reasons, interactive learning opportunities with content and student collaboration in the classroom provide a means for handling more complex language.

Content-Based Language Learning

One teaching practice that draws on Stephen Krashen’s theory of second-language learning is integrated language and content instruction, or content-based learning. (You will read more about Krashen’s theory later in this chapter.) Krashen’s emphasis that success in acquiring a second language depends on focusing on meaning rather than solely on form, on language input being just slightly above the proficiency level of the learner, and on the learning environment having ample opportunities for meaningful interaction, fits well with the content-based learning approach, which provides conditions similar to those present in first-language acquisition (Crandall, 1992).

Custodio and Sutton (1998) showed how content-based instruction (CBI) was used effectively in their own classrooms. Custodio, a middle school ESL teacher, used a sheltered content model for developing language with an introduction to U.S. history and culture. Students read historical fiction covering events from the explorations of Christopher Columbus to recent immigration to the United States. Biographies, nonfiction, textbooks, drama, poetry, and multimedia supplemented students’ learning. The students experienced many advantages by learning social studies through a variety of language materials: (1) They developed oral and written language skills in an integrated way, (2) they experienced the past by imagining what life was like in different places and times, and (3) the interdisciplinary activities, such as map studies, timelines, art projects, music, and current events, tied into the sheltered content model.

Sutton, a high school ESL teacher, used theme-based units focusing on young adult literature. Novels were selected relating to the students’ cultures, interests, varied reading levels, and the degree to which the literature could connect with mainstream language arts classes. For example, the class read a novel, Letters from Rifka, about a Russian Jewish immigrant at the turn of the century. Then students learned literary terms, wrote about themes in the book, practiced journal writing and dictionary use, and had meaningful discussions about their own immigration experiences and compared them to those in the novel. The CBI
approach in ESL classes can serve as a bridge to mainstream classes because it provides several important advantages, such as: (1) promoting higher-level thinking, (2) allowing for meaningful discussion of students’ cultures as reflected in the literature, and (3) reinforcing thinking through manageable amounts of reading, writing, listening, and speaking.

Although more and more elementary and high schools are implementing content-based world-language instruction, most curricular directions here are to support content learning unless they are in bilingual, immersion, or dual-immersion contexts. At the university level, there are many more programs that have been researched. These are called Foreign Languages across the Curriculum (FLAC) or Languages for Specific Purposes (LSP), in which several disciplines allow students to complete part of their coursework in a foreign language. These advanced-level courses are offered in economics, history, religion, sociology, and political science, among other disciplines. Notable postsecondary examples are found at St. Olaf’s College, Minnesota; State University of New York—Binghamton; the University of Minnesota; the University of Rhode Island; and the University of California, Los Angeles.

A Synthesis of Sociocultural and Psycholinguistic Theories and Practices

Our interactive approach to learning and teaching embraces the teacher’s position to choose, through principled decision making, an eclectic method for improving opportunities for learning content in his or her classroom. Instructional strategies that have a common focus on using meaningful experiences from the students’ own lives to enhance second-language learning in the content include such activities as engaging students in podcasts, wikispaces, twitter, and other social media platforms, collaborative learning, and language inquiry tasks that incorporate content-based language learning, and monitoring how their communication is proceeding at individual and group levels. These types of activities are derived from theories on learning, the role language plays in content learning, and linguistic theories.

This chapter will focus, in part, on instructional practices that have evolved from theories on how language is learned based on interdisciplinary sources contributed by educational theorists, social cognitivists, and sociolinguists, as well as philosophers, anthropologists, and sociologists. Although we will provide examples of how teaching innovations of the last ten to fifteen years have focused on interactive learning that benefits students, we also make brief mention of earlier practices in teaching before the focus on the learning process was established. Other sources may be consulted to explore earlier content-based language teaching (Bhatia, 2002; Chamot, 2007; Grenfell, 1999; Hancock & Scebold, 1999; Swales 1990).

Influence of Cognitive Researchers

Psychology has played an important role in the research on learning, and it is therefore considered one of the most powerful disciplinary bases in education. As the influence of scientific approaches to human behavior has spread, it also has contributed to our understanding of language learning (Robinson & Ellis, 2008).

In the late 1950s, behaviorist psychology (Skinner, 1957) influenced approaches to language instruction through the work of language educators such as Lado (1964) and
Bull (1965, 1972). In this model of language learning with linguistics as the content, students were to be given a sequence of discrete linguistic patterns that they practiced both in the classroom and in language laboratories through many repetitive drills and memorized dialogues until the patterns became habitual. Learners were expected to accurately reproduce the sound system, morphology, and syntax without error. The linguistic patterns were identified in terms of complexity and learners were expected to proceed hierarchically, adding each structure to their repertoire without necessarily returning to the same pattern after it was “learned.”

The communicative approach to learning was introduced as research on the learning of language developed (psycholinguistics and applied linguistics) and as the research on language as communication in a social context gained acceptance (sociolinguistics and semiotics). One of the main discoveries from psycholinguistic research was a developmental sequence of language learning that did not support the organization and presentation of linguistic items in classrooms. This discovery indicated that learning of structures was not linear, but rather it was more recursive. Research in psycholinguistics moved on to identify what types of input and processing would best facilitate the learning of the formal features of language at the sentence level.

An early theorist in the psycholinguistic field was Stephen Krashen, who proposed two distinct processes in developing ability in a second language: (1) acquisition, in which people acquire language as they engage in natural meaningful interaction, and (2) learning, in which people engage in a conscious process of study and attention to form and error correction, usually in formal language classrooms (Lightbown & Spada, 1995). Krashen viewed language acquisition as the more important process, citing that many speakers are competent without having learned rules, while other speakers may know rules but be unable to apply them correctly when focusing attention on meaningful interaction. Lightbown and Spada (1995) noted that it has proved to be very difficult to test this hypothesis, and acquisition and learning “would need to be defined more sharply, and controlled and manipulated experimentally” (p. 27). In spite of the difficulty of proving Krashen’s hypothesis, it is possible to gather information with the research questions coming from his theory, based on numerous classroom practices to help formulate views on useful teaching strategies.

An applied linguist, Michael Long, another proponent of this interactionist view, agreed with Krashen on the necessity of comprehensible input—that learners need to understand messages and that both comprehension and acquisition occur when the linguistic input contains forms and structures that are just slightly beyond the learner’s current level of ability (Lightbown & Spada, 1995). In linguistic shorthand, this is expressed as i + 1. Some examples of interactional language learning that he studied between native and nonnative speakers are (1) comprehension checks (“Do you understand?”), (2) clarification checks (“Could you say that again?”), and (3) self-repetition or paraphrasing (repeating the sentence partially or entirely).

Lily Wong Fillmore (1991), another applied linguist, contributed a wider view by demonstrating how social, linguistic, and cognitive processes are interconnected in language learning. Social processes occur in settings in which learners have the opportunity to observe the target language (TL) being used in natural communication so that eventually learners figure out how the language is structured and used. Linguistic processes refer to “ways in which assumptions held by the speakers of the target language cause them to speak as they do in talking to learners—in other words, to select, modify, and support the
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linguistic data they produce for the sake of the learner” (p. 54). Wong Fillmore defined the cognitive processes in capsule form:

[W]hat the learners have to work with are observations of the social situations in which the language was produced, and streams of vocal sounds produced by speakers according to complex and abstract systems of grammatical and social rules that systematically and symbolically link up sounds, meaning representations, and communicative intentions. What they must do with these data is discover the system of rules the speakers of the language are following, synthesize this knowledge into a grammar and then make it their own by internalizing it. (p. 56)

Wong Fillmore described the major difference between first- and second-language acquisition: First-language learning relies more heavily on the specific capacity of the human species to learn languages through a language acquisition device (LAD), whereas second-language acquisition relies more heavily on general cognitive skills, which are generally well developed by the time individuals learn a second language. In second-language acquisition, after general cognitive mechanisms are consolidated and assembled, the LAD device comes into play to synthesize the information into a “competence grammar” (p. 59).

Barry McLaughlin (1995), a psycholinguist, also embraces three principles that support second-language learning as a social interaction process: (1) “Language is used to communicate meaning,” (2) “Language flourishes best in a language-rich environment,” and (3) “Children should be encouraged to experiment with language” (pp. 6–8). Teachers must get feedback from students to see if they understand what is being said. Engaging in practices such as paraphrasing, modeling, and asking questions that clarify meaning can indicate how much is being understood by the learner.

The next principle McLaughlin stresses is the idea that teachers should present an environment filled with a variety of books and other printed materials so that students can explore and expand their thinking and use of language. In addition, teachers can model clear speaking, elaborate on the child’s speech, explain unfamiliar vocabulary, and stimulate social interaction among children by encouraging them to ask each other for help so that they can practice using language and increase their competency in reflecting on their learning.

Another meaningful way for children to express themselves is by writing child-generated texts based on their own cultural experiences. The last principle suggested by McLaughlin focuses on allowing children to experiment with language by not correcting all errors, because mistakes are part of a normal stage in language development that children go through to figure out the patterns and rules of a language. Instead of correcting in a formal manner, teachers can model correct language and expand on or rephrase what the child has said. Moreover, students use formulas or chunks of words put together without understanding how they function in the language. Feedback from other children provides the necessary information for students to learn whether they are using the formulas in the appropriate way. So, it is actually beneficial to be tolerant of children’s mistakes and to support them by supplying correct forms until they can produce language on their own.

McLaughlin’s principles (1992) have significance for teaching in several ways. First, teachers need to be aware of cultural differences, to know the patterns involved in second-language (L2) learning, and to provide a “variety of instructional activities—small-group work, cooperative learning, peer tutoring, individualized instruction, and other strategies
that take the children’s diversity of experience into account” (p. 8). Second, all of these teaching strategies involve more social interaction between students and teachers and, as McLaughlin suggests, viewing cultural diversity not as a problem but as an opportunity to challenge the educational system to become more innovative, which would benefit mainstream students as well as culturally and linguistically diverse students.

