

## DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 261 537

FL 015 196

AUTHOR Chamot, Anna Uhl; Stewner-Manzanares, Gloria  
 TITLE A Synthesis of Current Literature on English as a  
 Second Language: Issues for Educational Policy. Part  
 C Research Agenda.

INSTITUTION InterAmerica Research Associates, Rosslyn, Va.;  
 National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education,  
 Rosslyn, VA.

SPONS AGENCY Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages  
 Affairs (ED), Washington, DC.

PUB DATE Mar 85  
 CONTRACT 300-84-0166  
 NOTE 63p.; For related documents, see FL 015 195 and  
 199.

AVAILABLE FROM National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, 1555  
 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 600, Rosslyn, VA 22209.

PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Guides - Non-Classroom  
 Use (055)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.  
 DESCRIPTORS \*Classroom Techniques; Curriculum Design;  
 \*Educational Policy; \*English (Second Language);  
 \*Instructional Innovation; Instructional Materials;  
 Language Research; Learning Processes; Learning  
 Theories; Literature Reviews; Media Selection;  
 Program Design; Research Needs; \*Second Language  
 Learning; \*Student Characteristics

## ABSTRACT

A review of the literature on instruction in English as a second language (ESL) looks at four areas of ESL instruction individually and then derives conclusions and recommendations from those areas. The first area, ESL instructional approaches, includes discussion of the educational benefits of current ESL instructional approaches (audiolingual method, innovative techniques such as the Silent Way and Suggestopedia, communicative approaches, and cognitive and content-based approaches), second language learning theories, and practical and theoretical issues in ESL instructional approaches. The second area, program organization issues, looks at ESL within bilingual education programs, separate ESL-only programs, immersion programs, and ESL classroom organizational patterns. The third area, student characteristics and second language learning, focuses specifically on age and development, cognitive style, motivation and attitudes, and sociocultural/ethnolinguistic and environmental characteristics. The fourth area concerns the determination of the appropriateness of ESL instructional materials. Recommendations are made for each of these areas and for further ESL research in general. (MSE)

\*\*\*\*\*  
 \* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made \*  
 \* from the original document. \*  
 \*\*\*\*\*

ED261537



A SYNTHESIS OF CURRENT LITERATURE ON  
ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE:  
ISSUES FOR EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Anna Uhl Chamot

Gloria Stewner-Manzanares

InterAmerica Research Associates  
1555 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 600  
Rosslyn, Virginia 22209  
(703) 522-0710

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS  
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

NCBE

March 1985

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES  
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION  
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION  
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as  
received from the person or organization  
originating it.  
Minor changes have been made to improve  
reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-  
ment are those of the author(s) and do not  
represent the position or policy of



This study was conducted for the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs, Washington, D.C., under Contract No. 300840166. The views, opinions, and findings contained in this report are those of the authors and should not be construed as an official Department of Education position, policy, or decision, unless so designated by other official documentation.

FL 015196  
FL 015196

This document was prepared for the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs, and the Department of Education for the ESEA Title VII Part C Bilingual Education Research Agenda. This report does not necessarily represent positions or policies of the U.S. Government. The activities of the Part C Bilingual Research Agenda are coordinated by Gilbert N. Garcia and funded through the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs, Carol Pendas Whitten, Director.

This material is disseminated as a service to the users of the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. The views of the author do not necessarily represent those of the clearinghouse.

**SUBMITTED TO:**

U.S. Department of Education  
Office of Bilingual Education and  
Minority Language Affairs  
Room 421, Reporters Building  
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.  
Washington, DC 20202

Attention: Ms. Cynthia Ryan  
Government Project Officer

Contract Number: 300840166

**A SYNTHESIS OF CURRENT LITERATURE ON  
ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE:  
ISSUES FOR EDUCATIONAL POLICY**

**InterAmerica Research Associates**

**SUBMITTED BY:**

Anna Uhl Chamot, Ph.D.  
InterAmerica Research Associates, Inc.  
1555 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 600  
Rosslyn, VA 22209  
(703) 522-0710

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Overview	1
Rationale and Purpose	2
Organization	4
II. ESL INSTRUCTIONAL APPROACHES: EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS AND LANGUAGE LEARNING THEORIES	7
Overview	7
Educational Benefits of Current ESL Instructional Approaches	8
Audiolingual Method	9
The Wilder Shores	11
Communicative Approaches	13
Cognitive and Content-Based Approaches	16
Summary of Educational Benefits	18
Second Language Learning Theories and ESL Instructional Approaches	19
Instructional Approaches	19
Identification of Theories	22
Evolution of Language Learning Theories	23
Summary of Theoretical Issues	26
Practical and Theoretical Issues in ESL Instructional Approaches	27
III. ORGANIZATIONAL ISSUES IN ESL PROGRAMS	29
Overview	29
ESL Within Bilingual Programs	29
Separate ESL-only Programs	31
ESL Through Immersion Programs	33
ESL Classroom Organizational Patterns	36
Conclusions	37

<b>IV. STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS AND SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNING</b>	<b>39</b>
Age and Development Characteristics	40
Cognitive Styles	41
Motivational/Affective Characteristics	43
Sociocultural/Ethnolinguistic and Environmental Characteristics	43
Student Characteristics and Language Learning Theories	44
Conclusions	45
<b>V. APPROPRIATENESS OF ESL INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS</b>	<b>47</b>
Overview	47
What Are Good Materials?	49
Conclusions	50
<b>VI. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>51</b>
Overview	51
Educational Benefits of Instructional Approaches and Language Learning Theories	51
Organizational Issues in ESL Programs	52
Student Characteristics and Second Language Learning	53
Appropriateness of Instructional Materials	54
Recommendations for Future Research	55
<b>REFERENCES</b>	<b>59</b>

A SYNTHESIS OF CURRENT LITERATURE ON ENGLISH  
AS A SECOND LANGUAGE: ISSUES FOR EDUCATIONAL POLICY

I. INTRODUCTION

Overview

This synthesis of literature on English as a second language (ESL) and analysis of educational policy issues was prepared as part of the Review, Summary, and Synthesis of Literature on English as a Second Language, under Contract Number 300-84-0166 for the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs, U.S. Department of Education.

The major tasks accomplished in this study are the following:

Completion of a literature search on ESL instructional approaches, organizational patterns, materials, and language learning theories.

Completion of a review and summary of the literature identified through the literature search.

Preparation of a narrative synthesis addressing educational policy issues.

The products resulting from this study are a report containing an annotated bibliography of current literature on ESL, a report summarizing the literature reviewed, and the present report, which synthesizes the information summarized and addresses educational policy issues for different age and grade levels of students receiving ESL instruction in U.S. public schools.

## Rationale and Purpose

The need for a cohesive policy on English as a second language (ESL) education in U.S. public schools is readily apparent both from the numbers of limited English proficient school-aged children in the United States and from the numbers of teachers providing ESL instruction in schools. In 1980 the estimated number of school-aged limited English proficient (LEP) children was 2.4 million, and is expected to rise to 3.4 million by the year 2000 (Oxford-Carpenter et al., 1984). Even though three quarters of these young people were born in the United States, a language other than English is spoken in their homes, and for them, English is a second language which must be learned well enough to succeed in school and to participate effectively in American society. Not all are successful in learning English as a second language, however, and many fall behind their age mates and eventually drop out of school because they cannot compete successfully with native English speakers. Educators in school districts serving the needs of LEP students are well aware of the many problems involved in developing a high level of English competence in non-native speakers. In 1980-81 an estimated 103,000 teachers in the United States were providing ESL instruction to LEP students in elementary and high schools (O'Malley, 1983), and this number is expected to rise as the number of students needing ESL instruction increases.

Students in ESL classes need and deserve the most effective instructional approaches available which are grounded in research on how individuals learn a second language. Instructional approaches need to be supported not only by research on their effectiveness but also by organizational patterns and instructional materials which facilitate the delivery of instruction.



The purpose of this report is to address some of the policy issues affecting ESL education through consideration of the following seven questions:

1. What are the educational benefits of ESL instructional approaches currently found in elementary and high schools?
2. What language learning theories support current ESL instructional approaches?
3. How do the various organizational patterns of ESL programs interact with classroom composition and what are the effects on second language learning in ESL settings?
4. When and how is the native language and culture of students used in conjunction with ESL instruction?
5. How do cognitive, social, and affective learning styles of students affect their acquisition and learning of English in ESL settings?
6. What are the effects of student characteristics on second language learning in ESL settings?
7. What instructional materials are appropriate for use with various ESL instructional approaches?

The discussion of these issues is based on the two previous reports submitted as part of this study, Review, Summary, and Synthesis of Literature on English as a Second Language. The first report is a review of current literature on English as a Second Language which identifies a representative sample of recent published documents on ESL instructional approaches, organizational patterns, and instructional materials in current use in U.S. elementary and high schools, and the language learning theories supporting the instructional approaches identified (Chamot & Stewner-Manzanares, 1985). The second report is a summary of the literature on ESL instructional approaches, organizational patterns, instructional materials, and language learning theories identified in the

first report; in the summary report, published information is supplemented by information from a series of interviews with ESL teacher trainers, second language learning theorists, Bilingual Education Multifunctional Support Centers (BEMSCs), and ESL specialists in local school districts (Chamot & Stewner-Manzanares, 1985).