Another perspective emerged from the study of systematic language variation (sociolinguistics), through which language was seen as both a product and a process of learners becoming members of a social group in a particular context. In addition to geographic differences, socioeconomic, political, age, race, ethnicity, and gender differences also influence which variation of language people use and how people learn to communicate. To become members of a social group, communicative competence needs to be developed (Canale & Swain, 1980). While applied and psycholinguistic research at the time tended to concentrate on syntax, morphology, and phonological development of a “standard” language, sociolinguistics examined the social reasons for language variations in communication that involved vocabulary, pronunciation, communication styles (rhetorics), and interaction styles in particular social events.

The communicative approach in teaching evolved, influenced by the notion that the act of using language for authentic purposes required the learner to negotiate meaning by functioning in a social interaction that was culturally situated. Thus, not only linguistic input, but also appropriate social and cultural interaction were necessary to be communicatively competent. Consequently, achievement in communication also had to be defined.

Communicative competence, which includes grammar, sociolinguistics, discourse, and strategic competence, means that students are expected to demonstrate their knowledge about the rules of language, to practice the social norms for language use through performing communicative acts, and to use strategies for developing and maintaining conversations or written discourse. Errors are not only allowed, but also viewed as evidence of active learning. Furthermore, acts of repeating memorized phrases without benefit of clear comprehension were challenged by those who identified social contexts (both of the wider community as well as the unfolding events in the classroom) as having substantial influence on language learning. In this way, language socialization and development contrasted with the individual mental language acquisition model.

Research exploring the connections among socialization, language, and learning how to think also emerged as an area significant to language learning (Lafford, 2007). From a level of interaction, Vygotsky’s (1987) notions were introduced to explain how cognitive development occurs because of language development, which then contributes to further conceptual development. This is significant because Vygotsky’s theory explains the dialogic and dialectical connections between the society and the individual. As a result, culture becomes produced through the joint interactions of individuals and society.

According to Vygotsky’s sociocultural theory, language and culture play a critical role in human development (Eggen & Kauchak, 1999). Through social interaction people create knowledge in using their first language, and this use of language helps guide their joint activity in particular settings, allowing for ways of thinking to be shared and learned. Many of Vygotsky’s concepts have proven very applicable to second-language education; two of these are private speech, or the self-talk that guides thinking and action, and the zone of proximal development, which refers to the range of tasks that a child cannot do alone but can accomplish with assistance. Using these concepts, the teacher has three main tasks: (1) Assess and gauge the student’s ability to understand within the context of a
realistic, tangible, and concrete problem; (2) select learning activities and facilitate steps that enhance the chances for learner success; and (3) provide instructional support by scaffolding. Scaffolding includes modeling, think-aloud practice when solving a problem, asking students questions to focus attention, and suggesting alternatives. For students with some literacy skills, it also includes using prompts and cues, such as providing a list of questions to guide students to important information in writing or reading assignments, highlighting similarities and differences in rhetorically structuring arguments, coherence building, tone and audience considerations for lexical choices. Although Vygotsky researched first-language development, his contributions have been taken up by researchers in the bilingualism and second-language fields and more recently in the foreign language field (Hall & Verplaestse, 2000; Lantolf, 2000; Ohta, 2001; Swain & Deters, 2007; Takahashi, Austin, & Morimoto, 2000).

In further examining classroom life, research from critical theorists allows us to see classrooms not as objective laboratories, but rather as places where social dynamics and hierarchical power relationships influence who learns, what is learned, and how learning counts for whom and by whom (Guilherme, 2002; Kubota & Austin, 2007; Pennycook, 1998; Reagan & Osborn, 2001). Any use of language necessarily incorporates cultural referents and the negotiation of meaning has an impact on the future use of communication. On a macro level of interaction, notions from social theories also came into our field as language came to be seen as a tool for negotiating social, economic, and political power hierarchies that shape and are shaped by language use and development. Through socialization into groups within a particular culture, learners may recognize the diversity of choice to use these referents (Bakhtin, 1981). Nonetheless, not all variations of language are respected or valued. Often, variations with “cultural capital”—a currency or value in a particular dominant social group (Bourdieu, 1986)—are used to exclude or disenfranchise members of the community who use other varieties (Bourdieu, 1986; Fairclough, 1989; Hooks, 1991; Smitherman, 1995). For this reason, critical research examines the consequences of such social forces, particularly for students who are often considered “unsuccessful.” In addition to the sociolinguistic framework, language is considered to be a tool of action and power in shaping social relations and worldviews. Educators have called for attention to how language use can build notions of intercultural understanding and notions of global citizenship (Guilherme, 2002; Starkey, 2007).

These sociocultural theories have deep resonance for pedagogical practice. For learners in a second-language classroom, learning language is not just an individual mental event to gain communicative competence or even linguistic knowledge. The process entails socialization in the dominant culture’s ways of using language and literacy, which could often present conflicts or mismatches with the student’s home cultures and languages. Too often, the student is faced not with adding a new language, but with replacing one language with another. The response to learning then could affect the learner’s assimilation, accommodation (making allowances for newcomers), or manifest as resistance to instruction. Research has proliferated in identifying the mismatches and conflicts faced my learners in order to help teachers provide more culturally responsive instruction to diverse students. Although much of the second-language acquisition research is aimed at the beginning level of learners, studies from the critical perspective examine how successful learners at more advanced levels are identified and the conditions in which they are seen as successful or not. The characteristics of their struggles and interactions within institutions are studied to find out how they became successful.
There is an alarming overrepresentation of culturally and linguistically diverse children in special education and the quality of their educational experiences has often been regarded as among the most significant issues faced by the U.S. public school system in the past twenty-five years. Overrepresentation of English Language Learners in programs for students deemed mildly mentally retarded (MMR) has been the basis for litigation in a number of cases. Rulings in these cases required evaluators to test in the primary language; to use a variety of measures (including nonverbal and adaptive behavior instruments), and to implement additional due process procedural safeguards.

Mainstream Teachers Who Work with Ells

Aside from the language arts classroom, the focus on language is often at a vocabulary level. However, this is insufficient to help learners develop a deeper understanding of both the language and content areas. Vocabulary takes on meaning only in context. Because beginning L2 learners will be developing growing command of the language through interactions in the classroom, a focus on genres of language used in the discipline can be extremely helpful in each content area. This focus helps learners get a bigger picture about the content and language use that can be filled in with details that are important to each content area. Several genres also cut across content area but are structured differently, for example, oral reports in a biology class versus a literature class. Therefore, you will need to make these differences salient as well as their similarities. How can you build

Reflect and Respond

1. In what ways have your notions of language been influenced by your language learning or teaching experiences? TESOL/NCATE Standard 1.b. Language Acquisition and Development.

2. How will you demonstrate an understanding of language as a system and help ELLs acquire and use English in listening, reading, writing, and speaking? TESOL/NCATE Standard 1.a. Describing Language

3. Write about other personal, professional, political, or ethical issues you face as a language educator.
the context for understanding the genres in your classroom and textbook? The following chapters provide suggestions that can help you structure into your courses a focus on language of your content areas.

**Interaction and Roles of First (L1) and Second Languages (L2)**

Because learners of a subsequent language (L2) already have conventions in their first language (L1) background, these can be potential resources. Major questions you may want to consider are:

- How can I use resources from the students’ L1 that can help students learn L2?
- How can I create meaningful and relevant activities to facilitate using the L2 for a sustained period of interaction with L1 so that learners take on new roles, gain access and practice in these roles, improve their skills in using language and literacy for authentic purposes, and gain apprenticeship in critical thinking processes to act on improving their world?
- How can we critically help students to focus attention on the role of language in these activities—at discourse, pragmatic, syntactic, morphological, and lexical levels?

We draw on three attributes of interaction that have been explored in both the applied linguistic and psycholinguistic literature as well as sociocultural research:

1. Meaningful interaction
2. Reflection and action
3. Feedback

**Meaningful Interaction**

From an applied linguistics framework, linguistic input in the target language has been shown to become comprehensible through interaction—that is, when a person attempts to make information known to another and attempts to make sense of information that has been expressed by others. An active learner who has a purpose in a particular interaction and who must use language to communicate that purpose negotiates meaning. It is assumed that if both interlocutors share similar information, a need for communication will not exist. Applied linguistic research by Pica, Kang, and Sauro (2006) has identified that “gap” as necessary to precipitate communication between two interlocutors, and investigated different types of negotiation tasks that required overcoming this comprehension gap. Because not all interaction leads to intentional learning of a targeted goal, the interaction’s direction and what is accomplished through the interaction became the object of applied linguistics research in the late 80s and 90s. Through successive attempts to communicate, if the linguistic input becomes noticed and comprehensible, interaction can help learners attend to and acquire structures in a second language (Pica, 2005).

In working with learners to establish a common focal point through dialogue that seeks mutuality, teachers will need to provide learners with opportunities to articulate their personal meanings and viewpoints (Schön, 1983). Working from learners’ perspectives will help the teacher determine which interactive moments lend themselves to what kinds of teaching.
and for whom (Tharp & Gallimore, 1991). These judgment calls occur in planning, throughout implementation of lessons, and afterward, and need to be monitored and reflected on.

We included our narratives in the section earlier in this chapter to show how we became apprentices entering into a culturally sanctioned way of participation in the professional culture of language education. Because cultures provide different semiotic tools\(^1\) for their members, trying to join any culture will require understanding what these tools are and how they are used and for what purposes. Oral and written communication are among these tools. Also, as academic literacy instruction forms the major socialization events in schools, researchers from this line of investigation have analyzed how literacies taught for English as a first and second language function to create hierarchies in relation to the different languages and literacies that learners bring with them, dismissing and excluding nonstandard practices (Cummins, 2000; Darder, 2011). Garcia, Skutnabb-Kangas, and Torres-Guzman (2006) and Byram (2009) explore alternatives to ensuring success that are more inclusive and supportive of students’ identities and participation in multilingual and multicultural communities. The directions they have offered develop learners’ abilities to accept and use knowledge created out of multilingual contexts and intercultural communication.

In research from critical studies,\(^2\) the historical and physical locations of the participants from diverse communities are highlighted to show connections between the present classroom language-learning realities and their connections to broader social, economic, and political realities—in essence, how inequities persist because of unquestioned institutional practices (Macedo & Bartolome, 2000; McLaren, 1993). Precisely because second-language and foreign-language learners step into a context in which hierarchies are unknown, critical literacy and language awareness help them uncover these histories and assumptions. In addition, through critical pedagogy, learners study how to use language and literacy to change pressing social conditions in their classrooms, schools, and communities.