Additional policy issues outside the scope of work of the present study include questions related to the training and certification of ESL teachers, the identification of the academic language skills needed in the mainstream English curriculum, articulation of the ESL program with the mainstream curriculum, the relationship of English proficiency tests to language demands of the mainstream classroom, and the needs of older students entering U.S. schools after significant interruptions of previous schooling. These and other policy issues are urgent and need to be addressed in future studies.

### Organization

This report is organized in six chapters, starting with this Introduction. In the second chapter, the first two policy questions stated above are addressed through a discussion of issues related to ESL instructional approaches and second language learning theories. The third chapter addresses the third and fourth policy questions through an analysis of organizational and programmatic issues. The fifth and sixth policy questions are discussed in the fourth chapter which addresses the relationship between student characteristics and ESL learning. The fifth chapter discusses the seventh policy question on curriculum and instructional materials issues. In addition to the analysis contained in

each chapter, gaps between theory, research, and practice are identified, and the need for additional research is discussed. Finally, the sixth chapter summarizes and synthesizes the information contained in the previous chapters and proposes future research directions.

## II. ESL INSTRUCTIONAL APPROACHES: EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS AND LANGUAGE LEARNING THEORIES

### Overview

This chapter addresses the first two policy questions:

1. What are the educational benefits of ESL instructional approaches currently found in elementary and high schools?
2. What language learning theories support current ESL instructional approaches?

This chapter discusses both practical and theoretical issues related to the following thirteen instructional approaches identified in A Summary of Current Literature on English as a Second Language (Chamot & Stewner-Manzanares, 1985):

Audiolingual Method	Notional/Functional Syllabus
Silent Way	Communicative Approaches
Community Language Learning	Strategic Interaction Approach
Suggestopedia	Natural Approach
Language Experience Approach	Cognitive Approaches
New Concurrent Approach	Content-Based Approaches
Total Physical Response	

The first part of this chapter addresses the practical issues involved with these various ESL approaches, namely the educational benefits identified with each. In the second part of this chapter, the second language learning theories supporting these instructional approaches are reviewed. Finally, the gaps between research and practice and what is claimed and what can be demonstrated are discussed, and the need for research on the effectiveness of different ESL instructional approaches is appraised.

## Educational Benefits of Current ESL Instructional Approaches

An examination of the thirteen different approaches to ESL instruction reveals that each approach claims certain benefits for students. These benefits need to be related to two major factors: instructional objectives and students' needs. Instructional objectives vary with the age and grade level of students, and student needs at the primary grade level are quite different from those of high school students. These two factors can also be related to other factors such as student characteristics, organizational patterns of programs, and availability of suitable instructional materials. Such a complex relationship of factors indicates that no one instructional approach is likely to be a panacea for all ESL students in both elementary and high schools. Specification of instructional objectives and of student needs at different grade levels needs to be considered before selecting a specific instructional approach.

Although the ultimate objective of ESL instruction for LEP students must always be the development of English skills sufficient to allow educational access to the mainstream curriculum, the degree to which these skills need to be developed varies with the age and grade level of the student. Thus, a kindergarten child needs primarily to develop oral communicative competence in English, whereas an upper elementary or secondary student needs to develop the academic language skills needed to participate effectively in the literacy-dependent curriculum of the secondary school. The same instructional approach for developing English skills may not be appropriate for such differing instructional objectives.

Student and teacher characteristics can also be expected to have an influence on the choice of instructional approach. Some students and teachers may be more comfortable with one approach than another, and this would affect the effectiveness of an approach in a particular teaching/learning situation. In fact, the information gained from the interviews conducted to supplement the literature reviewed indicated that most teachers did not use a single approach but opted for eclecticism, using aspects of different approaches that they found to be effective for their particular students.

Student needs should also be considered when selecting or adapting an instructional approach. This is especially true in cases where students need prerequisite skills before being able to participate effectively in the ESL curriculum. For instance, preliterate students past the primary grade level need to develop initial reading and writing skills before they can follow an ESL curriculum which incorporates instructional objectives appropriate for their age and grade level.

In the discussion of educational benefits of various ESL instructional approaches that follows, major features of the approaches identified are discussed, and then compared to instructional objectives and student needs at different grade levels.

Audiolingual Method. The prevalence of audiolingual methodology in school districts interviewed and in instructional materials surveyed indicates that many ESL practitioners believe it to be an effective teaching method. The simplicity of this approach is appealing: the teacher models correct sentences, students repeat them many times, and finally the model sentences become fixed in memory and can be retrieved

whenever the student needs to say that particular sentence. Each of these steps, however, is refuted by recent ideas in linguistics, cognitive psychology, and pedagogy. In general, the importance of meaning and understanding is today considered of paramount importance in these disciplines, and in audiolingual methodology, meaning and understanding can be bypassed.

Recent studies which have compared the audiolingual method to other ESL instructional approaches such as cognitive approaches (Ramirez & Stromquist, 1979) and Total Physical Response (Asher, 1982; Wong, 1984), have consistently found that students taught audiolingually scored lower on achievement measures than those taught by the other methods.

Yet audiolingual methods linger. One reason may be that the method has a number of teaching techniques and a variety of instructional materials associated with it; this means that it is easy to teach. New approaches tend to provide less specification for exact teaching techniques, and textbook publishers, who ultimately depend on teachers for the acceptance of their materials, have been reluctant to innovate too drastically. In audiolingual teaching, the classroom is teacher-directed, so that specific instructions for what the teacher should do are quite clear. Communicative approaches, on the other hand, rely on task-centered small group work, and the teacher's role is not as clear-cut. Cognitive approaches focus on the learner, which might seem to leave the teacher without a role. Approaches calling for teachers to provide comprehensible input to their students as their major classroom function not only leave teachers in some doubt as to exactly how to provide comprehensible input, but also downplay instruction to the point that teachers may even feel superfluous.

Another aspect of the audiolingual method that teachers may intuitively accept is its insistence that students be prevented if possible from making errors, and that if errors are made, they should be corrected immediately. ESL teachers, like English teachers of native English speakers, may have a deep conviction that correct language usage is the single most important product of their teaching. They may firmly believe, and be encouraged in their belief by the curriculum they are required to teach, that extensive overt practice of grammatical patterns will lead to the use of correct grammar automatically.

Points to be considered about the continued popularity of the audiolingual method are:

- o This method is probably the easiest to teach and is supported by extensive instructional materials.
- o Many ESL teachers today were themselves taught a foreign language audiolingually, so the methodology is quite familiar to them.
- o Newer approaches require expenditures of time and effort which teachers may not have available; inservice workshops, teacher-developed materials, and individualization of instruction are examples of time and energy commitments required of teachers adopting newer instructional approaches.

The Wilder Shores. Three instructional approaches are innovative, but their applications to classrooms in U.S. schools may be limited. Each has claimed success in teaching second language, however, and each has enthusiastic adherents. Instructional approaches on the wilder shores of ESL include Silent Way, Community Language Learning, and Suggestopedia.



Silent Way involves the student in consciously learning grammatical forms by recalling stored visual and auditory images. The teacher is silent for long periods, forcing students to rely on their own auditory recollection of the language, which is facilitated by association with visual images. There is little empirical evidence for this approach, and student frustration has been reported. (Stevick, 1980; Varvel, 1979). The paucity of language provided by the teacher and limited opportunities for student practice make this approach the very antithesis of communicative approaches which call for comprehensible input from the teacher and active use of the language by students.

Community Language Learning uses psychological counseling techniques to develop language proficiency. Students and teacher cooperate on task-centered activities in an unpressured atmosphere. This approach is communicative rather than grammatically based, and focuses on social and affective aspects of language learning. The relationships of this humanistic approach to instructional objectives in schools is not explicit. Evidence for the effectiveness of this approach comes from practice; for some students it is too psychologically demanding, whereas others find it a worthwhile experience (Stevick, 1980). Little is known about this approach for school-aged ESL students.

A third psychologically-based second language learning approach is Suggestopedia, which originated in Bulgaria. In this approach, students are supposed to learn by suggestion. Certain techniques employed in the suggestion method are: relaxation through physical exercise and suggestion, use of specific types of background music to overcome intellectual inhibitions to intake of the new language, provision of

physically comfortable and aesthetically appealing surroundings, and encouragement of infantilization so that memorization becomes spontaneous. Evidence for the effectiveness of this approach is provided by its originator (Lozanov, 1979) in Bulgaria, and, in the United States, by a study in Iowa which found that the use of suggestopedia across the curriculum in the first ten grades led to accelerated achievement (Hammerman, 1979). This evidence has been challenged because of methodological weaknesses in the case of Lozanov (Scovel, 1979), and because of non-replicability of suggestopedia results in other studies (Wagner & Tilney, 1983).

The usefulness of suggestopedia in addressing instructional objectives of ESL curricula in U.S. schools has not been addressed, so this approach, while interesting and innovative, does not at this time seem particularly practical for second language learning contexts.