Reflection and Action

A final aspect of interaction is the relationship between reflection and action. From psycholinguistic research, metacognition and metalinguistic awareness comes from a dialectical relationship between learners’ experiences and their reflection. Developing skills in

---

\(^1\) Semiotics is the study of signs that are used to represent meaning. These signs historically have connotations and interpretations. Signs and their referents are united by a culture’s attaching meaning between these. Thus, learning to be a member of a culture means learning to attach significance to some representations and not others. Danesi (2000) claims that developing these associative thinking processes in the second language takes a “considerable amount of time” (p. 67).

\(^2\) We use critical studies here to encompass four areas of research: (1) critical cultural studies (e.g., Bourdieu, Hall, Hooks, Lather), (2) critical pedagogy (e.g., Freire, Giroux, Macedo, Nieto, Walsh), (3) critical literacy (e.g., Auerbach, Benesch, Cushman, Fairclough, Luke, Norton), and (4) critical language studies (e.g., Corson, Rampton, Pennycook). While all share a research agenda to uncover the use of power through different semiotic analyses, each focuses on different arenas of inquiry, communication systems, instructional practices, and literacy that enable one to see and use power relations constructed through printed or oral practices. The research agenda of these noted scholars may differ from goals of deconstructing symbols and myths, creating emancipatory interventions in teaching and learning, or highlighting the power of ideology and how it works through language and literacy. Each type of critical study contributes to forging a more just society through social analyses in media, public institutions, and language and literacy studies.
These important cognitive processes allow for learners to develop better self-awareness and control, automaticity, and ability to make changes in their linguistic behaviors. In other words, by becoming aware of their thoughts, feelings, and actions, students can use their efforts for greater monitoring and control of these processes. Over time, this may lead to full automatization of processes that can help learning language and literacy. To develop this type of reflection, instructing learners about cognitive and metacognitive strategies is important. In fact, it is not surprising that from this viewpoint, students would be encouraged to engage in hypothesis testing and generate feedback through their interaction with others, which would enable them to notice gaps between their current skill levels and the level needed for reaching mastery of the target language. Then, with overt attention to these gaps, learners can plan their responses to gain greater mastery.

As part of Vygotsky’s theory of learning, social constructivism holds the tenets that knowledge is constructed through meaningful social interaction between the apprentices and others who have a higher skill level. The kinds of past experiences, as well as the ways these experiences are organized, influence the knowledge construction process.

Feedback

Rather than correcting language forms to evaluate the learners’ abilities, feedback is given to help learners complete tasks. The high frequency of language use and the interactional demands influence the learner’s ability to learn and participate meaningfully in the communicative practices of the wider communities. If feedback is limited to linguistic forms, learners will begin to value the accuracy of language forms over the functionality of these forms to convey their thoughts and build further knowledge. If feedback encourages learners to express their thoughts as they learn to manage their language production, learners become aware of the need to refine their language use as a means of communicating their feelings, understanding, and new knowledge to a variety of audiences for a variety of purposes. Thus, they are shaping their own identities through communication.

Second-Language Teaching Strategies

One of the major issues in second-language learning is the debate over traditional teaching methods versus innovative teaching methods. Thomas and Collier (1999) defined traditional teaching methods as “classes that are more text-book driven and very teacher-controlled, where students have few opportunities to interact with each other” (p. 8a). Consider the following finding from a U.S. Department of Education-sponsored national study:

Direct observations reveal that teachers do most of the talking in classrooms, making about twice as many utterances as do students. . . . In over half of the interactions that teachers have with students, students do not produce any language. . . . When students do respond, typically they provide only simple information recall statements. This pattern of teacher–student interaction not only limits a student’s opportunity to create and manipulate language freely, but also limits the student’s ability to engage in more complex learning. (Ramirez, Yuen, & Ramey, 1991, p. 8)

This model of instruction, in which a teacher asks a question, the student responds, and the teacher evaluates the response, is a very different discourse than more recent
dialogic approaches that focus on learning practices facilitated by instruction. According to Thomas and Collier (1999):

[C]urrent approaches focus on interactive, discovery, hands-on learning. Teachers in these classes often use cooperative learning, thematic interdisciplinary lessons, literacy development across the curriculum, process writing, performance and portfolio assessment, microcomputers, critical thinking, learning strategies, and global perspectives infused into the curriculum. (p. 8a)

These current instructional practices offer an interesting way to incorporate a variety of interactional formats into the classroom learning process, thus stimulating learner investment in the activities and language learning. Ongoing staff development can help teachers implement these techniques.

SUMMARY

Many disciplines contribute insights for language instruction. In the past, psychology has held a firm lead in generating directions for educational practices. However, in the past thirty years, fields that have distinct theoretical bases in the fields of applied linguistics, anthropology, sociology, and philosophy have contributed to the research on language, language learning, and teaching. Language educators, in particular, can benefit from understanding how to draw on these disciplines to make classroom contexts more supportive of diverse learners.

We have shown that every language lesson, classroom, program, and policy departs in some way from a set of beliefs about language and language learning in academic contexts. No single learning theory accounts for all the variety that exists in the ways language learners develop ability in a subsequent language and literacy. This underscores how complex human behavior is, and how complex the purposes for language use are—learning language, constructing knowledge, and forming identities.

Both psycholinguistic research and sociocultural research provide bases for informing our decisions about teaching. While the literature from psycholinguistic research attempts to provide universal rules about second-language acquisition and factors of mental processes or stages that an individual may undergo, the research from sociocultural perspectives identifies the particularities of learning in an identified social context. Seen from a sociocultural lens, learning language is first and foremost a learner in a social, dynamic, and interactive context with other learners. Principles derived from sociocultural research help teachers examine how to mediate learners’ active development in collaborative, inclusive classrooms.

For this reason, as teachers we must use, observe, and develop professional judgment in our application of any particular theory. Our success with real learners in a given context is impacted by our decisions to be responsive to their struggles and to do so in an informed manner that builds our theories of language and successful language learning.

EXERCISES AND ACTIVITIES

Discuss and Reflect

1. The communicative language teaching approach borrowed similar organizational sequences (namely, a simple-to-complex sequence) from a behaviorist model. However, this approach replaced linguistic structures with language functions (e.g., self-introductions, forming questions, making requests, apologizing). In what ways do you see learning from this approach being advantageous or disadvantageous when compared to a behaviorist classroom? In what ways are the learners in the two models similar?
Ask Yourself These Questions

1. How do your notions about language learning versus language acquisition impact your instructional strategies or assessment in a content area? Consider the social interactions in your classroom and the activities that promote conceptual development.

2. In what ways do the sociocultural theories resonate with your current or future pedagogical practice? Consider the support that is given to learners in both L1 and L2 for content learning, activity collaboration with peers, and time to reflect using L1 and L2.

What Do Teachers Have to Say?

Why is it important for language teachers to know about language acquisition and language learning? We all wonder why it is necessary to take courses in which the focus is primarily on theories and research. Further, we continually ask ourselves, “What does this have to do with teaching?” As a veteran eighteen-year teacher, I feel amply experienced to attest to the importance of not only understanding language acquisition and language learning, but also being able to apply those theories to practice. As teachers, we should be able to determine where our students are, both cognitively and socially. It is important to know what is learnable at what point in time. This is, of course, more easily said than done.

However, SLA research does offer a wide variety of concepts and descriptive accounts that can help teachers interpret and make better sense of their own classroom experiences, as well as provide ideas for classroom use. For example, SLA research has provided accounts of interlanguage development which show that although learners follow relatively invariant routes of learning, these routes are not linear and, during phases of interlanguage restructuring, apparent regression occurs. My background and knowledge of language learning and language acquisition have served me well. I am absolutely convinced that having this knowledge base has greatly contributed to my ability to skillfully apply theory to my everyday practice.

Michelina H. Main
ESL Teacher, San Antonio, Texas

Case Study

Gisela Zuniga has been a kindergarten–third-grade bilingual/ESL teacher for the past ten years in an urban school district that receives many return migrant students from Puerto Rico. Depending on the limitations of the families’ finances, many students spend varying amounts of the academic year in Puerto Rico and other stretches of time in the United States. Gisela’s school district has decided to eliminate transitional bilingual education, but it will extend ESL services. In all former bilingual education classes, the district’s plans are to include more native speakers of English, the majority of whom are speakers of African American Vernacular English. Gisela is excited about the possibility of building a dual-language program with the bilingual teachers of her school and the teachers in the mainstream classes. Despite some conflict about the amount of time that was supposed to be dedicated to direct ESL instruction, both the bilingual teachers and the principal worked out a rationale that explained how English as a medium of instruction would be used to build comprehension with both groups—and, as a bonus, how students would learn Spanish. After an assembly where information was available to parents in Spanish and English, the principal announced that all parents of kindergarteners could choose either to enroll in the dual-language or all-English medium classroom. To his surprise, the majority of the parents, both Spanish speaking and English speaking, chose the dual-language program. There were barely enough students in the English-only medium to constitute a class.

Gisela’s plan, to have an entire class in which at any moment a child could be learning through his or her second language, made her more conscious about her need to plan how she was going to use English and Spanish for her instruction and how she was going to help her students become at ease and flourish in their second-language environment. Gisela decided to use themes that could help students build positive identities through their language use. Her themes were Me, My Family, and My Neighborhood, and would serve to meet ESL, language arts, art, and social- and physical-education development objectives. She selected highly colorful materials that would let students learn how to
describe themselves, their families, and their friends through reading and making charts, posters, postcards, and maps. Her goal was to help students formulate questions about their communities that served as inquiry projects to map the city, neighborhood by neighborhood. Gisela thought this would help her students connect their lives to school experiences and the school with their communities. This was the beginning step in doing more exploration and for using language learning to communicate to different audiences.

1. What are some arguments for using the strengths of students’ past language-learning experiences to build proficiency in another language and literacy?
2. What advice would you give Gisela in making her classroom welcoming to both groups of students?

Technology Highlights

View the following two YouTubes that explore language learning and language acquisition:

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PZatrvNDOiE
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Foj8_HBa4Xw

Advocacy

Create brochures or fliers “Tips for Working with English Language Learners” and distribute them throughout your school. Place them in strategic places such as the teachers’ workroom, mailboxes, and even the restrooms!

Comprehension Exercises

I. Chapter Review

1. Define language.
2. Define language learning.
3. Differentiate between language learning and language acquisition.
4. What are some pedagogical implications for psycholinguistic theories and practices?
5. What are some pedagogical implications for sociocultural theories and practices?

II. Reflecting on What You’ve Read

1. How do you ensure that your lessons are both interactive and content-based?
2. Given that you will undoubtedly have multilevel proficient students in your classes, how will you design instructional strategies that provide comprehensible input, namely i + 1?
3. What kinds of print material will you make available to students in your classroom? What will guide your selection?
4. How will you use resources from your students’ L1 to help them learn English?

III. Application Activities

Write an activity for second language learners that incorporates each of the three attributes of interaction:

1. Meaningful Interaction
2. Reflection and Action
3. Feedback

IV. KWLA

Use the following KWLA activity to summarize what you’ve learned.

1. This is what I now know, wanted to know, learned, and how I’ll apply how languages are learned and acquired:
Planning for Today’s Millennial Learners and a Standards-Based Classroom

What Does the Research Say?

In Chapter 3 we discuss several methods and approaches to foreign- or second-language teaching in the classroom; however, not all of these methods are compatible with an interactive and standards-based approach. You will note that we are very careful in not recommending any one method or approach over another. We both agree that a wide repertoire will allow you to choose techniques that will serve all your students. In the same regard, learning to plan effectively is probably most readily achieved from a holistic approach. It might be argued that effective planning is one of the important keys to effective teaching. If this is true, what does it take to plan effectively?

Effective planning begins long before the teacher enters the classroom. A lesson plan should have a thoughtfully devised description of goals, objectives, activities, outcomes, and assessments. The task of planning for teaching would be considerably easier if our only concern was to identify the content to be learned by our students. We have important decisions to make regarding basic content and general goals from which we will be working (MacDonald, 1999).
Planning for an interactive, standards-based foreign-/second-language classroom requires careful thinking and consideration. Learners in K–12 settings are well served when they are enabled to integrate knowledge of the academic content areas with their own existing knowledge. Planning also requires a clear articulation of the goals and objectives teachers are trying to achieve. Good planning and preparation require that teachers know what materials and resources are available and how they can be used to create a positive learning experience for all students (Pelletier, 2000).

The idea of backward planning, as espoused by Grant Wiggins and Jay McTighe (2001), notes that teachers should begin by stating their overarching objectives and by planning the formal assessments to show that they have accomplished these objectives. According to Semonsky (2010), there are several benefits to planning the final assessments first: (1) It helps the teacher focus the planning; (2) it helps eliminate lessons where there are too many activities that do not reinforce the main language objectives; (3) it encourages teachers to assess meaningful language output in both written and spoken form, rather than discrete identification; and (4) it provides assessment data that address accountability expectations.

Research related to the effectiveness of educating English learners has documented the importance of creating a classroom environment that promotes instructional strategies, including high cognitive complexity of lessons, an integrated and thematic curriculum, collaborative learning, and building on the language-culture knowledge base that students brings to the classroom (Au, 1993; Chamot, Dale, O’Malley, & Spanos, 1992; Cummins, 1996; Dalton & Sison, 1995; Garcia, 1991, 1994; Goldenberg, 1991; Henderson & Landesman, 1992; Rosebery, Warren, & Conant, 1992; Tharp & Gallimore, 1988; Thomas, 1994; Valdez Pierce, 1991; Warren & Rosebery, 1995). This consideration benefits language majority students because it opens their worlds to perspectives and values they may not otherwise have opportunities to explore.

Eugene Garcia summarizes this research by emphasizing that a key to students’ success is an interactive, student-centered learning context. This builds on the language and culture of the home:

- Any curriculum, including one for diverse children, must address all categories of learning goals (cognitive and academic, advanced as well as basic).
- The more linguistically and culturally diverse the children, the more closely teachers must relate academic content to a child’s own environment and experience.
- The more diverse the children, the more integrated the curriculum should be. That is, content areas (e.g., math, science, social studies) and language-learning activities should be centered around a single theme. Children should have opportunities to study a topic in depth and to apply a variety of skills they have acquired in home, community, and school contexts.
- The more diverse the children, the greater the need for active rather than passive endeavors, particularly informal social activities such as group projects, in which students are allowed flexibility in their participation with the teacher and other students.
- The more diverse the children, the more important it is to offer them opportunities to apply what they are learning in a meaningful context. Curriculum can be made meaningful in a number of creative ways. Science and math skills can be effectively applied, for example, through hands-on, interactive activities that allow students to explore issues of significance in their lives (Garcia, 1994, p. 275).
In order to plan effectively, a teacher must have a relatively broad view of the teaching–learning process, as well as knowledge of the subject matter he or she is preparing. Subject matter and content need to be organized and sequenced in such a way that students are provided the best possible chance of attaining learning goals and objectives. The teacher must fully understand the learning goals and then determine the learning foci, lesson sequencing, and activities and projects, as well as the teaching methods and strategies that will be most appropriate.

Research over the last several years supports involving the learner more actively in the learning process (Kagan, 1989; Lee & VanPatten, 1995; Scarcella & Oxford, 1992). Therefore, in an interactive classroom, teachers must provide activities that allow students to actively use the language. This involves planning lessons that provide optimal opportunities for students to be active participants.

Planning and Managing Interactive Instruction

Sheltered Instruction Observational Protocol (SIOP) Model

One lesson planning and teaching model that has become widely used across the country, as well as internationally, over the past several years is the Sheltered Instruction Observational Protocol (SIOP) Model (www.siopinstitute.net). The SIOP Model, authored by Jana Echevarria (California State, Long Beach), MaryEllen Vogt (California State, Long Beach), and Deborah J. Short (Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D.C./ Academic Language Research and Training, Arlington, Virginia), was designed to help make grade-level, content-area standards accessible and comprehensible by English language learners (ELLs). Sheltered instruction is the integration of content and language instruction with the dual goal of providing accessibility to grade-level content while fostering the development of English language proficiency. Sheltered instruction can also be referred to as specifically designed academic instruction in English (SDAIE).

The SIOP Model is comprised of eight components and thirty features within its components. The eight SIOP Model components are: lesson preparation, building background, comprehensible input, strategies, interaction, practice/application, lesson delivery, and review and assessment. One of the key aspects of the SIOP program is the application of both content and language objectives in each lesson.

Lesson planning is critical to both student and teacher success. For maximum learning to occur, planning must produce lessons that enable students to make connections between their own knowledge and experiences, and the new information being taught (Rummelhart, 1995). It is essential to plan lessons that make learning “real world” for students. When this occurs, content is more meaningful and students are able to make real-life connections to materials and activities introduced in the classroom.

For beginning and preservice teachers, planning can be one of the more daunting tasks of teaching. Planning can seem endless. Try to begin thinking about planning in such a way that you will divide it into three different levels: course planning or program planning, unit planning, and daily lesson planning. Each of these types of planning has a different purpose and covers a different period of time. See Figure 2.1 for information on long-term and short-term planning. We will first concentrate on incorporating standards into course or program planning.
Section II Interactive Instructional Practice in Content-Based Settings

Figure 2.1 Long-Term and Short-Term Planning

1. Long-Term Plans—Yearly Planning

Purpose:
How were plans created?
What constraints exist with the plans?
City/school system/community
School or state curriculum guides
Department
Theoretical principles
Beliefs
Values
Incoming and continuing learner interests/abilities/backgrounds
Funding
What does the plan look like?

2. Long-Range Plans—Quarterly Planning (May Be Organized by Marking Term)

Purpose:
How were plans created?
What guides the plans?
City/school system
School or state curriculum guides
Department
What does the plan look like?
Short-term planning includes units, weekly plans, and daily lessons. It supports the goals of the long-term plans and puts into action these goals on a daily basis. Interview your cooperating teacher, department chair, or other teachers in the building to discover how they organize their short-term planning.

3. Short-Term Plans—Unit Planning

Units may be organized around themes or subject areas. Some units are interdisciplinary and use a variety of knowledge content areas. Units have a beginning and an end.

- Review examples of “model” units from your school of education. How are they organized?
- Ask your cooperating teacher (or other teachers) to share units he or she has completed. What do you notice?

4. Short-Term Plans—Weekly Plan-Book Planning

Teachers commonly complete weekly plans in a plan book distributed by the school system. These books are often available in office supply stores, and you may want to purchase one to document the lesson plan you will be teaching during the week. Another option is to copy from your teacher’s plan book. Make multiple copies and place them in a three-ring binder to use as your own plan book. This will give you a complete documentation of all lessons you have taught.

- How is your cooperating teacher’s plan book organized?
- Is it color coded? Could it be?
- How will you organize your plan book?
Incorporating Standards into Course and Program Planning

In this section we highlight five types of national standards as they relate to course and program planning. Course and program planning often include subject matter elements, learning goals, and teaching methods. This type of planning takes place in accordance with an entire year or semester. Planning frequently resembles a broad outline.

I. Central goals and purposes of the course or program
   A. National standards
   B. State standards
   C. Local standards
   D. Stakeholders: colleagues at school, parents, students, administrators, principals, and school boards

II. Course content—what is to be taught
   A. Organizing principles—learner-centered instructions, topics that relate to the real world
   B. Sequencing—logical progression from familiar to unfamiliar
   C. Resources—in the community, school, and classroom (staffing, time, space, technology, books, money)

III. Assessment
   A. Course and program evaluation
   B. Teacher self-assessment
   C. Assessment of student learning

The TESOL Pre-K–12 English Language Proficiency Standards were published in 2006. (The are available to read or order online at www.tesol.org. To read, click on “Quick Links, Pre-K–12 ELP Standards.”) This publication is organized around three overarching goals: the development of (1) social language, (2) academic language, and (3) sociocultural knowledge. Each goal supports the following five standards. Reaching these standards means that students will demonstrate proficiency as English speakers, readers, and writers. The standards include both social and academic uses of the language students must acquire for success in and beyond the classroom.