Three main points can be made about the wilder shores of ESL instructional approaches:

- o Silent Way, Community Language Learning, and Suggestopedia are highly innovative approaches to teaching a second language.
- o Each approach requires a high level of teacher training and teachers who can believe that a single, disciplined approach can meet the needs of all students.
- o Each approach requires a learning context that can be completely controlled, and this may be difficult in a public school setting.

Communicative Approaches. Newer approaches to second and foreign language instruction stress the importance of developing communicative competence, which has been defined as consisting of grammatical competence,

sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence, and strategic competence (Canale & Swain, 1980). Communicative approaches stress as their major goal the development of interpersonal communication skills (Nattinger, 1984; Savignor, 1983; Taylor, 1983). The language functions and topics outlined in the Notional/Functional Syllabus clearly focus on language embedded in a social context, and although a specific methodology was not originally associated with this curriculum, it lends itself to communicative language teaching in which students focus on language functions instead of language forms in order to accomplish a task. Practice in using language to solve problems is a feature of the Strategic Interaction Approach (Di Pietro, 1982), which also develops social interactive language. Also strongly communicatively based is the Natural Approach (Terrell, 1981), in which students initially begin to acquire the new language through the teacher's comprehensible input and are not expected to speak until ready. When speech emerges, the focus is on the communication of meaning rather than on accuracy of form. An approach recommended for the beginning stages of second language acquisition is Total Physical Response (Asher, 1982), in which students can link their teacher's comprehensible input with physical, motor responses, and respond kinesthetically rather than verbally. All of these approaches are communicative in nature and emphasize the development of social interaction in the target language.

When is the development of social interaction skills in English a major instructional objective in U.S. schools? A survey of sample curricula revealed that listening and speaking skills receive some emphasis in the primary grades, but that as students move into upper grades, the emphasis shifts to literacy skills applied to the various subject areas (Chamot,

1983). While the development of social interaction skills through communicative approaches may be a necessary desirable component in English language development, communicative approaches by themselves are not designed to prepare students to meet academic instructional objectives.

Experimental work conducted with various communicative approaches indicates that they can be effective in fulfilling goals for proficiency in social interaction skills. Asher (1982), for example, found that Total Physical Response (TPR) students outperformed students trained in the Audiolingual Method on both oral language and reading, indicating some transfer of skills developed orally to written language. Savignon (1983) found promising results in a study of college students of French who were provided with communication activities; the students in the experimental group could actually converse in French, while control group students could not; both groups scored about the same on linguistic achievement on the posttest. Although aspects of the Natural Approach have been the object of studies in related areas such as reading and writing, and in first language acquisition (Houck, Robertson, & Krashen, 1978; Snow & Ferguson, 1977), to date no experimental studies comparing the Natural Approach to another ESL approach have been reported.

Two major points arise from the review and discussion of communicative approaches as they relate to teaching ESL in U.S. schools:

- o Communicative approaches are intended to develop initial, mainly oral, language competence for social interaction. There is some evidence that they do accomplish this objective.
- o Evidence is needed to assess the relationship of social interaction skills developed through communicative approaches with the academic skills of the elementary and secondary classroom.

Cognitive and Content-Based Approaches. These are discussed together because of the potential they have for integration into an approach designed to develop academic competence.

Cognitive approaches to second language teaching and learning have emerged in various forms and with differing emphases. Early cognitive approaches were grammatically based, as were virtually all second language approaches at the time. As formal grammar instruction has been supplanted or at least supplemented by communicative approaches, cognitive approaches have been linked with functional language use. Cognitive approaches differ from communicative approaches such as the Natural Approach in that they focus on the learner's mental activity and information processing capability. An important element of cognitive approaches is a concern with the strategies that a learner uses in order to take in, process, and retrieve information. Various learning strategies have been identified and taught to ESL students, both in reading (Renault, 1981), writing (Lott, 1983) and academic oral language (O'Malley, Chamot, Stewner-Manzanares, Russo, & Kupper, in press). The intent of cognitive approaches to second language teaching and learning is congruent with instructional objectives which focus on academic and literacy-related language skills. Few experimental studies of cognitive approaches to second language learning have been conducted. One study of primary grade ESL students found greater student growth with teachers using a cognitive approach than with teachers using an audiolingual approach (Ramirez & Stromquist, 1979). A recent study of high school ESL students found significant improvement of academic speaking skills in students trained to use learning strategies for these skills (O'Malley et al., in press).

Content-based ESL instructional approaches are also appropriate for the accomplishment of academic instructional objectives. In content-based approaches, the focus is on the subject matter to be learned, and language development is almost incidental to the acquisition of concepts. Parallels with communicative approaches, in which the focus is on the meaning rather than on the linguistic form are clear; the main difference is that in communicative approaches, the meaning has to do with language functions related to social interaction, whereas in a content-based approach the language functions are related to subject matter content. Content-based ESL instruction seeks to combine content teaching with language teaching, but whether this should be done formally or whether the language will emerge as a result of content-based activities is not clear (Mohan, 1979). Experimental evidence for the effectiveness of content-based approaches comes from immersion studies both in Canada and the United States (California State Department of Education, 1984), and also from experimental studies in which LEP children in a special math and science program increased their English language proficiency as they acquired math and science concepts (DeAvila, 1984).

An approach to reading that incorporates both cognitive and content-based elements is the Language Experience Approach (LEA), in which ESL students create their own initial reading texts through dictating stories and personal accounts to the teacher, who transcribes the stories and uses them for classroom reading practice. As in communicative approaches, the LEA focuses on the meaning of the message rather than on the correctness of the form. It has been used with both elementary and secondary LEP students at the initial stages of learning to read English (Rigg, 1981). Evidence for the success of the LEA is reported from classroom practice (Feeley, 1983; Levenson, 1979; Rigg, 1981).

Another variant of content-based approaches is the New Concurrent Approach, in which the teacher uses the students' first language to clarify instruction in a deliberate and planned fashion (Jacobson, 1981). Again, the focus of instruction is on concepts and meaning, rather than language in itself. This dual language instructional approach is used for content subject classes, but not for language arts.

Cognitive, content-based, and language experience approaches are all linked directly to instructional objectives that focus on the language needs of the classroom: reading comprehension, writing, academic oral language, and the use of language to acquire and express the concepts underlying the academic disciplines of the school curriculum.

The following points related to cognitive and content-based ESL approaches need to be considered:

- o These approaches are intended to develop academic language and content knowledge, and could be used in conjunction with or as a sequel to communicative approaches.
- o Differences in students' developmental stage and in the curriculum at various grade levels can be expected to affect both the methodology and content of these instructional approaches.

#### Summary of Educational Benefits

Conclusions to be reached from the preceding discussion of the educational benefits of various ESL instructional approaches are the following:

- o Instructional objectives at different grade levels and for differing levels of English proficiency are important determinants in choosing appropriate instructional approaches.

- o Communicative approaches are probably best suited to initial second language development, and cognitive and content-based approaches are more closely linked to instructional objectives related to the development of academic language skills.
- o Audiolingual methodology persists for a number of reasons, and may be expected to do so until newer approaches become easier to teach.
- o Some approaches, while innovative, are not geared to the needs or objectives of U.S. elementary and secondary education.

Second Language Learning Theories and ESL Instructional Approaches. The second part of this chapter addresses theoretical issues associated with ESL instruction by analyzing the relationship between second language learning theories and current instructional approaches.

Instructional Approaches. Thirteen approaches were identified in the survey as current pedagogical approaches that were applicable to ESL. Of the thirteen approaches only Audiolingual, the Natural Approach, Total Physical Response (TPR), and Communicative approaches were reported as being used by six or more of the twenty-two institutions (school districts, Bilingual Education Multifunctional Support Centers, and teacher trainers at universities) interviewed. Of the eight school districts interviewed, four stated that eclectic approaches were used and two stated that communicative approaches were used. The majority of BEMSCs interviewed reported using Audiolingual, eclectic, Natural, and TPR approaches. Teacher trainers reported providing methodological instruction in presenting Communicative, Natural, TPR, and Silent Way approaches to students in preservice courses. Given these facts, it is clear that current pedagogical approaches and what teachers do in the classroom do not coincide. Even though the number interviewed was small, indications are that ESL practitioners remain conservative, tending to retain approaches developed thirty years ago



(Audiolingual) or to develop their own approach from parts of current teaching approaches (eclectic). Teacher trainers, on the other hand, do not particularly encourage eclecticism. They report that their aim is to provide a rich menu of approaches to fit the needs of the students and teachers. By providing such a menu, however, they may indirectly encourage the use of bits and pieces of approaches in a single program.

The failure of some approaches to answer teachers' and students' needs may be important in explaining the gap which exists between what teacher trainers recommend and what teachers report they actually do.

Approaches such as Community Language Learning (CLL) and New Concurrent Approach, for example, cannot be used with ethnolinguistically mixed groups because they require that teachers interpret from the native to the target language. The expectations that students and parents have of academic programs may also inhibit the use of approaches that are non-traditional such as CLL or Suggestopedia. These approaches may appear unstructured to students who expect a formal academic orientation and students may not react favorably as a result. Other approaches such as TPR and the Natural Approach appear to be suitable for the initial stages of a program, but cannot be followed as a sole approach in a continuing intensive program. Approaches which are not well defined may also discourage practitioners who feel the need for a concrete approach that is described in full. Communicative approaches and content-based approaches, for example, have not been well documented and have few materials that support the approaches. Practitioners may judge, probably correctly, that approaches for which there are few materials may be time-consuming and costly if the practitioners themselves have to write and develop materials.