Standard 1: English language learners communicate for social, intercultural, and instructional purposes within the school setting.

Standard 2: English language learners communicate information, ideas, and concepts necessary for academic success in the area of language arts.
Standard 3: English language learners communicate information, ideas, and concepts necessary for academic success in the area of mathematics.
Standard 4: English language learners communicate information, ideas, and concepts necessary for academic success in the area of science.
Standard 5: English language learners communicate information, ideas, and concepts for academic success in the area of social studies.

Table 2.1 lists the TESOL Pre-K–12 English Language Proficiency Standards. The standards include five levels of language proficiency. The use of five levels reflects how
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complex language development is and it allows for tracking of student progress across grade levels. The five levels of language proficiency levels are intended to highlight the process of language acquisition. Many teachers are required to show evidence of standards-based teaching. Therefore, this book will support documentation of standards-based planning as well as differentiating instruction to reach all English language learners.

The Standards for Foreign Language Learning (SFLL) were first published in 1996. The following statement of principles is the foundation for the standards:

Language and communication are the heart of the human experience. The United States must educate students who are equipped linguistically and culturally to communicate successfully in a pluralistic American society and abroad. This imperative envisions a future in which all students will develop and maintain proficiency in English and at least one other language, modern or classical. Children who come to school from non-English-speaking backgrounds should also have opportunities to develop further proficiencies in their first language (ACTFL, 2012)

The SFLL are available to order online at www.actfl.org/i4a/pages/index.cfm?pageid=4283. The new third edition of these standards has been revised and includes Arabic standards. National, state, and local SFLL standards documents are shown in Figure 2.2. This figure highlights the inclusion of standards and primary components of the planning process. These range from standards at the national level to the daily or unit lesson plan. Use this figure to envision how to coordinate and implement the necessary national, state, and district requirements, as well as your individual planning requirements.

Figure 2.2  National, State, and Local Standards Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Standards</th>
<th>State Framework</th>
<th>District Curriculum</th>
<th>Lesson/Unit Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>Goals for instruction</td>
<td>Local goals for instruction</td>
<td>Specific objectives for learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards</td>
<td>Standards content</td>
<td>Content unit specifics</td>
<td>Content lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit types</td>
<td>Suggested units and sequence</td>
<td>Specifics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure of content</td>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>Unit topics and lessons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching/learning</td>
<td>Resources for unit lessons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample progress indicators</td>
<td>Recommended assessment procedures</td>
<td>Specific assessment techniques</td>
<td>Specific objectives and assessments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA)

The development of language proficiency standards describes performance on a continuum characterized by levels of proficiency. Listening, speaking, reading, and writing assessments are federally mandated by the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act to determine an English language learner’s eligibility for English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) services, their progress in English, and their readiness to exit from services. The WIDA is a criterion-referenced test that is scored against the language proficiency standards and shows where students are on the language proficiency continuum. The proficiency levels are: (1) least proficient, or entering, (2) beginning, (3) developing, (4) expanding, (5) bridging, and (6) reaching. Levels one through four are still eligible to receive ESOL services. NCLB also requires that all ELLs be measured with Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) to ensure that their proficiency increases by one or more levels. The WIDA English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards are available online at www.wida.us/standards/elp.aspx.

Common Core State Standards

The Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts articulate rigorous grade-level expectations in the areas of speaking, listening, reading, and writing to prepare all students, including ELLs, to be college and career ready. The National Governors Association Center for Best Practices and the Council of Chief State School Officers have stated that all students should be held to the same high expectations outlined in the Common Core State Standards. However, they acknowledge that ELLs may require additional time, appropriate instructional support, and aligned assessments as they acquire both English language proficiency and content area knowledge. The Common Core State Standards are available online at www.corestandards.org.

21st Century Skills

The Partnership for 21st Century Skills developed a unified, collective vision for twenty-first century learning and education support systems that can be used to prepare young people for a global economy. This vision is the result of a multi-year, comprehensive effort to create a shared understanding and common vision for education (see Figure 2.3). To learn more about twenty-first century learning, visit www.p21.org.

Creating a Lesson Plan

In this chapter, two sample lesson plan templates are provided—one for ESL and one for foreign-language teaching. They are designed to be comprehensive and should be very useful, especially for the beginning teacher.

There is no single best lesson plan format, so we recommend that you consider various examples. The templates we have provided, on the following pages and in Figure 2.4, provide an organized, logical way of putting on paper your approach to standards-based lesson planning. As a beginning teacher, you will want to design lesson plans with this degree of specificity and detail. Later, as you become more experienced at planning, you will be able to modify this to a much shorter version. Figure 2.5 is an example of a reflective
Figure 2.3 21st Century Framework

Figure 2.4 Lesson Plan Template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foreign Languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher __________________ School __________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade(s) ______ Language(s) _____ Level(s) _______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date ______ Number of Students ______ Time/Period ______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEME / TOPIC OF LESSON / UNIT: ________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLANNING PHASE
Performance-Based Objectives
As a result of this lesson/unit, students will be able to:
1. 
2. 
3. 

Alignment with Standards:
National:
State:

Local:

**Assessment of Learning:**
Pre-teaching assessment:

Ongoing/formative assessment:

Post-lesson assessment:

**Materials Needed:**


**TEACHING PHASE**

**Lesson Outline**

**Theme or Topic:**
- Warm-up activity: ____________________________
- Vocabulary: ________________________
- Verb(s): ________________________
- Grammatical structure(s): ________________________
- Cultural perspectives: ________________________

**Daily Lesson Plan**

*Activity 1:*
- Transition:

*Activity 2:*
- Transition:

*Activity 3:*
- Transition:

**Presentation and Practice**

**Three Modes Employed:**
- Interpersonal activities:
Presentational activities:

Interpretive activities:

**Methods/Approaches/Strategies Used:**

---

**CLOSURE**

Review of this lesson:

Preview for next lesson:

**Expansion/extension for learners**

This lesson could be expanded (in content) by:

This lesson could be extended (in scope) by:

**Other Activities or Lesson Details**

Accommodations made for varied learning needs:

Assessment:

Technology:

Homework:

Follow-up:

**REFLECTION PHASE**

**Self-Evaluation**

*Learning Objectives and Assessments*

1. Were the class objectives met? Why or why not?
2. Formative assessment results:
Efforts to Accommodate

What were the results of my efforts to accommodate:
- Visual learners
- Auditory learners
- Kinesthetic learners
- Specials needs learners
- Heritage/native speakers
- Multiple intelligences and learning styles

What worked well?

What didn’t work well?

What will you do differently as a result of this plan?

How might this lesson be improved?

One important thing I learned was:

How did I use my pre- and post-teaching assessment data to inform my understanding of what the students learned? How will I use the assessment information to inform future instruction?

For the next class:

For longer reaching goals:

guide for student teachers who may want to keep a journal or log of their lesson planning and teaching experiences.

In Figure 2.6, we have broken down the parts of the ESL lesson plan template in order to explain how you should use each section. First you will identify the teacher and school, grade(s) of students, proficiency level(s), program model, and content. This is typically referred to as demographic information. You will also indicate the class duration.

Next, the planning phase is outlined. Here the teacher clearly and succinctly lists the content and language objectives, vocabulary, and materials. This is also where the
CHAPTER 2  Planning for Today’s Millennial Learners and a Standards-Based Classroom

Figure 2.5  What Are My Thoughts?

You may choose to self-evaluate by writing your thoughts on the lesson plan or attaching this form to each plan.

1. Was my plan effective?
2. Did I reach all learners?
3. What will I do differently the next time as a result of how this lesson went?
4. What worked well and why?
5. What didn’t work well and why?
6. Did I provide scaffolded and/or differentiated instruction?
7. Were the materials/visuals/technology/resources age and language-level appropriate?

Figure 2.6  Sample Lesson Plan Template

English as a Second Language

Teacher _____________________________  School _____________________________
Grade(s) __________  Proficiency Level(s) __________  Program Model __________
Content: ___________________________  Class Duration (45/60/90 minutes) __________

PLANNING PHASE

Content Objectives
As a result of this lesson, students will be able to: (I can)
1.
2.
3.

Language Objectives
As a result of this lesson, students will be able to: (I can)
1.
2.
3.

Vocabulary

Materials

Available Technology
Lesson Outline:

Content:

National/State/Local Standards:

TEACHING PHASE SEQUENCE

Warm-up Activity:

Transition:

Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Scaffolding</th>
<th>Processes</th>
<th>Multiple Intelligences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entire class</td>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Visual/spatial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small group</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>Kinesthetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>Guided</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>Musical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td></td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Logical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>Naturalist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Activity # 1

Activity # 2

Activity # 3

Differentiated Instruction

Starting up
Beginning
Developing
Expanding
Bridging
Special needs
Gifted

Assessment (formative/summative)

Closure

Review of this lesson:
Preview for next lesson:
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Homework

REFLECTION PHASE

Learning Objectives
Were the content and language objectives met? How or why not?

Efforts to Accommodate:
- Visual learners
- Auditory learners
- Tactile learners
- Specials needs learners
- Gifted learners

What worked well?

What didn’t work well?

What will you do differently as a result of this plan?

How might this lesson be improved or expanded?

One important thing I learned about my teaching was
One important thing I learned about my students was

The teacher describes the subject area content and identifies alignment with national, state, and/or local standards.

Before writing objectives, you must understand what is to be taught, to whom, and under what circumstances. Once you are familiar with national, state, and local standards, and you understand the curriculum, planning differentiated instruction is a straightforward task. When planning instruction for ELLs, it is most beneficial to think about writing objectives that encompass both content and language. Also, keep in mind that most states now require proficiency exams for ELLs. Therefore, lessons must be planned around emphasizing the four skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

Content objectives identify what students should know and be able to do. These guide teaching and learning. The bottom line for English learners is that content objectives need to be written in terms of what students will learn or do, be stated simply (both orally and in writing), and tied to specific grade-level content standards (Echevarria & Graves,
Content objectives are usually taken from the state core subject area standards. While carefully planning and delivering content objectives, teachers must also incorporate in their lesson plans activities that support students’ language development (Short, 1999). Some active verbs that typically appear in content objectives are: create, distinguish, select, identify, solve, and so forth. For example, “Students will be able to identify and describe various aspects of the solar system.”