Furthermore, since communicative approaches are relatively new, clear directions for establishing communicative curricula are lacking. These approaches require major changes in the curriculum and in educator attitudes toward language education, and therefore may not receive support from administrators who have constraints in investing in curriculum development, new materials, and teacher training time.

The lack of access to materials that support current approaches may also inhibit experimentation with new approaches. While teachers may be educated in a variety of approaches, materials in the school systems may be out of date in spite of the wealth of new materials on the market. The problem of materials is discussed in a later section.

In light of the constraints stated above, it is not surprising that current approaches are apparently not widely used in classrooms. Practitioners are necessarily conservative when it comes to experimenting with new ideas and materials. The preference for not identifying with any given approach is evident in the response "eclectic". This may be indicative of the attempt on the part of practitioners to meet the daily needs of their students by piecing together activities and techniques from various approaches. The advantages of doing this are that the program remains flexible enough to meet a variety of student needs and the teacher is not burdened with having to defend a given approach if students react poorly. The disadvantages are that language learning models and teaching models that underlie daily activities become vague. For example, with certain approaches comes a set of assumptions of how learners learn and how best to facilitate this learning. Teaching and learning principles are sometimes lost when activities and techniques are strung together to meet the immediate needs

of the students and the objectives of the ESL curriculum. Requiring overt teaching of grammar would be antithetical to using the Natural Approach, for example, but might be a requirement of the planned curriculum. The practitioner is then left with having to put a mixed program together that can no longer be identified with a specific approach. This is not to say that the decision to teach "eclectically" is a bad one, but rather that this choice masks learning and teaching principles that should be made explicit to both administrator and teacher. That is, practitioners should be able to state how they believe learners learn and acquire a second language and how their pedagogical approaches relate to this model. However, since proponents of pedagogical approaches have not always clearly defined the language learning theories that underlie the approaches, it may be unreasonable to expect practitioners to have clear ideas on relationships between language learning, acquisition, and teaching.

Identification of theories. The task of identifying each pedagogical approach surveyed in this study with one or more language learning theories was not an easy one. While some approaches have grown out of explicit language learning theories, such as the Natural Approach, other approaches have emerged from practical experience or theories about what language is, rather than how it is learned. Communicative approaches, for example, are based on a theory of communicative competence rather than on any language learning theory. The relationship between language learning theory and pedagogical approach is therefore somewhat speculative in these cases.

The clearest relationship between language learning theory and pedagogical approach is found in those approaches such as the Natural Approach developed by language learning theorists. The murky relationship that

exists, however, between language learning theory and the majority of approaches may contribute to further confusion in the selection of approaches to implement in the classroom. That is, practitioners may be able to state what they do in the classroom but not be able to explain theoretical reasons for doing so.

Another problem in the identification of language learning theories with approaches is that current theories do not address all aspects of language learning. The language theories surveyed are more of a collection of hypotheses concerning different aspects of language learning and acquisition. Some theories that address cognitive aspects may ignore social, linguistic, cultural, and affective aspects. Other theories focus on affective aspects but ignore cognitive and linguistic aspects. In other words, few language learning theories provide a complete model of language learning. Therefore, a language learning theory may underlie one aspect of an approach but have little explanatory adequacy regarding other aspects.

Language learning theories that do not address all aspects of language learning also fail to address student characteristics, and this is discussed in the section on student characteristics.

Evolution of language learning theories. The theories identified with the approaches surveyed reflect the evolution of ideas in both linguistics and learning theory. Audiolingual methodology is based on a behaviorist view of learning in which language learning is equated with habit formation and on a view of language which is more concerned with describing sentence patterns than with underlying meaning. When the behaviorist view of learning was challenged and the focus was placed on the learner's mental processes, language came to be viewed as rule-governed behavior.

In linguistics, notions of communicative competence in social settings began to replace the idea of language being merely a system of linguistic or grammatical competence. Language learning theorists in parallel began to hypothesize that language learning is basically an unconscious, implicit process. Various communicative language teaching approaches evolved which sought to develop social interactional language skills, and one of these communicative approaches is explicitly designed to provide students with the comprehensible input needed to foster the implicit acquisition of language and encourage its use for social purposes.

But while linguists were positing models of communicative competence and curriculum developers were designing the content of second language courses around the language functions needed to accomplish these communicative objectives, learning theorists in cognitive psychology continued to investigate the mental processes underlying learning in disciplines other than second language learning. Thus, recent theory in second language learning has taken a completely different direction from recent theory in other areas of learning.

This difference can be found in school contexts, where concern with academic achievement is given a high priority. This concern is reflected in areas such as the increased emphasis on basic and higher order skills in the mainstream curriculum, and an emerging focus on the development of the academic language skills of ESL students. ESL content-based approaches are intended to develop these academic language skills by using language to learn the content of school subjects. A cognitive approach based on an understanding of the mental processes underlying learning can also be combined with a content-based approach to develop LEP students'

learning strategies so that they can become more effective learners of both language and content. Through such approaches designed to develop academic as well as linguistic competence in English, an ESL program can begin to bridge the gap between the ESL class and the mainstream curriculum.

The evolution of theories of learning and language in the last thirty years has given rise to a number of instructional approaches reflecting the theories to a greater or lesser degree. The diagram below is a schematic representation of the relationships between theories on language learning, linguistic theories on the nature of language, and the main types of instructional approaches related to each.

LANGUAGE LEARNING IS INFLUENCED MOST BY:	LANGUAGE IS:	
	GRAMMAR BASED	MEANING BASED
Habit formation	Audiolingual	
Rule formation	Cognitive	Cognitive
Social interaction		Communicative Content-Based
Mental processes	Cognitive	Cognitive Content-Based

Thus, the audiolingual method views language learning as a matter of developing correct habits, and the nature of language as a grammatical system. Early cognitive approaches also viewed language as grammatical system, but one which was meaning-based, and these approaches saw language learning as the development of the rules needed to generate meaningful language. Communicative approaches see language as a meaning-based phenomenon that exists in a social setting, and language learning as a

product of social interaction. Current cognitive approaches view mental processes as essential in language learning, and these can be applied to both the grammatical and the meaning-based systems of language. Both communicative and content-based approaches focus on the meaning underlying language, and see language learning as a functional process in which the objective is to use language for a purpose, whether social or academic.

Each of these views of language and learning may have validity which depends on the learner's characteristics and needs, and on the learning objectives in the social or educational context. What is needed is a model of second language learning that sees learners as individuals and as social beings interacting with the linguistic, intellectual, and physical characteristics of the second language learning environment.

#### Summary of Theoretical Issues

Conclusions to be reached from the preceding discussion of the theoretical issues underlying second language instructional approaches are the following:

- o Current language learning theories are incomplete, tending to focus on only a few aspects of the learning process.
- o The relationship between language learning theories and specific instructional approaches is not always clear; the relationship becomes clearer when similar approaches are grouped together under a common descriptor such as "Communicative" or "Cognitive," as in the diagram above.
- o Practitioners interviewed tended not to identify with any one instructional approach, but preferred using a combination of approaches, thus precluding the adoption and understanding of a unifying language learning theory to guide instruction.

## Practical and Theoretical Issues in ESL Instructional Approaches

This chapter has discussed the educational benefits of different instructional approaches used in the teaching of English as a second language and the relationships between second language learning theories and these instructional approaches. The picture that emerges is one lacking in integration. Theories in general are incomplete, leading to approaches that address only limited aspects of students' language learning needs. The educational benefits claimed for different approaches are not closely related to many of the instructional objectives of the mainstream curriculum in U.S. elementary and secondary schools.

The key to selecting the most effective approaches or combination of approaches to ESL instruction in U.S. elementary and secondary schools depends on the answers to two questions:

1. What language skills are needed for successful participation of LEP students in the mainstream curriculum at different grade levels?
2. How can students of different ages, different ethnolinguistic backgrounds, and different cognitive styles best acquire these language skills?

The answers to these questions are not completely known, and research is needed in these areas. However, some assumptions based on what is known about instructional objectives in schools may be useful in guiding the direction of future research. By first identifying what English proficient students need to do with language at different grade levels, hypotheses about instructional approaches for ESL can be tested empirically. The following framework is suggested as a possible sequence of ESL instruction which could be tested through research.



## ESL INSTRUCTIONAL SEQUENCE

<b>English Proficiency:</b>	Beginning	Low Intermediate	High intermediate and Advanced
<b>Language Objective:</b>	Social Interaction	Initial Literacy	Academic Language Skills
<b>ESL Instructional Approach:</b>	Communicative	Language Experience	Cognitive/Content-Based

If, as seems likely, the language objectives listed above are best met through the instructional approaches linked to each, then the remaining questions to be answered concern the appropriateness of the different language objectives for instructional objectives at various grade levels. All of the language objectives listed above may be appropriate at each grade level, but the relative importance of each may vary. Thus, very young children's development of social communicative competence may be the most important instructional objective, and emerging literacy and academic language skills may be of lesser immediate importance, while for the adolescent student, social communicative competence, though still extremely important in personal life, may be considered by the school as far less valuable than the literacy and academic language skills needed to study different school subjects.