As with content objectives, language objectives should be stated clearly and simply, and students should be informed of them, both orally and in writing (Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2008). Content and language objectives should be gleaned from the topic of the lesson and play a vital role in the overall instructional plan. Some active verbs that are used in language objectives are: write, compare, define, retell, summarize, and so forth. An example might be, “Students will be able to compare and contrast what an animal cell and a plant cell look like, their functions, and their main differences in structure using a Venn Diagram graphic organizer.”

The next section is called the teaching phase sequence. In this section of the lesson plan you create the opening activity, the warm-up. This is a vital start to the beginning of every class because this is what focuses the learner on moving from the external variables of school life toward concentrating on a new learning experience for that day.

Transitions are the parts of the lesson that guide teachers to realize that every lesson should be comprised of seamless connections between each activity. The activities grid provided in the template enables you to use grouping, scaffolding, and multiple processes to balance your teaching. Simply placing a check mark allows you to see at a glance how varied your teaching strategies are. It is in this section that you will describe differentiating instruction for the TESOL five levels of proficiency. Finally, the template includes spaces for assessment, closure, and a description of homework.

Homework should be an extension of the day’s activities. However, consideration must be given that some students will not have someone at home to assist them. Also, we should not assume that students will have access to resources such as the Internet, newspapers, or even books. Homework must be given with clear directions and purpose. It is always a good idea to check to be sure students understand the assignment before they leave the classroom by completing one or two items from the assignment in class together.

The last section of the lesson plan template is just as important as the planning and teaching phases. The reflection phase gives you an opportunity for reflective practice. Becoming a reflective practitioner should be a goal that you set for yourself. Not only does it entail knowledge gain, but it will also enhance your perspectives on teaching and learning. This knowledge growth will then affect your classroom practice. This is the section of your plan where you go back and reflect on what happened during the lesson. Start by asking yourself if you accommodated all learners. Then reflect on: (1) what worked well, (2) what didn’t work well, (3) what you will do differently, (4) how the plan can be improved, and (5) one important thing you learned.

Reflective practice is a conscious, systematic, deliberate process of framing and reframing classroom practice in light of the consequences of the actions, democratic principles, educational beliefs, values, and preferred visions teachers bring to the teaching–learning event (Serrafini, 2002). You are strongly encouraged to use this section to reflect on what is working well and what is not. Doing so allows you to decide what adjustments you may want to make. This also gives you the opportunity to look at your teaching through multiple lenses and make informed decisions about your practice.
There are numerous program models in second-language education. Wherever you find yourself teaching in the United States, you will most likely experience one or several of the models listed here.

**Program Models**

There are numerous program models in second language education. Wherever you find yourself teaching in the United States, you will most likely experience one or several of the models listed here.

- **bilingual immersion education**—Academic instruction given in both first and second languages for grades K–12

- **90–10 model**—90 percent of academic instruction is in the second language, and the remaining 10 percent of academic instruction is in the first language. Referred to as *early total immersion* in Canada.

- **50–50 model**—Academic instruction is equally split between first and second languages. Referred to as *partial immersion* in Canada.

- **content-based ESL**—ESL students learn age-appropriate content in math, science, social studies, and English language arts.

- **developmental bilingual education**—Academic instruction in each language for half the day in grades K–5 or 6. This used to be referred to as maintenance bilingual education or late exit bilingual education.

- **English as a Second Language (ESL) or English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL)**—All academic instruction is in English.

- **ESL content or sheltered instruction**—ESL content classes are usually self-contained at the elementary level for one or two years, with a gradual shift to moving students to their age-appropriate grade-level classes. Secondary students attend classes taught by teachers with dual certification in ESL and a content area subject.

- **ESL pull out**—Students are taken out of the grade-level classroom for English language instruction according to grade level and language need. This is the most expensive of all program models in bilingual/ESL education because it requires hiring extra resource teachers who are trained in second-language acquisition (Chambers & Parrish, 1992; Crawford, 1997). In the United States, ESL pullout is the most implemented and the least effective model (Thomas & Collier, 1997).

- **immersion**—Students attend specially designed content-area classes taught in the target language. Teachers are usually certified in both the content area and the target language.

- **inclusion**—The ESL teacher and the classroom teacher plan and teach together in the grade-level classroom.

- **mainstreaming**—Once the ESL teacher determines that the ESL students are proficient to move to all-English classes, the transition is made to content-centered courses.

- **monitoring**—The ESL teacher monitors classroom progress of students who are close to exiting the ESL program, as well as those students whose language needs are addressed in programs other than ESL.
**partial immersion**—Programs in which up to 50 percent of subjects are taught in the foreign language. In some programs, the material taught in the foreign language is reinforced in English.

**sheltered English**—This is a specialized form of an immersion program. Students coming from varying native language backgrounds are taught by a teacher with a background in both subject-matter and ESL pedagogy. Students usually have a regular ESL class as part of the curriculum.

**specially designed academic instruction in English (SDAIE)**—Content-based approach to teaching English for intermediate and advanced learners.

**structured English immersion (SEI)**—There are only ELLs in class, and they preferably have one native language. All instruction is in English.

**submersion**—Students are “submerged” in regular content-area classes with no special second-language instruction. Research indicates that students do not do well in this model and some schools elect to use a pullout model program to assist students.

**submersion plus ESL**—Classrooms for small-group tutoring in English, typically lasting 30 to 45 minutes per day.

**total immersion**—Programs in which all or almost all subjects taught in the lower grades (K–2) are taught in the foreign language. Instruction in English usually increases 20 to 50 percent in the upper grades (3–6), depending on the program.

**transitional bilingual education**—Academic instruction in each language for half of the day, with gradual transition to all second-language instruction in approximately two to three years.

**two-way bilingual education**—Language majority and language minority students are taught together in the same bilingual class.

**two-way immersion**—Programs that give equal emphasis to English and a non-English language, and in which one to two thirds of the students are native speakers of the non-English language, with the remainder being native speakers of English.

### Sample Schools Representing Program Models

**Oyster-Adams Bilingual Elementary School**  The Oyster-Adams Bilingual Elementary School is a public school that delivers a 50–50 two-way dual immersion bilingual model of education. Fifty percent of the instruction is in Spanish. The school began in 1971 as a bilingual school and serves a student population that is linguistically, ethnically, and economically diverse.

**The Hawaiian Language Immersion Program**  The Hawaiian Language Immersion School, Ka Papahana Kaiapuni Hawaii, was started in 1987 as a one-year pilot program in combination kindergarten/first grade in two schools. It expanded to a K–6 program in four schools by 1989. By 1995, there were 756 K–8 students enrolled. The Hawaiian Language Immersion Program is taught in Hawaiian only until grade five or six, when English is introduced as the medium of teaching and learning for one hour a day.

**Hanshaw Middle School**  Hanshaw is a middle school located in Modesto, California. It has a population of students that is 56 percent Hispanic, 26 percent white, 11 percent...
Asian, and 5 percent African American. Hanshaw teachers make curriculum design decisions based on the following principle: Every lesson or skill must be relevant to the students’ lives. Planning instruction focuses on helping students know why an answer is correct. Most important, teachers build on students’ own experiences in thematic instruction. Themes unify instruction across science, math, language arts, and social studies, incorporating topics from the California curriculum frameworks.

**Foreign-Language Program Models**

There are three program models for early foreign language education: FLES, FLEX, and immersion. **Foreign Language in the Elementary School (FLES)** is a sequential, articulate program in which the goal is to teach the four skills—listening, speaking, reading, and writing. The number of contact minutes (the number of minutes the teacher is with the students) varies from school to school.

The **foreign language exploratory or experience (FLEX)** programs take place over a given period of time, typically from six to nine weeks or an entire semester. The goal for students in FLEX programs is to learn about the language. Usually, culture is strongly emphasized and communication is not a goal.

**Immersion** programs provide students the opportunity to learn content subjects in the target language, usually at the elementary levels. This may range from a designated segment of the day (partial immersion) to a full day (total immersion). The goal of immersion programs is to provide extended learning opportunities in which the student can develop a certain level of language proficiency while learning subject content.

Texts and materials for FLES and FLEX programs are often teacher generated. Summer workshops and staff development throughout the school year are offered in many school districts as a means of providing teachers with materials, ideas, and collaborative networking. Textbook analysis and selection for ESL, bilingual, and foreign-language programs is much more established and regulated by state and/or district boards of education.

**The Role of Textbooks and Other Materials in Planning for Content-Based Instruction**

Textbooks are useful for planning in that they are usually written in such a way that they provide an organizing framework for curricula. In addition, most textbooks include activities, additional resources, and certain types of multimedia. These may include websites, wiki spaces, blogs, webinars, videos, podcasts, CDs, DVDs, and other Internet resources. Be very careful not to rely exclusively on a single textbook, however. Remember that in working with second-language learners, you will want to provide such a wide array of instructional materials that it is literally impossible for one textbook to satisfy all your needs and those of your students.

**Textbook Analysis and Selection**

Once determinations have been made about course or program planning, consideration must be given to resources: texts and textbook selection. We carefully distinguish here between texts as those forms of print media represented in Chapter 6. Textbook is defined as one type of text, such as a book used in an educational curriculum. We strongly encourage
you to consider multiple textbooks from which you pick and choose those segments that fit your course or program objectives. Once you allow yourself the freedom to use multiple sources, you will find that you are much more likely to satisfy all of your requirements and ultimately you will not feel restricted and confined to one single textbook. The same is true for selecting appropriate texts. Using authentic text materials will not only provide avenues to connect your students to the target language and culture, but they also afford you with multiple opportunities to bring real-world aspects into the classroom. Galloway (1998) defines **authentic texts** as “those written for oral communications produced by members of a language and culture group for members of the same language and culture group” (p. 133). Authentic written materials should also be presented in their original form, if possible, to allow students to use nonlinguistic cues to interpret meaning (Grellet, 1981).