Thus, the ESL instructional approach selected should be congruent not only with the language learning theory upon which it is based, but also with the instructional objectives of the educational context.

### III. ORGANIZATIONAL ISSUES IN ESL PROGRAMS

#### Overview

This chapter addresses the third and fourth policy questions:

3. How do the various organizational patterns of ESL programs interact with classroom composition and what are the effects of second language learning in ESL settings?
4. When and how is the native language and culture of students used in conjunction with ESL instruction?

This chapter discusses the issues related to different organizational patterns for ESL instruction and analyzes the benefits and disadvantages of each. In A Summary of Current Literature on English as a Second Language (Chamot & Stewner-Manzanares, 1985), three major types of organizational patterns of ESL programs were reviewed:

ESL within bilingual programs

Separate ESL-only programs

ESL through immersion programs

In addition, a brief review of classroom organizational patterns and their relation to different ESL instructional approaches was presented.

This chapter describes these types of ESL organizational patterns and then discusses the educational impact of each.

#### ESL Within Bilingual Programs

As a required component of bilingual programs, ESL instruction is generally offered for one or more class periods during the day. This special class is designed to help students learn English more rapidly than they would by

informal exposure to the English speaking community. In areas of the United States where most of students' out of school contacts are with speakers of their native language, the instruction provided by the ESL teacher may constitute their principal exposure to English.

An advantage of ESL within bilingual programs is that students can develop initial concepts in the language they understand best, rather than have to learn both concepts and a new language simultaneously. A disadvantage to ESL within bilingual programs has been identified as the fact that students have less exposure to natural communication in English and may therefore lack acquisition opportunities (Ohio Department of Education, 1983). Bilingual programs which include English proficient students can solve this difficulty through planned interaction and learning between ESL students and their English speaking peers.

In self-contained or team-taught bilingual classrooms where ESL and native language subjects are either taught by the same teacher or by two teachers working closely together, the ESL curriculum can be coordinated with the native language curriculum fairly easily, ensuring that transfer of concepts from the L1 to the L2 is developed. Programs in which the ESL teacher has less contact with the native language teacher and curriculum may result in lack of coordination of instructional objectives.

ESL within bilingual programs are planned on the assumption that all students share the same first language and culture and that all are at similar levels of English proficiency within each grade level. In these conditions, the L1 can be used to mediate instruction where necessary, as was found in the effective bilingual classrooms studied in the Significant

Bilingual Instructional Features Study (Tikunoff, 1983). Information from interviews with BEMSC representatives reveals that most regions report some use of the L1 in conjunction with ESL instruction. Of the eight BEMSCs contacted, four reported minimal use of the L1, three reported varying use depending on individual programs and classroom composition, and only one reported that the L1 was not used during ESL instruction.

A possible disadvantage of bilingual programs is that students may feel segregated from the mainstream of school life and that they may have few contacts with native English speaking peers. Organizational patterns which include English proficient students in two-way bilingual programs have been established successfully in schools in different parts of the country. The advantages of these programs are evident for both LEP and English proficient students; both have opportunities to acquire a second language through interaction with native speaking peers.

#### Separate ESL-only Programs

School districts with multilingual populations in general offer ESL as a separate program, rather than as a component of a bilingual program. This may be necessary for several reasons. If there are insufficient numbers of a particular language group in the same school and at the same grade level, provision of native language instruction is difficult to organize. In the case of less commonly taught languages, it may also be difficult to find trained teachers and appropriate instructional materials to deliver native language and subject matter instruction.

In larger ESL-only programs students are typically classified as at beginning or intermediate level of English proficiency and grouped accordingly in order to facilitate instruction. Beginning level students in general receive more intensive ESL, while intermediate students receive less ESL because they are mainstreamed into certain content classes that are considered less demanding linguistically. A promising organizational pattern reported is the provision of alternative content or "sheltered" classes at the secondary level. In these classes, intermediate level ESL students attend content classes in subjects such as history or science in which the language of instruction and of the content is deliberately simplified to make it comprehensible to LEP students. Teachers with ESL training as well as content knowledge teach these courses, and since only LEP students attend them, they have greater opportunities for success than they would in mainstream classes where they would be competing with native English speakers. A content-based approach such as this is congruent with an organizational pattern which allows for a transitional period between ESL instruction and mainstreaming.

There are some potential disadvantages to ESL-only programs. If only one class is spent on ESL and students spend the majority of the day in mainstream classes where the instruction is not comprehensible, the value of ESL may be quite limited. If the instructional objectives of the ESL class are not congruent with those of the mainstream, students will not be adequately prepared for entry into the English-only curriculum. Examples of such potential lack of congruence are explained in a recent program guide developed by the Ohio Department of Education (1983):

i

"If the emphasis of the ESL class is on grammar with few or no natural communication activities, the ESL instruction will probably have little impact on the students' acquisition of English.

If the focus on the ESL class is only on oral interpersonal communication skills, the ESL instruction will have a negligible effect on promoting the academic skills that the language minority students need in order to be successful in school." (p. 11 underlining added)

This program guide goes on to recommend that native language support services be provided as part of ESL programs and that mainstream teachers should be provided with techniques and approaches that will facilitate acquisition of English by LEP students in their classes (Ohio Department of Education, 1983).

Interviews with representatives from school districts and from BEMSCs revealed that the native language support provided in some ESL-only programs appeared to be about the same as the native language support provided in programs identified as bilingual.

### ESL Through Immersion Programs

A small number of English immersion programs was identified in Texas, California, and Florida. In these programs, children receive content instruction in simplified English from a bilingual teacher, who uses only English for instruction but can understand children when they respond in their native language. This type of immersion model is possible in areas in which all LEP children share the same first language and are at approximately the same stage of English proficiency. All of the ESL immersion programs identified devoted some instructional time to native language instruction, in effect making them bilingual programs.

The greatest value of the immersion model lies not so much in its organizational pattern but in its instructional approach. It uses content-based ESL instruction adapted to the proficiency level of the students, so that students focus on concepts and meaning rather than on learning language forms. The degree to which grade-appropriate content can be taught to students at beginning or low level of English proficiency has not been reported. The immersion model assumes that children begin at kindergarten level, which means that during at least the first year of schooling the focus can be on learning activities that develop oral language communication skills. Literacy skills can be developed in first and second grade, together with less linguistically demanding arithmetic skills. Thus, by the time demanding content subjects are introduced in the third and fourth grade, LEP students have developed a proficiency and literacy base in English that will help them learn content through English. This sequence in an immersion program may be quite successful (in fact has been successful for children learning French in Canada and in various foreign language immersion programs in the United States), because it correlates with the instructional sequence and objectives of the mainstream curriculum .

However, the immersion model does not take into account the needs of older elementary or secondary students new to English for whom greater demands are made both in language and in conceptual knowledge. These students are likely to need conceptual input in their native language during the period in which they are developing sufficient English proficiency to be able to profit from even linguistically simplified content instruction in English at their appropriate grade level.

Another disadvantage of the immersion model is that LEP students segregated into special classes have little contact with English speaking peers, thus reducing opportunities for additional language input and acquisition. Without exposure to more English models than just their teacher, immersion students typically develop a sort of classroom dialect which varies considerably from standard varieties (California State Department of Education. 1984).

Certain teacher needs are not met by the immersion model. If the composition of the classroom is varied in ethnolinguistic background, teachers cannot take full advantage of an important feature of the immersion model, which is provision for student responses in the first language that are comprehensible to the teacher. Teachers who can understand their students' first language can judge how well students are understanding instruction by their responses, questions, or complaints in the first language. If many non-English languages are present in the same classroom, few teachers possess the necessary multilingual skills to provide equal benefit to all students. Another teacher need that is not addressed by the immersion model is the classroom containing students with varying degrees of English proficiency, which occurs in many school districts receiving new LEP students on a continuing basis. These students would have to receive the same basic content instruction at a given grade level, but the teacher would have to vary the degree of simplification of presentation in order to provide comprehensible input to all students. Peer tutoring and the use of teacher aides have been suggested as ways to meet these types of teacher needs.



## ESL Classroom Organizational Patterns

Organizational patterns within ESL classrooms are largely determined by the instructional approach selected, which in turn is often guided by the instructional materials used. Audiolingual classes are likely to be teacher-directed, while communicative approaches favor small group activities. Cognitive approaches tend to be learner-focused, while content-based approaches focus on the curriculum; either, or a combination of the two, could provide for small group of paired work in which students share and compare learning strategies for a given task. Content-based instruction could be in the form of a traditional teacher presentation to the entire class or could also have small group organization in which students cooperate to work on a learning task.

Teachers with differing English proficiency levels in their ESL classes can group students heterogeneously so that more fluent speakers can serve as tutors and resources to less proficient ones. This type of grouping may be a necessity in content-based ESL classes composed of students with different levels of English proficiency.

One aspect of classroom organization which emerged from interviews and visits to school districts, was that elementary teachers tend to have more experience in managing multiple groups in classrooms than do secondary teachers, who are more accustomed to delivering instruction to the whole class.

## Conclusions

Following are some of the major points that emerged from the interviews and the review of the literature on organizational patterns of ESL programs.

- o Demographic characteristics of a school district play a major role in determining the choice of organizational pattern.
  - Districts with linguistically homogeneous student populations find bilingual or immersion programs feasible.
  - Districts with multilingual student populations may have to select an ESL-only program, with some native language support if possible.
- o ESL programs which are correlated to the mainstream program in organization and curriculum objectives facilitate the transition of LEP students into mainstream programs.
- o ESL is most effective when it is incorporated into a substantial part of the total curriculum, rather than limited to a single daily class.
- o Native language support can improve the effectiveness of ESL programs.
- o ESL teachers at both secondary and elementary school levels need classroom management skills in providing small group activities and individualized instruction.
- o LEP students profit from contact with native English speaking peers, and provision for this contact should be built into the organizational pattern.
  - Contact with proficient English speaking peers is provided in two-way bilingual programs.
  - Contact with proficient English speakers is provided in mainstream classrooms where ESL students spend part of their day.
  - Contact with proficient English speakers is not provided in English immersion programs.
- o Comparison of different organizational patterns is complex and should be done on the basis of program characteristics rather than labels attached to programs, because the same name can be given to programs which in fact differ significantly.

#### IV. STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS AND SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNING

This chapter addresses the fifth and sixth policy questions:

5. How do cognitive, social, and affective learning styles of students affect their acquisition and learning of English in ESL settings?
6. What are the effects of student characteristics on second language learning in ESL settings?

This section discusses the relationship of instructional approaches and language learning theories to characteristics of the learner. In surveying the various approaches and theories, careful attention was paid to how each addressed cognitive, developmental, affective, social, linguistic, and cultural characteristics of LEP students in grades K to 12. While each instructional approach or underlying theory was found to address student characteristics in one or more ways, none was found that addressed all factors enumerated above.

The relationship between student characteristics, instructional approaches, and language learning theories has not been extensively studied. Most approaches are based on a particular view of language learning or on observations of what works. These approaches address one or two broad characteristics of learners, but fail to address all characteristics. One possible explanation is that, of the instructional approaches surveyed, most were developed for a specific population, such as adults, foreign students in U.S. universities, foreign language students, or students of English in other countries. This population does not always coincide with the ESL school-aged population. Another possible explanation is that instructional approaches address student characteristics only to the degree that the underlying theory does.

Language learning theories, tend to focus on one or two aspects of language learning and acquisition rather than account comprehensively for all characteristics of the learner in a single theory.

Age and developmental characteristics. Various instructional approaches have been developed for specific age groups and populations. Community Language Learning (CLL) was developed as a form of psychological therapy for university students studying to be therapists. As a language learning approach, it was applied to foreign language training for adults. This approach presupposes knowledge of social rules and the need for communicating within a group, and very young students may lack this knowledge. Similar to CLL, Strategic Interaction was developed for foreign language training at the university level. This approach also involves group discussion and decision making which may be unsuitable for very young ESL students who are beginning to learn social rules of action.

The Silent Way approach was originally developed for adults; it requires long periods of concentration that may be suitable only for those students who have reached an advanced level of cognitive development. Content-based approaches also presuppose a certain developmental stage. The Finding Out/ Descubrimiento program of De Avila (1984), for example, is designed to stimulate the cognitive development and content knowledge of students who have reached the concrete operational stage. Cognitive and content-based approaches may be most appropriate for upper elementary and secondary students. While aspects of cognitive approaches may be introduced earlier, on their own they are generally unsuitable for the very young ESL student unless carefully integrated with a communicative approach, such as in the experimental ESL curriculum being developed in Paterson, New Jersey (Feneran & Hilferty, 1984).

The few approaches that do address age and developmental differences are Total Physical Response (TPR) and the Language Experience Approach (LEA). With TPR, first language and second language learning processes are considered to be the same. Context embedded language and corresponding physical actions promote comprehension and retention as they do in the first language. Physical actions and delayed oral production answer the very young learners' developmental, physical, and affective needs. The LEA was developed expressly to link oral speech with the written word and is used widely with young ESL or bilingual learners at the initial stages of emergent literacy. While success has been reported in using the LEA with pre-literate adolescents, it is used mainly with younger students.

Cognitive styles. Few instructional approaches take into account differences in cognitive style. While some approaches include visual, auditory, and kinesthetic input, they specify a sequence of input so that written language follows oral language (e.g., Audiolingual, CLL, Natural Approach, and TPR). Other approaches allow for exposure to written and oral language simultaneously (Silent Way, Suggestopedia, Strategic Interaction, and content-based approaches). Allowance for written and oral input may be important for the older, literate student.

Analytic versus synthetic styles of thinking are addressed by cognitive, communicative, and affective approaches. Cognitive approaches offer rule-oriented learning that is explicit. Communicative and affective approaches assume that learning, whether of grammar or of language functions is implicit and wholistic. That is, language is learned as a whole and not analyzed into its constituents initially. In the Natural Approach, for

example, no overt rules of language are taught. Language is seen in a social context, is used for communication only, and is modified only for the sake of comprehension. The student unconsciously learns language patterns and vocabulary and can use them when the situation requires it. In cognitive approaches, language is consciously learned through mental processes that identify and synthesize parts of rules. Conscious practice of language is the main focus of this approach.

The Audiolingual Method also includes overt practice, except that after being exposed to language patterns, students are to guess the underlying rules, through inductive processes, rather than deductively as in cognitive approaches.

The controversy over how a second language is learned, implicitly or explicitly, is very much alive. While some theorists hypothesize that the ability to produce a second language comes from implicit acquisition (Asher, 1982; Krashen, 1982), other theorists hold that language learning is explicit (e.g., proponents of cognitive approaches). Recent critics of language learning theories point out that language learning cannot be entirely implicit in an academic setting (Fillmore & Swain, 1984). Implicit learning contributes to oral fluency in informal settings, but does not contribute extensively to native-like command of oral and written language in a formal academic setting that requires decontextualized language and cognitively demanding behavior (Tikunoff, 1984). These trends in thinking suggest that instructional approaches should provide for both acquisition (implicit) and learning (explicit) so that students' needs are more completely met.

Motivational/affective characteristics, CLL, Suggestopedia, LEA, TPR, Strategic Interaction, Natural Approach, and some content-based approaches were developed around motivational and affective considerations. While these approaches view motivation as an important aspect of language learning, they do not address motivational aspects that are related to ethnolinguistic attitudes. For example, the affectively-based approaches (CLL, Suggestopedia, and TPR) provide for motivation in a general way. The student builds trust for those around him in a relaxed, non-threatening atmosphere. What these approaches do not address are ethnolinguistic attitudes that prevent students from identifying or even feeling positive about the target language culture, and this may lower motivation.

Communicatively based approaches also assume that by focusing on communication of messages and not on formal language rules, learners will be highly motivated. Krashen (1982) in the Monitor Theory does posit an affective filter which accounts for the variable achievement of equally intelligent acquirers. However, the nature of this filter and its relationship to ethnolinguistic attitudes are not known.

Sociocultural/ethnolinguistic and environmental characteristics. The affectively based approaches (CLL, Suggestopedia, and TPR) provide for some sociocultural and ethnolinguistic considerations. That is, students can talk about their feelings toward language, language learning, and the learning situation (CLL), or create a new "persona" so that negative feelings toward the target language and culture are displaced (Suggestopedia). Sociocultural, ethnolinguistic, and environmental characteristics of ESL students in grades K to 12 are addressed by only one approach, the New Concurrent Approach. This approach has as its main

objective equal acquisition of two languages. By concentrating equally on two languages, students learn that both languages and cultures have equal status in the society. While this is not feasible with heterogeneous ESL classes, cultural and linguistic allusions can be made in such classes to promote positive sociocultural attitudes. Use of the first language to various degrees is also discussed in the section on organizational patterns.

Student characteristics and language learning theories. As discussed before, most language learning theories address either biological/neurological, cognitive, or socio-affective aspects of second language learning and acquisition. Only two current language learning theories address more than one of these areas: the Monitor Theory of Krashen (1982) and the Interactionist Theory of Fillmore and Swain (1984). The Monitor Theory includes an affective filter and a Monitor which applies to conscious learning. Exactly how the process, acquisition, takes place is unknown. The Interactionist Theory includes affective, cognitive, and linguistic components. How each of these components interacts with the other is not known. Evidence for the validity of these two theories or any of their components or their interrelationships needs to be provided.

Current theories tend to take into account learner characteristics that are general and abstract in nature. However, characteristics that are specific to ESL school populations have not been specifically addressed. Neither instructional approaches nor language learning theories have incorporated ethnolinguistic, cultural, environmental, and to a certain extent cognitive characteristics found in ESL student populations.



The implications for research are that issues arising from these characteristics must first be well defined, and models of language learning and pedagogy must begin to describe the role that these characteristics play in language learning, acquisition, and teaching.