Textbook analysis and selection is a process that in many school districts takes place every four to seven years. Therefore, teachers should be discerning consumers when selecting textbooks, since they will be using these books for a designated time frame. Textbook adoption committees are usually selected at both the state and local levels. Teachers, administrators, and curriculum developers all take part in this process. Textbook fairs are often held during which the representatives from the various book companies present their “latest and greatest.”

Figure 2.7 contains a checklist that foreign- and second-language teachers may want to consider in analyzing and selecting textbooks.

### Figure 2.7 Textbook Selection Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The textbook is visually appealing.</th>
<th>✓</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The language of the textbook is appropriate given the students’ reading levels.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The book incorporates appropriate cultural information about the target language.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The textbook is free of cultural, gender, or racial biases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The book is organized for my goals and learners’ interests.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The activities go beyond including the three communicative modes, (e.g., interpersonal, presentational, and interpretive).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The textbook activities allow for creation of language, knowledge, and negotiation of meaning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The textbook incorporates interactive activities for diverse learning styles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language, diversity, literacy, and listening are presented in meaningful ways.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on language forms is integrated into the activities (e.g., discourse, genres, vocabulary, grammar, phonology, morphology).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities are sequenced in a logical way.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The National Standards (SCs or WIDA) are included throughout the book.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology is integrated throughout the book.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Nature and Role of Culture in Planning

In Chapter 3, we discuss the importance of providing instructional strategies and assessment practices that reflect the cultural, linguistic, and cognitive diversity of your students. The diversity of learners, both racial/ethnic and cognitive, will continue to play a role in impacting curriculum and planning. The changing ethnic texture of the U. S. population has major implications for all of the nation’s institutions, including schools, colleges, universities, and the work force (Banks, 1998). Students of color will make up about 46 percent of the nation’s student population by 2020 (Pallas et al., 1989, p. 19). Most teachers now in the

Reflect and Respond

1. Describe how your planning process will include a variety of instructional practices that reflect language outcomes and articulated program models and address the needs of diverse language learners. ACTFL/NCATE Standard 3.b—Developing instructional practices that reflect language outcomes and learner diversity

2. What are three ways to include students’ cultural and linguistic backgrounds in planning standards- and content-based lessons? TESOL/NCATE Standard 3.a—Planning for standards-based ESL and content instruction

3. Look at Chapter 4 on Assessment and describe how data from assessments can inform instruction. TESOL/NCATE Standard 4.c. Classroom-based assessment for ESL
classroom or in teacher education programs will have students from diverse ethnic, cultural, and racial groups in their classrooms during their careers. This is true for both inner-city and suburban teachers (Banks, 1998). How are the backgrounds, experiences, and individualities of these learners represented, acknowledged, and even celebrated in the classroom? How does a teacher begin to consider and embrace the multitude of diversity when planning the program or course, unit, or daily lesson?

First, let us consider the national standards previously mentioned—WIDA, TESOL, and SFLL. By definition, the TESOL standards were designed to address learners who represent racial, ethnic, linguistic, and cultural diverse backgrounds.

Next, take a close look at the ACTFL Standards (see www.actfl.org) and determine whether they are written with consideration for students representing an array of diverse backgrounds (i.e., racial, ethnic, linguistic, and cultural). You might ask yourself how decisions are made when national standards are written and then begin to focus on the impact for planning lessons.

After examining these sets of standards, teachers must approach planning in such a way that they are meeting national, state, and local standards and providing a curriculum that is inclusive of all learners.

**Unit Planning**

One key element in unit planning is to provide achievable and measurable unit objectives based on a standards-based curriculum. Teachers must know what the program goals are and how they will be arranged into long-term and short-term goals. In addition, teachers must provide a sequence of instruction that will acknowledge students’ prior language learning experiences and the expectations of the next level of instruction. For the novice teacher, it is also helpful to design a unit plan based on a particular theme or universal question that you would like the students to research or explore. In an advanced ESL classroom for example, the students could explore the overall theme “Who Am I?” Addressing this theme can be divided into four distinct marking periods or designated weeks. The year-at-a-glance planning method shown in Figure 2.8 can help guide your planning process into manageable chunks.

**Assessment**

When planning for assessment it will be helpful to understand and be capable of using various types of assessments for evaluating how students learn, what they know, and what they are able to do. In Chapter 4, we discuss in greater detail current trends in assessment practices. For planning purposes, it is important to understand that assessment is an ongoing process that includes formative and summative measures that may be formal or informal. Assessments may include observation, teacher-made tests, student self-assessment, peer assessment, standardized tests, portfolios of student work, performance-based tasks, or projects.

**Accommodating Learners with Special Needs**

Considerations for diverse learner needs will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 8. For the purposes of this chapter, we will address accommodating the needs of diverse learners as it relates to planning. First, we will address culturally and linguistically diverse
exceptional students, and then we will describe the Individual Education Plan for special needs students.

**Culturally and linguistically diverse exceptional students** are defined quite broadly. “Culturally and linguistically diverse” describes persons from a variety of cultural, racial, or ethnic backgrounds for whom English is not a first language. For the purposes of this chapter, the term *exceptional* will be used to describe those who are gifted and well as those who have physical, emotional, or learning disabilities.

Teachers planning for classes that are culturally and linguistically diverse have the challenge of determining whether a specific student behavior is the result of cultural differences or evidence of a learning or behavior problem. Teachers need to be especially sensitive to the possibility that what at first appears to be a learning or behavior problem may actually be a difference in the beliefs or customs of the student. When planning, therefore, we suggest that you include a wide array of activities that cover students’ learning styles. Note on the sample lesson plan template in Figure 2.4 there is a section on reflection, which focuses the teacher’s attention to the need for accommodating visual, auditory, and kinesthetic learners. We will further this discussion of planning in Chapter 8, which will cover an interactive approach for working with diverse learners.

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (1999) requires detailed, written instructional plans for students with special needs. The **Individual Education Plan (IEP)**

---

**Figure 2.8** Year-at-a-Glance Planning for "Who Am I?" Themed Lesson

- **Overall theme:** Who am I?
  - **1 marking period:** Where have I been? Where am I from?
  - **2 marking period:** What have I learned? What do I know?
  - **3 marking period:** What defines my world? What is important to me?
  - **4 marking period:** What will I do? Where am I going?
is jointly prepared by the teacher, student, parent, someone who has recently evaluated the child, and usually the building principal or a special education teacher or case manager. The IEP is a legal and binding document that must be strictly followed. Be certain that you carefully read all of the accommodation requirements and ask questions when in doubt. Accommodations may include: (1) preferential seating for students with hearing or visual disabilities, (2) allowing more time for responses to questions, (3) exemption from timed activities, including quizzes or tests, (4) reading texts aloud on demand, (5) reading questions aloud for tests (except for reading comprehension tests), (6) allowing use of bilingual dictionaries, (7) using highlighting markers.

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) is a U.S. law that governs how states and public agencies provide early intervention, special education, and related services to children with disabilities. It addresses the educational needs of children with disabilities from birth to age 18 or 21 that fall under fourteen specified disability categories.

Planning across Proficiency Levels— Differentiated Instruction

In addition to acknowledging that planning must include a recognition of diverse learners, as educators we must also recognize that students learn at different speeds and that they differ widely in their ability to think abstractly or understand complex ideas. This is more challenging when we consider the range of proficiency levels that you will encounter in an ESL or bilingual classroom. How can you be expected to plan for reaching all students? Can you teach to the standards and still differentiate?

According to Carol Ann Tomlinson (2010), author of several books on differentiated instruction, “Clearly, differentiation is based on acceptance of the reality that learning is shaped by a variety of factors, including prior experiences, culture, economics, language, interests, learning preferences, and support systems. Coplanning or coteaching with specialists (e.g., English language learner, special education, reading, etc.) enriches the teacher’s repertoire, extends learning support for his or her students, integrates specialties into the regular classroom, and helps to forge teams that work across specialties on behalf of a wide range of students” (pp. 58, 66).

There are three aspects of differentiating:

1. **Content**—refers to concepts, principles, and skills that teachers want students to learn
2. **Process**—refers to the activities that help students make sense of, and come to own, the ideas and skills being taught
3. **Products**—refers to culminating projects that allow students to demonstrate and extend what they have learned

Planning for differentiating instruction while meeting national, state, and local standards is possible. It takes careful thought and deliberation. As a beginner teacher, you will probably want to seek advice from a mentor or senior teacher if you start to feel a bit overwhelmed. Remember, what is most important is that you approach every class and every individual student as separate and unique. Get to know your students—their backgrounds, interests, and experiences. Take your students where they are and work with them to reach their full potential.
Mainstream Teachers Who Work with ELLs

An important goal for teachers working with ELLs is to recognize the value of all languages as useful mediating tools for accessing and comprehending new information. Mainstream teachers who work directly with children from diverse backgrounds and see them make academic progress as a result of their participation in tutoring programs move away from negative stereotypes and low expectations (Alder, 2000). The more positive, direct experience preservice teachers have with diverse students with critical analysis of their personal beliefs, the more opportunity there is to dispel harmful attitudes and inaccurate stereotypes. Alder (2000) also emphasizes, however, to be careful not to make generalizations about all diverse students.

Planning and Content-Based Instruction

Chamot (2009) offers the following as guidelines for planning and teaching content:

- Identify and share content and lesson objectives.
- Start by linking the lesson topic to students’ prior knowledge.
- Provide hands-on and minds-on experiences with the content.
- Address different learning styles by presenting content visually, aurally, and kinesthetically.
- Present and encourage students to use the technical vocabulary appropriate to the content subject.
- Demonstrate how to ask and answer higher-level questions about content.
- Monitor students’ comprehension on an ongoing basis.
- Teach students how to “know when they don’t know,” and what action to take.
- Provide books, informational texts, and other resources on the content topics being studied; teach students how to use them.
- Show students how to use a variety of graphic organizers to identify prior knowledge, prepare study guides, and restructure prior knowledge. (p. 33)

All instruction, however, cannot be planned. You will encounter those times when an event happens and your students will want to discuss it, right then and there. It may be a significant world event, or maybe a cultural experience a student wants to share. These are sometimes referred to as teachable moments. Rather than ignore or put off the student, temporarily put your plan aside and regard this as a potential learning experience. However, be careful that you do not allow students to purposely manipulate or distract you from the lesson.