### Conclusions

The following major points summarize the information on relationships of student characteristics to ESL instructional approaches and language learning theories that was revealed in the literature review.

- o Each instructional approach revised was originally developed for a specific age group, and the appropriateness of its extension to younger or older students is not known.
- o Differences in cognitive style are not taken into account in any instructional approach except very generally; each approach makes the implicit assumption that all learners will learn equally well through that approach.
- o Affectively-based approaches provide for student motivation in a general way, but do not address ethnolinguistic attitudes that can affect motivation.
- o Cultural, linguistic, and environmental characteristics of students are addressed in a a general way by affective approaches and by any approach that makes use of students' first language and culture to some degree, but only a bilingual approach which treats both languages and cultures equally can address such student characteristics fully.
- o Most second language learning theories address only one area of student characteristics; Krashen's Monitor Theory and Fillmore and Swain's Interactionist Theory are the only current theories addressing a variety of student characteristics.

## V. APPROPRIATENESS OF ESL INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS

### Overview

This chapter addresses the seventh policy question:

7. What instructional materials are appropriate for use with various ESL instructional approaches?

Instructional materials surveyed exemplified a variety of instructional approaches. Overall, the materials were found to incorporate various ideas from current approaches as well as audiolingual concepts. Materials developed expressly for newer approaches are now beginning to be available on the market.

However, communicatively based, interactional, and affective approaches encourage student and teacher developed materials rather than commercially produced materials. For example, in Strategic Interaction, the students discuss how best to solve a given communicative problem and the language necessary to accomplish the task. The teacher outlines the task and provides coaching on the target language. Students create their own conversations and manuscripts of these conversations can be used for reading later. With CLL, all materials are student generated in the initial stages in order to make them more meaningful.

While student generated materials fill communicative needs, they do not necessarily meet the academic needs of students. Teacher generated materials are necessary to provide samples of formal academic tasks. Furthermore, since these newer approaches have been described more

completely for the beginning levels only, teachers still must plan and prepare materials to meet school objectives for intermediate and advanced levels.

The expectation that teachers and students should generate their own materials is seen in the proliferation of teachers' guides. These guides outline basic principles and provide sample activities. Teachers are expected to apply these principles to developing their own materials. If teachers need samples of authentic language, for example, they must record their own or obtain real documents. The shortcoming of this approach is that the teacher must spend a great deal of time in preparation and materials production. The advantage of using materials that take students through a lesson in lock-step fashion is that both student and teacher can easily measure progress by the number of pages covered and structures reviewed. This may be one of the reasons why audiolingualism has persisted in current materials; audiolingual techniques are easy to prepare and use.

Most writers or companies of current commercial materials did not overtly state either the instructional approach or the language learning theory upon which the text was based. Adjectives such as "communicative" and "natural" were included in many of the instructions, but were not reflected in the lessons. Apparently, publishers shy away from identifying a text with a certain approach for fear that the approach might not be in favor in the second language teaching community. Those student texts and teacher guides that clearly state their approach and theoretical underpinnings are those written or developed by the proponent of the approach or theory (e.g., Asher, 1982; Krashen & Terrell, 1983). These proponents believe strongly in their approach, and may be willing to risk a possible failure

In book sales. Textbook publishers, on the other hand, try to please as wide an audience as possible, developing their texts for general applications.

Most student materials reviewed were developed for populations other than the ESL student population in grades K through 12. Since these materials are developed mainly for adults, the subject matter is usually not appropriate for younger ESL students. These materials do not take ethnolinguistic or cultural characteristics into account. Particularly lacking are those texts which introduce content to either the elementary or the high school ESL student. Practitioners reported using teacher-developed materials or texts designed for native speakers that require considerable adapting. This suggests that practitioners are not using new materials or new approaches widely because the basic needs of the ESL student are not met by them. Perhaps teacher-made materials and "eclectic" approaches come closer to fulfilling both students' needs and school objectives. Information on the characteristics and benefits of locally developed materials, however, is lacking. In answer to this need, the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education is currently collecting locally developed ESL materials and plans to make descriptions and availability of these materials known to practitioners nationwide.

What are good materials? Results of the interviews found that there was little consensus on the type of materials used. This lack of consensus may be related to the failure of most materials to answer specific student needs. The generation of locally produced materials indicates the need for materials that are oriented to the ESL student. The lack of consensus on materials may also indicate the confusion over the selection of approaches to follow. As long as the ESL student population's needs are not being

met, practitioners will continue to teach eclectically and to produce their own materials.

### Conclusions

There are four major observations concerning the relationship current materials to instructional approaches:

- o Current materials incorporate some newer ideas but remain relatively conservative, tending to retain audiolingual aspects and to avoid direct identification with newer approaches.
- o Many current materials are not written specifically for the U.S. school-aged ESL population.
- o In interviews with local school districts and BEMSCs no particular consensus on materials was found. In many cases locally produced materials were preferred over commercially produced materials.
- o When approaches emphasize student-centered lessons, the need for student texts decreases while the need for teachers' guides increases.

Because they must appeal to a wide audience, commercially produced materials tend to perpetuate practices that do not coincide with current instructional approaches or theories of language learning. Furthermore, they do not meet the needs of this country's growing ESL student population. Materials that do meet the needs of ESL students in the United States should:

- o be geared to the age of the student;
- o address ethnolinguistic and cultural characteristics;
- o meet academic as well as personal needs;
- o offer content-based materials designed for different approaches; and
- o state clearly the instructional approaches and language learning theories on which they are based.

## VI. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### Overview

This chapter summarizes the main conclusions reached in the synthesis of current literature on English as a second language, and analyzes policy implications for the education of limited English proficient (LEP) students in U.S. elementary and secondary schools. The conclusions and policy implications are summarized in the following sections:

- o Educational Benefits of Instructional Approaches and Language Learning Theories
- o Organizational Issues in ESL Programs
- o Student Characteristics and Second Language Learning
- o Appropriateness of ESL Instructional Materials

Finally, recommendations for future research directions in ESL education are presented.

### Educational Benefits of Instructional Approaches and Language Learning Theories

The policy questions addressed in this section sought to identify the educational benefits of various ESL instructional approaches currently found in elementary and secondary schools, and also analyzed the second language learning theories that support these approaches. The findings from the literature search and interviews with practitioners and theorists are the following:

- o Benefits claimed for different approaches can be related to the instructional objectives of different grade levels.

- o While communicative approaches may be most suited to initial second language development, particularly for young children, they are not intended to develop cognitive academic language skills.
- o Cognitive and content-based approaches may be most appropriate for meeting instructional objectives related to literacy skills and the development of academic language skills.
- o Audiolingual methodology is still quite popular, and can be expected to continue until newer approaches become easier to teach.
- o Few of the newer approaches appear to be regularly used in ESL classrooms.
- o Instructional approaches do not always clearly define the language learning theories on which they are based.
- o Current instructional approaches do not completely meet either student or teacher needs.
- o There is little evidence supporting either the validity of current language learning theories or the effectiveness of current instructional approaches.

### Organizational Issues in ESL Programs

This section described three major types of organizational patterns found in ESL programs: ESL within bilingual programs, separate ESL-only programs, and ESL through immersion programs. The policy questions considered in the analysis of these program types concerned the interaction of the programs with classroom composition, the effects of these programs on second language learning, and the use of the native language and culture in different types of ESL programs. Findings from the literature review and interviews with practitioners are the following:

- o Demographic characteristics of school districts play an influential role in the selection of organizational pattern; districts with homogeneous LEP student populations can opt for either bilingual or immersion programs, while districts with linguistically heterogeneous populations may have to choose ESL-only programs.

- o Native language support can improve the effectiveness of ESL programs.
- o To be most effective, ESL instruction should be incorporated into a substantial part of the total curriculum, rather than limited to a single class per day.
- o ESL teachers at all grade levels need management skills to provide for small group and individualized instruction.
- o LEP students profit from contact with proficient English speaking peers; this can be accomplished in two-way bilingual programs and in ESL-only programs in which LEP students are partially mainstreamed; it is not accomplished within immersion programs.
- o Comparison of different types of organizational patterns is complicated by the fact that the same name is often given to programs that in fact have differing characteristics, and that programs with similar characteristics may bear different identifying labels.

### Student Characteristics and Second Language Learning

This section examined the relationship between student characteristics and second language theory and instruction. The policy questions addressed the effect of student characteristics and learning styles on the learning of English as a second language. The following conclusions were reached on the current state of knowledge about the relationship of student characteristics to language learning theories and approaches:

- o Few student characteristics are addressed by current instructional approaches.
- o The effectiveness of instructional approaches for students of different ages than those for whom they were designed is not known.
- o Differences in cognitive style are taken into account only in the most general manner by either instructional approaches or language learning theories.
- o Most language learning theories address only one facet of student characteristics.



## Appropriateness of Instructional Materials

Instructional materials were reviewed in order to assess their appropriateness for use with various ESL instructional approaches. The findings revealed the following points:

- o Only a few ESL materials reflect current approaches and language learning theories.
- o Most instructional materials include aspects of a variety of approaches, and usually this potpourri is not well integrated.
- o ESL instructional materials are not individualized in terms of specific age, cognitive style, culture, and ethnolinguistic background.
- o Many current materials were written for older students, often for students studying English in other countries.
- o Interviews with practitioners revealed little consensus in choice of instructional materials.
- o Materials are generally selected on the basis of their match with the ESL curriculum and instructional approach; since this can vary from one school district to another, books containing a combination of approaches are generally favored.
- o Student-centered lessons require explicit teachers' guides or resource books.
- o Instructional materials reflecting cognitive and content-based approaches are few; more materials are now available which reflect communicative approaches.
- o Most of the materials surveyed do not meet students' academic language needs.

## Recommendations and Directions for Future Research

The field of teaching English as a second language in the United States has developed in response to the needs of persons of other language backgrounds who must learn English in order to participate successfully in American society. The focus of ESL teaching was originally on adult students, perceived to be in greatest need of special instruction, as it was assumed that school-aged students would pick up English through exposure in school.

In recent years it has become apparent that in many cases mere exposure to English in school is not enough to develop the language skills needed for LEP students to keep up with their native English-speaking classmates. ESL instruction has now become a part of the curriculum in many U.S. schools, particularly those most heavily impacted by non and limited English speaking students. In San Francisco, for example, every elementary and high school in the district provides ESL instruction, either as part of a bilingual program or as a separate program.

The growth of ESL in schools has lacked direction from the national level. Standards for teachers, methodology, and instructional materials have been largely dictated by previous experience with adult students learning English either in this country or overseas.

Many school districts have found effective ways to meet the ESL needs of LEP students, but these solutions in general are not widely known. Other school districts new to ESL could profit from the experience of established ESL programs.

There is a need for more information about the current state of ESL instruction in schools. The present study has reviewed recent literature on ESL relevant to instructional approaches, organizational patterns, instructional materials, and language learning theories relevant to school-aged students, but published information does not provide a comprehensive picture of what is actually happening in ESL at the school level. The literature review has been supplemented by a series of interviews with practitioners, administrators, teacher trainers, and researchers, and these interviews have provided additional information about the current state of ESL in U.S. schools. But the information is far from complete. Therefore, the following research needs are proposed:

1. Conduct a national descriptive study of the characteristics of ESL services provided in elementary and high schools and the educational benefits of each.
2. Conduct a series of investigations of the relative effectiveness of different ESL instructional approaches for different ages, ethnolinguistic backgrounds, learning styles, and other student characteristics.
3. Develop and test ESL approaches specifically designed to meet mainstream instructional objectives, such as cognitive and content-based approaches.
4. Investigate the relationship between social interactive language skills and academic language skills and the degree to which the latter is dependent on the former at different ages.
5. Develop and test instructional materials supporting newer ESL approaches, and reflecting second language learning theoretical principles.
6. Compare the effectiveness of different models of ESL program organization in terms of student achievement in the mainstream curriculum.
7. Develop a comprehensive model of second language acquisition and learning that addresses different learner characteristics, cognitive processes, affective and motivational factors, and the language learning context (social and/or academic); and test the model empirically with LEP students of different ages and from different ethnolinguistic backgrounds.

8. Investigate the effect of cognitive, social, linguistic, developmental, and affective factors on second language learning and achievement of limited English proficient school-aged students.

Additional research is also needed in areas not addressed by this study, such as the training and certification of ESL teachers, the identification of mainstream academic language skills, articulation of ESL programs with the mainstream curriculum, relationship of English proficiency tests and ESL program exit criteria to the language demands of the mainstream classroom, and instructional approaches to meet the needs of older students entering school after significant interruptions of schooling in their native countries.

## References

- Asher, J. J. (1982). Learning another language through actions: The complete teacher's guidebook. Los Gatos, CA: Sky Oaks Production.
- California State Department of Education (1984). Case studies in bilingual education. (Available from California State Department of Education, Office of Bilingual Bicultural Education, California)
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. Applied Linguistics 1(1), 1-47.
- Chamot, A. U. (1983). Implications of structured immersion for the ESL elementary curriculum. (Available from EDRS, P.O. Box 190, Arlington, VA). (ERIC Document Reproductions Service No. 230 038)
- Chamot, A. U. & Stewner-Manzanares, G. (1985). A summary of current literature of English as a second language. Rosslyn, VA: InterAmerica Research Associates, Inc.
- De Avila, E. A. (1984). Bilingualism, cognitive function, and language minority group membership. (Unpublished paper available from Linguametrics groups, San Rafael, CA).
- Di Pietro, R. (1982). The open-ended scenario: A new approach to conversation. TESOL Quarterly, 16(1), 15-20.
- Feeley, J. T. (1983). Help for the reading teacher: Dealing with the limited English proficient (LEP) child in the elementary classroom. The Reading Teacher, 36(7), 650-55.
- Feneran, L & Hilferty, R. (1984). Heterogeneous groups: Turning a liability into a strength. Elementary ESOL Education News, 7(1), 5-6.
- Fillmore, L. W., & Swain, M. (1984). Child second language development: Views from the field on theory and research. Paper presented at TESOL Convention, Houston, TX.
- Hammerman, M. L. (1979). Suggestopedia: An update for second language teaching. (Available from EDRS, P.O. Box 190, Arlington, VA) (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 181 740)
- Houck, N., Robertson, J., & Krashen, S.D. (1978). On the domain of the conscious grammar: Morpheme orders for corrected and uncorrected ESL student transcriptions. TESOL Quarterly, 12(3), 335-339.
- Jacobson, R. (1981). Implementation of a bilingual instruction model: The NEW concurrent approach. In R.V. Padilla (Ed.) Ethnoperspectives in bilingual education research: Bilingual education technology (14-29). Tempe, AZ: College of Education, Arizona State University.
- Krashen, S. D. (1982). Principles and practices in second language acquisition NY: Pergamon Institute for English.

- Krashen, S. D., & Terrell, T. (1983). The Natural Approach, Hayward, CA: Alemany Press.
- Levenson, S. (1979). Teaching reading and writing to limited and non-English speakers in secondary schools. English Journal, 68(8), 38-42.
- Lott, D. (1983). Analysing and counteracting interference errors. ELT Journal, 37(3), 261-266.
- Lozanov, G. (1979). Suggestology and outlines of suggestopedy. New York: Gordon and Breach Science Publishers.
- Mohan, B. A. (1979). Relating language and content teaching. TESOL Quarterly, 13(2) 171-182.
- Nattinger, J. R. (1984). Communicative language teaching: A new metaphor. TESOL Quarterly, 18(3), 391-407.
- Ohio Department of Education (1983). Strategies for developing language programs for national origin minority students. Columbus, OH: Ohio Department of Education.
- O'Malley, J. M. (1983). Teacher's language skills survey. Rosslyn, VA: InterAmerica Research Associates, Inc.
- O'Malley, J. M., Chamot, A. U., Stewner-Manzanares, G., Russo, R. P., Kupper, L. (In press). Learning strategy applications with students of English as a second language. TESOL Quarterly.
- Oxford-Carpenter, R., Pol, L., Lopez, D., Stupp, P., Gendel, M. and Peng, S. (1984). Demographic projections of non-English-language-background and limited-English-proficient persons in the United States. Rosslyn, VA: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.
- Ramirez, A. G. & Stromquist, N. P. (1979). ESL methodology and student language in bilingual elementary schools. TESOL Quarterly, 13(2), 145-158.
- Rigg, P. (1981). Beginning to read in English the LEA way. In C. W. Twyford, W. Diehl, & K. Feathers (Eds.), Monographs in language and reading studies, reading English as a second language: Moving from theory (81-90). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University, School of Education.
- Renault, L. (1981). Theoretically based second language reading strategies. In C. W. Twyford, W. Diehl, & K. Feathers (Eds.). Monographs in language and reading studies: Reading English as a second language: Moving from theory (64-80). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University, school of Education.
- Savignon, S. J. (1983). Communicative competence: Theory and classroom practice. Reading MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Scovel, T. (1979). Review of suggestology and outlines of suggestopedy. TESOL Quarterly, 13(2), 255-266.

- Snow, C., & Ferguson, C. (1977). Talking to children, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Stevick, E. W. (1980). Teaching language: A way and ways. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Taylor, B. P. (1983). Teaching ESL: Incorporating a communicative student-centered classroom. TESOL Quarterly, 17(1), 69-88.
- Terrell, T. (1981). The Natural Approach in bilingual education. Schooling and language minority students: A Theoretical framework. Los Angeles, CA: Evaluation, Dissemination, and Assessment Center, California State University, Los Angeles.
- Tikunoff, W. J. (1983). Significant bilingual instructional features study. San Francisco, CA: Far West Laboratory.
- Tikunoff, W. J. (1984). Student functional proficiency: Toward specifying a practitioners' operation model. (Available from the Center for Interactive Research and Development, San Francisco, CA)
- Varvel, T. (1979). Silent Way: Panacea or pipedream? TESOL Quarterly, 13(4), 483-94.
- Wagner, M. J. & Tilney, G. (1983). The effect of superlearning techniques on the vocabulary acquisition and Alpha brain wave production of language learners. TESOL Quarterly. 17(1), 5-17.
- Wong, A. (1984). Personal communication.