Go to Chapter 3 and read the teacher’s unit plan on page XX. Notice how the objectives are stated. An objective for a high school advanced ESL class might be, “Students will locate information appropriate to an assignment in text or reference materials.”

The following represent Hall Haley’s (2010) guidelines for planning lessons:

1. Determine what your local and state curriculums require you to teach. Identify the content and/or language objectives.
2. Decide what vocabulary is to be taught and decide on a strategy for preteaching new words.
3. Have materials, resources, and supplies readily available and well organized for easy access.

4. Determine what students need to know (content facts and information), understand (principles and concepts), and do (summarize or retell) as a result of the learning experience.

5. Identify national, state, and local standards with which to align your lessons.

6. Decide what differentiated needs the students have based on formal or information assessments or pre- or post-tests.

7. Determine what strategy or strategies of differentiated instruction you want to use. Examples might include grouping, scaffolding, tiered assignments, and learning centers.

8. Decide how you will use assessments (formal and informal) to reach all learners’ intelligences and learning styles.

Other Considerations in Daily Planning

**Time**  As a beginning teacher, you may be quite surprised to discover that the lesson you taught at the beginning of the day may fail miserably in the afternoon. (Ask any veteran teacher!) The time of the day will, to some degree, impact your ability to effectively carry out your lesson plan. What are some factors that influence this? Students at the very beginning of the day may need a little more energizing. You may want to plan more interactive openers or warm-up activities to get your students started. You may see a change in your students’ performance after lunch. The phenomenon may also occur at the end of the day when students may be feeling tired and just want the day to be over. How might instruction in block scheduling, after-school programs, and extracurricular activities differ from daily planning? How might culminating activities in each semester build up school and community awareness and appreciation of your students’ growing communicative abilities?

**Place**  Given the growing numbers of students annually enrolling in pre-K–12 schools, often there are not enough rooms for every teacher. When this occurs teachers must share rooms, requiring one teacher to be a “floater.” Usually a floating teacher carries all of his or her materials on a cart. Careful planning is critical for this teacher because it’s not always possible to go back and retrieve a forgotten item. However, if you are fortunate enough to have your own room, your planning should take into consideration how seats are arranged, students’ ability to see the boards clearly, where the computers are located, and how you strategically place equipment such as an overhead projector or a TV and VCR. You should decide where you will place print materials and how you will use your bulletin boards for interactive activities. These must all be taken into consideration when planning for instruction.

**Locating Other Resources**  A single textbook cannot meet the needs of every student. Therefore, you will need to supplement your curricula with additional resources. When you plan you will want to consider what other resources and materials to use. With the increasing popularity of information technology, more information than ever on effective planning is available for teachers. We suggest you incorporate multiple texts, including the Internet, magazines, newspapers, films, CD-ROMs, videos, student-generated items (e.g., student-generated, developed, found, or researched materials), into your objectives for lessons. This allows you to select texts that are of particular importance to you and your students.
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Think, Pair, Share

After reading this chapter, complete the following activity with a partner.

1. What steps can teachers take to critically consider the alignment of their curriculum with a state framework, national standards, and their students’ needs?

2. What characteristics will be most beneficial to you when analyzing or selecting texts and textbooks?

3. What are some considerations for daily planning?

SUMMARY

In this chapter we have attempted to provide you with ways to enhance your planning skills for interactive standards-based language instruction. This will make the planning phase of teaching more manageable and meaningful. Planning for the inclusion of cultural, linguistic, and cognitively diverse learners will better enable you to teach for reaching all learners. Moreover, connecting to national standards, state frameworks, and local curriculum guides will ensure that you are preparing your students to succeed by meeting the challenges in mainstream classes throughout their educational experience. It is important to remember that planning is not teaching. Incorporating purposeful texts and careful textbook analysis and selection will prove extremely beneficial as you plan meaningful instructional activities and assessments.

EXERCISES AND ACTIVITIES

Discuss and Reflect

1. What are some of the major considerations in the planning process?

2. Discuss the importance of using a lesson plan template.

3. What role do textbooks and other materials play in the planning process?
Ask Yourself These Questions

1. Why is it important to reflect on the effectiveness of your planning?
2. What additional resources will you use in your planning efforts?
3. How do teachers plan for multilevel classes?

Activities

1. Talk with an experienced second- or foreign-language teacher and ask them to describe their planning process. Then talk to an elementary ESL teacher and discuss time frames and teaching.
2. Write three questions to ask teachers about planning for multiple proficiency levels.
3. Talk to a mainstream teacher. How does he or she plan for ELLs? How does he or she collaborate with other teachers?

What Do Teachers Have to Say?

Having been both an ESOL teacher and a classroom teacher thus far in my teaching career, I have been fortunate to see the view from both sides of the fence. Human nature can make it easy to jump to the notion that one job is more demanding than the other, more important that the other, and so forth. As an ESOL teacher, it is important to remember that your co-teaching input is valuable! While knowledge of language acquisition and language-based objectives may appear to be a distant second to the content knowledge that the classroom teacher brings to a lesson, your expertise and input is what helps to make that knowledge comprehensible and meaningful to your ESOL students. One can create the best lesson, but if that lesson is not presented in a way that makes the material attainable to all students, it will truly be a waste of instructional time.

Co-planning and co-teaching will look different in every school and classroom. The goal to keep in mind as an ESOL teacher is that you are going to help the classroom teacher make the content “digestible” for all students through language-rich objectives and strategies. Always bring to the table ways to create and enrich listening, speaking, reading, and writing opportunities.

Offer differentiated options that will meet the needs of all language levels. Enhance lessons with strong picture support when applicable. Offer ways to incorporate total physical response and other strategies that promote ELL learning. Help enhance content-area lessons by providing leveled text (fiction or non-fiction) that correlates with the lesson. Modify assessments through added picture support, redesign of questions, alternate forms of assessment, and so on, to provide authentic ways to capture student learning. Provide solid, more-structured support for newcomers, dually identified ELLs, and those who have more extreme language needs. Perhaps most of all, make your co-teacher aware that your tools as a specialist can help ensure that the flavor and intention of the content area lesson will truly be absorbed by the ESOL students. Co-planning and co-teaching is what each of you makes of it and when educators work in concert together, you can provide your students with a feast of knowledge that can be enjoyed by all students.

Margo K. Machuga
University Supervisor, George Mason University, Fairfax, VA

Case Study

Eileen Cotton is a second-year ESL teacher in an urban public middle school that uses a pull-out program model. She asks your advice about ways to collaborate with the general education content teacher for interactive standards-based planning. You invite her to a curriculum planning meeting. When the meeting begins,
the teachers discuss aligning their curriculum with local guides. Since Eileen is new to this school district, she is unfamiliar with this kind of planning.

Answer the following questions and then share your responses with a partner.

1. How can the more-experienced teachers in the department assist Eileen?
2. What steps can Eileen take to familiarize herself with collaborative standards-based planning?

**Technology Highlights**

1. For additional information, support, and resources on differentiating instruction, go to http://daretodifferentiate.wikispaces.com.
2. Log on to https://lpg.sdsu.edu and practice using the online Lesson Plan Generator.
3. View the video in the Teaching Foreign Languages library on planning for a multilevel class. Go to www.learner.org/resources/series185.html?pop=yes&pid=2016, Click on number 16, “Exploring New Directions.”

**Advocacy**

You may want to share your knowledge and expertise by volunteering to conduct a professional development workshop that focuses on: (1) effective planning for English language learners, (2) how to plan for multi-level classes, or (3) creating opportunities to bridge your school and community.

**Comprehension Exercises**

**I. Chapter Review**

1. List three types of planning.
2. List five sets of national standards for language learning.
3. Describe FLES, FLEX, and immersion education.
4. Describe the SIOP model of planning.
5. Explain how the time of day influences your planning.

**II. Reflecting on what You’ve Read**

1. How does prior knowledge influence planning in an interactive standards-based classroom?
2. How does cultural awareness play a role in planning?
3. What are some of the criteria you would use to analyze and select a foreign- or second-language textbook?
4. When planning, how can or should standards be part of the process?

**III. Graphic Organizer**

Use the following organizer to develop a one-week plan. You may base the plan on either a thematic subject or on a required standard.

Subject, Theme, or Standard: _______________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources Needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. Application Activities

One of the many challenges that new teachers face is planning appropriately, based on curriculum requirements as well as students’ needs. You should teach content in a way that assists the students with the content and with second-language acquisition. The following is a class scenario with which you can practice planning lessons that suit the group’s dynamics. Note that the group is not homogeneous, which is a reflection of real-life classrooms.

The scenario has been set up to indicate each student’s age, gender, home language, L2 level, and learning style. Use this information during preplanning, when choosing materials, and for developing both lesson plan structure and assessment models.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>M/F</th>
<th>Home Language</th>
<th>L2 Level</th>
<th>Learning Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hyung</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>Beg</td>
<td>Auditory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byung</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>Beg</td>
<td>Kinesthetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Int</td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Beg</td>
<td>Auditory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosalva</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Beg</td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hasan</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td>Int</td>
<td>Spec Need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Beg</td>
<td>Kinesthetic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Situation 1: The fifth-grade team comes to you and informs you that the class is beginning a unit on the three branches of the U.S. government. How will your planning reflect the needs of the students in this class, assuming it is a pullout situation? Pullout means that the ESOL teacher works independently with students in a location separate from the mainstream students. Write a sample lesson for this student group using the following questions as a guide.

   a. What do you want your students to know?
   b. What do you want your students to be able to do?
   c. Can you measure it? How?
   d. How will you differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all your learners?

2. Situation 2: Prepare a reading lesson in which the skill taught is identifying the main idea. Choose a book you think would be appropriate for this group and explain how you would differentiate instruction for students in your class.

3. Situation 3: Prepare a writing prompt and describe a writing lesson you would plan that encourages students to share attitudes and information that reflect their cultures.

4. Plan a lesson that would introduce and prepare students for one of the following: reading and comprehending calendars and bus and train schedules; filling out job applications; or developing banking skills.

V. KWLA

Use the KWLA activity below to summarize what you’ve learned in this chapter.

1. This is what I now know, wanted to know, learned, and how I’ll apply what I learned about planning for a standards-based classroom: