DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 392 260 FL 023 595

AUTHOR Helmar-Salasoo, Ester
TITLE A National Study of States' Roles in Choosing Reading and Literature for Second Language Learning. Report Series 2.25.
INSTITUTION National Research Center on Literature Teaching and Learning, Albany, NY.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 95
CONTRACT R117G10015
NOTE 39p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Bilingual Education; Course Content; Curriculum Design; Curriculum Guides; Elementary Secondary Education; *English (Second Language); *Instructional Materials; Language Arts; Literature Appreciation; *Media Selection; Multicultural Education; National Surveys; *Reading Materials; Resource Centers; Second Language Instruction; *Statewide Planning; Teaching Guides

ABSTRACT

A national survey was undertaken in 1993 to discover what approaches and materials state agencies recommend in the teaching of reading and literature to students in elementary and secondary school bilingual and English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) programs. The report summarizes the study methodology and findings in these areas: existence and content of a state curriculum guide of framework for bilingual/ESL programs; enrollments of limited-English-proficient (LEP) students; instructional support offered by the state in the form of teacher handbooks, materials addressing specific LEP populations; adherence to local control in bilingual/ESL instruction; alignment of bilingual/ESL programs with English language arts programs; use of multifunctional resource centers; workshop and conference offerings for bilingual/ESL teachers; use of core instructional materials lists; and common issues encountered by state ESL/bilingual program directors, including reorganization and reduced resources, lack of trained teachers, difficulty in collecting and disseminating useful "fugitive" material within the state, and time pressures. A brief bibliography is included, and summaries of survey findings and lists of relevant state publications are appended. (MSE)

A National Study of States' Roles in Choosing Reading and Literature for Second Language Learning

Ester Helmar-Salasoo

National Research Center on Literature Teaching & Learning
UNIVERSITY AT ALBANY • SUNY

Literature Center

School of Education • 1400 Washington Avenue • Albany, New York 12222

A National Study of States' Roles in Choosing Reading and Literature for Second Language Learning

Ester Helmar-Salasoo

National Research Center on Literature Teaching and Learning
University at Albany
State University of New York
1400 Washington Avenue, Albany, New York 12222

Report Series 2.25

1995

Preparation of this report was supported under the Educational Research and Development Center Program (Grant number R117G10015) as administered by the Office of Research, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. The findings and opinions expressed here do not necessarily reflect the position or policies of the sponsoring agency.

National Research Center on Literature Teaching and Learning

The National Research Center on Literature Teaching and Learning is a research and development center located at the University at Albany, State University of New York. The Center was established in 1987 (as the Center for Learning and Teaching of Literature), and in January 1991 began a new, five-year cycle of work sponsored by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. The Center's mission is to conduct research and sponsor activities to improve the teaching of literature, preschool through grade 12, in schools across the nation.

Center-sponsored research falls into three broad areas: teaching and learning processes, curriculum and assessment, and social and cultural traditions in the teaching and learning of literature. Special attention is given to the role of literature in the teaching and learning of students at risk for school failure, and to the development of higher-level literacy skills, literary understanding, and critical thinking skills in all students.

For information on current publications and activities, write to: Literature Center, School of Education, University at Albany, 1400 Washington Avenue, Albany, NY 12222

A National Study of States' Roles in Choosing Reading and Literature for Second Language Learning

Ester Helmar-Salasoo

INTRODUCTION

Much attention has been focussed on literature and its use in the language arts classroom in the past decade: we have seen a trend towards literature-based curriculum, we have witnessed the political bent to discussions of choice of literature or reading materials in terms of multiculturalism and cultural literacy, and we have seen a vigor in the research of the teaching of literature to native speakers (Applebee, 1990; Langer, 1991). In addition, literature has been shown to help in the development of literacy and critical thinking (Langer, 1992).

The past decade, too, has seen a significant increase in the number of students whose native language is not English. The number of Hispanic children in schools is expected to increase from 5.9 million in 1982 to 18.6 million by the year 2020 (Pallas, Natriello, & McDill, 1989). While ESL and bilingual programs are becoming an increasing reality in schools in the United States, how much attention has been paid to conceptualization of their curriculum?

The focus of this study was to see what is valued and recommended at the the state level in the teaching of reading and literature to students in bilingual and ESL programs. What guidelines or recommendations does the state make to teachers of second language learners regarding reading and literature? What reading/literature is recommended for second language learners? What is the place of reading/literature in the ESL/bilingual classroom? Considering the attention given to multiculturalism, and the new focus on literature-based curriculum in the language arts, how much of this has transferred to the classrooms of second language learners?

Research in the area of the teaching of reading and literature to second language learners is scant, and extends back only a couple of decades. Most of the research covers methodological issues in the teaching of reading skills, or views the teaching of literature to "advanced" students as a highbrow task in the teaching of the culture of the target language.

Constructivist theory is currently having some influence on the teaching of language arts in schools throughout the nation, and the 1980s saw some publications advocating constructivist approaches to reading and literature teaching in the second language classroom. Constructivist notions focus on the individual learners constructing and

interpreting knowledge themselves. Meaning does not reside in the text, but involves the interactions among the text, the reader, and the social context.

The area of teaching reading and literature to second language learners has clearly and regrettably not kept up with the more prolific research in the teaching of reading and literature to native speakers. This study was undertaken to see how states have reckoned with constructivist notions.

Traditionally, the second language classroom has relied on textbooks or publishers' packages to guide the teaching of reading. Rather than viewing the teacher as the expert, these textbook approaches provide a predetermined homogenous script for teachers to guide their students through a menagerie of reading skills. The text, rather than the teacher or the students, determines the sequenced curriculum. Reading is seen as the mastery of skills. Students read short, abridged excerpts that may be simplified, repetitious, and organized in a carefully sequenced manner. The literature, if in another language, is usually translated from English (Freeman, 1988).

Emphasis in this traditional approach is placed on the activities that follow the reading. The goal of most exercises is to identify individual words, not to build meaning about what has been read (Freeman, 1988). This is the "transmission" model of teaching (Barnes, 1976). Genuine dialogue between the teacher and student is missing.

Second language students or students of diverse backgrounds appear to receive a lower-quality education than their counterparts (Allington, 1991). A disproportionate number of students from diverse backgrounds appear to end up in the bottom reading group, while students from mainstream backgrounds are placed in higher groups (Oakes, 1985). Second language students are more likely than mainstream students to be labeled "language impaired" or to be tracked according to what they can't do, say, or write. This ceremony of labeling and segregation prevents second language students from receiving the higher-quality education experiences available to mainstream students (Shephard, 1991).

Much evidence exists to illustrate the impending need for schools to enrich their literacy instruction for students of diverse language and cultural backgrounds. Schools are usually less successful in improving the achievement levels of second language students (Pallas, Natriello, & McDill, 1989). The National Assessment of Educational Progress (Applebee, Langer, & Mullis, 1988) clearly shows that Hispanic and African American students do not read as well as European American students at all levels tested (Grades 3, 7, and 11). A substantial difference in performance exists, and a gap is evident by Grade 4. The need for attention to improving instruction for second language learners is real and urgent.

This study was conducted to look at ways in which each state guides its teachers in the teaching of reading and literature to second language learners. The following section

provides an outline of the study, of the questions asked, and of the way the study was carried out. The next section outlines the findings of the study, discussing what was found in the frameworks for second language learners with regard to reading comprehension, literature, culture, literary texts, and other support offered by states to teachers. The final section discusses conclusions and looks at how states view the teaching of literature and reading to second language learners with regard to the documents and support they offer teachers. It discusses, too, continuing issues in the teaching of second language learners.

THE STUDY

The study was conducted from February to August 1993. Each state agency was asked to issue information regarding the guidelines they set or recommendations they made in the teaching and choice of reading materials and literature for LEP (limited English proficient) students.

First, an ERIC search was conducted to see what had been done in the preparation of state guidelines or frameworks for reading and literature for second language learners. Very little information was found; however, a sense was gained of what language to use when asking for information.

The *State Educational Agencies 1993 Directory*, published by the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs, was then used to establish contact with the director or supervisor of each state agency responsible for second language learners.

Questions asked

In a phone call to each director or supervisor, a brief outline of the study was given, after which several questions were asked:

1. I'd imagine you have a document called a "State Curriculum Guide or Frameworks for ESL and Bilingual Programs." Do you have something like this?
2. If I were a teacher beginning to teach an ESL or bilingual class in your state and I wanted advice or a guide to teaching reading and literature in the curriculum, is there anything you might send me or suggest?
3. Do you offer any workshops or conferences for teachers at the state level? If yes, what is the nature of those? Do they include the teaching of literature/reading?
4. Do you encourage teachers to follow the "Language Arts Guide" that is used in the classroom for native speakers of English?
5. Are you considering developing/revising your framework or guide in the future?
6. Do you have a state "Core Adoption List" for ESL/bilingual students?
7. How many LEP students do you have in your state?

8. Is there any other office in your state that focuses on ESL or LEP students, other than your own?

Numbers of LEP students

There were some problems with the figures given in response to the question regarding the number of LEP students in each state. Some directors gave only approximations to the nearest thousand and others gave figures for the new year. The numbers that were eventually used for LEP students came from the 1992 "Report to Congress" by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of the Secretary. The numbers themselves, however, are only approximations and lack some consistency across the board because criteria and definitions of "LEP student" differ from state to state. Each state uses its own different instrument to assess English proficiency; for example, Arkansas uses the *Iowa Test of Basic Skills*, Alabama uses the *Stanford Achievement Test*, and in New Hampshire the individual school district determines the instrument (U.S. Department of Education, 1992). There seems to be no standard assessment to define an "LEP student" across the United States.

Language used

It was important to choose the language for the telephone conversations carefully and appropriately. The term *LEP student* was used because it is used in the annual data collection conducted by states and it appears to be the common term used to signify a second language learner for whom English is a second language in the United States. In order to gather data most efficiently and to ensure universal understanding, then, this term was used.

The study required gathering documents dispersed by state agencies for teachers of LEP students. Directors were specifically asked if a framework or state curriculum guide for ESL and bilingual programs was available. A *framework* is a document providing outer limits, a vision, or a basic structure of ideas for teachers to contemplate and use in preparing for more specific learning encounters in their classroom. A framework does not dictate a list of prescribed activities and is not a straitjacket for local curriculum developers. A *curriculum guide,* on the other hand, is a more specific and prescriptive document, one that guides the teacher's classroom lessons by providing a list of skills, objectives, and/or activities for the classroom teacher. The study investigated whether the states did provide a vision or any guidance to teachers of LEP students, with specific regard to reading/literature. And if so, what then? Frameworks or guides published by state agencies have the potential to be powerful and influential shapers of teachers' choices of reading materials and approaches to the teaching of reading in their ESL/bilingual classes. Do states mandate or recommend particular reading skills, ways of teaching

reading, and/or lists of books, or do they provide guidance to teachers in the selection of reading materials? What do these materials look like?

Finally, it is important to clarify what is meant by *reading* since the study sought to reveal what states recommended in the choice of reading materials. *Reading* covers all of the written and oral materials used in class, such as novels, plays, poetry, readers, basals, textbooks, fiction, and nonfiction. Because the term *literature* has more of a highbrow connotation, both terms were used—*reading materials* and *literature*—so that as many bases as possible could be covered. Had directors only been asked what *literature* is recommended to teachers of LEP students, it might have invited mention of only the traditionally recognized highbrow canon.

The study was intended to gather as much information as possible regarding what is read in ESL/bilingual classrooms. What are second language learners required to read in ESL and bilingual classes? In having chosen *what* students are to read, does this determine *how* it is taught? If particular texts are used, then does this become the curriculum?

Support offered by states to teachers

The study sought all information and documents from state agencies of the support they offered teachers of LEP students in the teaching of reading/literature. Did a state have a framework or curriculum guide? Did this mention reading/literature? Were states in the process of developing or revising frameworks or a guide? Did the state have packages or information to send out to teachers regarding reading? Were workshops or conferences offered in each state? What was the nature of these? Did they include the teaching of reading/literature? Were teachers encouraged to follow a "Language Arts Guide"? Did a state have a core adoption list for ESL/bilingual programs?

State agencies have potential access to state-of-the-art pedagogy and could be in a powerful position to disseminate such information to the classroom teacher. Was the state able to provide a vision of how reading/literature can be used in the ESL/bilingual classroom?

Even before the study began, it was clear that, whatever information was found, the study could only be a first step in our understanding of what reading is recommended and how it may be taught in the classroom of LEP students. This study looked only at the state agencies' recommendations and guidelines on the teaching of reading. How closely does this mirror what actually goes on in the classroom? The obvious next step in our understanding would be to study the ESL/bilingual classroom itself.

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

Frameworks

The first question asked of state directors of ESL/bilingual programs was whether they had a document called a "State Curriculum Guide" or "Framework" for ESL/bilingual programs (see Appendix 1 for a summary of all findings). Ten states acknowledged that they have specific frameworks or curriculum guides to offer teachers of ESL/bilingual students (see Table 1; see Appendix 2 for a list of publications). States with the highest LEP enrollments made some attempt to provide a document to teachers of ESL/bilingual programs (see Table 2; see Appendix 3 for a complete list of states and numbers of LEP students).

Table 1. States with curriculum guides or frameworks for ESL/bilingual programs.

State	*# LEP Students*	*Framework*	*Guide*
California	986,462	*	
Texas	313,234	*	
New York	168,208		*
Florida	83,937	[a]	
Illinois (Chicago)	79,291		*
Maryland	12,701	*	
Louisiana	8,345		*
North Carolina	6,030		*
Tennessee	3,660	*	
New Hampshire	1,146		*

[a]Florida sent the first draft of their framework, entitled "Curriculum Framework for ESOL" (1993), which was chosen to be included in the study. This draft has since been updated, but is still being reviewed.

There appears to be a strong correlation between the existence of a framework and a high number of reported LEP students. It is significant that the five states with the highest LEP enrollments are able to offer a framework or a guide to teachers. The total number of LEP students in the most populated states (California, Texas, New York, Florida, and Illinois) make up 73 percent of the total LEP population in the United States (U.S. Department of Education, 1992) (see Appendix 4 for a list of students by geographic region). The District of Columbia was not included in the study as it did not respond to repeated information requests. While Illinois does not have a state framework/guide, the city of Chicago has developed guidelines for curriculum for ESL students.

Table 2. States with the highest LEP enrollments.

State	*# LEP Students*	*Framework/Guide*	*Other Document(s)*
California	986,462	*	*
Texas	313,234	*	
New York	168,208	*	
Florida	83,937	*	*
Illinois	79,291		a
New Mexico	73,505	b	
Arizona	65,727	c	
New Jersey	47,560		d
Massachusetts	42,606		d

[a]City of Chicago has curriculum guide.
[b]Has competency framework (no separate competencies for ESL).
[c]Has "Literature Essential Skills" (no separate ESL document).
[d]Local control.

California does not have a separate framework for LEP students but integrates the needs of LEP students into all subject areas. In the "Language Arts Framework," California repeatedly and explicitly highlights the needs and expectations for LEP students.

Both New Mexico and Arizona provide guidance to teachers through a competency framework (New Mexico) and "Literature Essential Skills" (Arizona), but these provide guidance for teachers of language arts and are not specifically targeted to teachers of LEP students. These two states see no need for separate documents for ESL/bilingual programs, feeling instead that the same high expectations should be held for LEP students as for other students, and seeing no need for separate expectations for LEP students in a separate document. Arizona was not included in the study findings as its "Literature Essential Skills" does not explicitly address the needs of LEP students. Some states are currently working on developing frameworks (Utah, Arkansas), while others are working on curriculum guides (Hawaii, Indiana).

Discussion of Frameworks and Curriculum Guides

How did the documents address reading? All articulated at least the teaching of basic reading comprehension skills. Some differences, however, were evident in the ways that the frameworks or guides saw "reading." Most saw a primarily functional goal in teaching reading, listing inventories of reading skills that needed teaching. A large gap, too, appears to exist in the mention and valuing of literature for LEP students. Some lower-level or beginning ESL classes tended to avoid the term *literature* altogether,

dwelling more on reading as skill development. More advanced classes were offered the privilege of studying literature in terms of genre and the elements of literature. Personal student engagement in literature in terms of exploration and questioning in discussion appeared mostly to be lacking in the frameworks and guides.

Reading Comprehension

All documents did encourage reading comprehension skills. The lower-level comprehension skills of reading for information and following directions were well covered and mostly set out in inventories. Most activities appeared to be text-based and teachers were encouraged to use "paragraphs, pa: ges and simplified texts" to teach reading comprehension skills (Florida, New York). Simple reading comprehension involved decoding, reading for information, and following directions. Here, reading was seen as skill development.

Higher levels of reading comprehension were encouraged, too, such as making inferences, drawing conclusions, and predicting the future. Again, these were to be taught using "passages" and "paragraphs," a phrasing which does not differentiate between literature and nonliterature, as is seen in the following example from Florida: "Ask and answer questions that demonstrate the ability to analyze, synthesize, and evaluate written passages" (Grades 9-12, ESOL combined skills III).

Many other states followed suit by concentrating mainly on reading comprehension, in the teaching of reading. Maryland stated that the primary objectives for ESOL were functional, with an emphasis on reading for information. New Hampshire, too, saw use of ESL materials for reading readiness, reading strategies, and reading comprehension development. There appeared to be a focus on gaining information, and no judicious separation of literature and nonliterature.

Literature

Literature or written and oral texts did have explicit inclusion or brief mention in most documents for LEP students. The word *literature* was sometimes not explicitly used, but reading of literature was inferred by use of phrases such as "written discourse" and a "fictional book" (New Hampshire), or reading "literary selections" (Louisiana), or "authentic literary pieces." Others were more specific in calling for a literature-based language arts curriculum (California) and for "using meaningful culturally valuable pieces" (Florida).

If teachers were encouraged to use literature in their classrooms, then what were they encouraged to do with it? Literature was mentioned in three ways.

First, literature was seen as a topic of study. Literature was to be studied in terms of genre (Tennessee, Florida, Illinois [Chicago]) and as a way of understanding the elements of literature such as setting and character (Louisiana, Tennessee, Illinois [Chicago], North

Carolina). The documents made little mention of *how* this study was to be undertaken, but rather followed the spirit of an inventory of reading skills, focussing on *what* was to be taught, not *how* it was to be taught. This study of literature by means of analytic activities appeared especially to be emphasized in the more advanced classes, which had more highly proficient English students. The study of literature, of genre and the elements of literature, appeared not to be encouraged in some beginner or Level I classes, whereas they were studied at higher levels (Illinois [Chicago], Florida).

Other states did teach genre and elements study at beginner levels (Tennessee, North Carolina, Louisiana, Texas). For example, in North Carolina, the objectives for ESL Grades 7-12 (Beginner) included: "Identify and understand plot, setting, and characters of any given story." There is no mention in this example of *how* this study of plot, setting, and characters is to proceed, although we have a clue when we see that the evaluation task suggested for this is multiple-choice tests. Here, it appears that reading skills are being developed where students must read for information rather than reading and building meaning from personal interaction with the text. Literature, then, is used by the teacher to guide students through their reading in order to realize predetermined meanings of the piece, especially if evaluation was based on a multiple-choice test.

Do teachers expect that LEP students would not be able to understand whole works of quality literature because they expect difficulty? Are discussions of literature not included or articulated as an integral part of the program because of assumptions that LEP students would not have adequate language to engage in discussion? Because the reading of whole works of quality literature appeared absent from the formal program for some beginning ESL students, are we to assume then that literature is usually just for the top readers? Are there lower expectations for LEP students with lower proficiencies in language? Are many beginner ESL students being excluded from rich literary experiences?

California was an exception in encouraging the use of literature with *all* students, emphasizing that LEP students should be exposed to high-quality literature regardless of level of language proficiency.

The second way literature was mentioned in the frameworks or guides was as reading for pleasure. This ranged from the reading being supplemental (Maryland) to the love of reading being encouraged in students (California). If students were encouraged to think about a favorite book, it was again in terms of the "inventory of comprehension skills" approach, where (as in the case of North Carolina) "students retell or write summary of their favorite movie, book, or story, stressing the main idea" (ESL Grades 7-12, Beginner, Intermediate). Other documents just required students to "listen to literary selections daily for personal enjoyment" (Texas—Kindergarten). Visits to the school and public library were encouraged, as well as displays of appealing literature in the ESOL classroom (Maryland). Texas stated that "students shall be provided opportunities to select books for

individual needs and interests" (Grade 1, Bilingual). Maryland made an important point when it noted that "in the sometimes intense drive to mainstream LEP students as quickly and as effectively as possible, this aspect of reading instruction (reading for enjoyment) is sometimes neglected."

Rather than encouraging wide and regular reading in LEP students, many of the frameworks and guides made only token mention of reading for students. Direct and explicit encouragement needs to be made for students to choose literature themselves and to read for enjoyment.

The final way in which literature was mentioned in the state documents was in having students respond to it. "Respond" covered a wide range of meanings, from a teacher-directed written "reaction" to a piece, to oral "class discussion," to "emotional engagement" with literature" (Texas). Response was either written or oral. Few states encouraged classroom time for discussion and engagement with literature in a constructivist sense. There appeared to be little focus on the individual interpretation of a literary piece.

Response was encouraged in written form; for example, in Louisiana: "Writes one or more paragraphs analyzing or explaining a personal reaction to a literary selection." Florida described the use of reading journals where students would write "summaries and reaction to representative genres"(Grades 6-8, Level III). Reading journals were also used in Chicago. Another way for students to respond was being required to do a book report, in oral or written form (New Hampshire). A student here would describe characters, give a summary of the story, and give a reaction to it. Where written responses were required, again no mention was made of the context for such responses. Did students write their responses immediately after reading? Did they have opportunities to discuss issues first? Did they have opportunities to share written responses? What was done with the written responses? Were they used for later discussion? Were they graded?

"Class discussion" was mentioned in several places, but no detailed description of its conduct was given. Did the teacher go through a list of questions (Louisiana: "Have a class discussion for comprehension") or a predetermined agenda? Did "class discussion" mean that students themselves raised issues and questions? Several states included objectives that focused on developing skills of group discussion, again in an inventory mode (New Hampshire, Louisiana, Illinois [Chicago]). An objective that states, "Student expresses his or her opinion of a literary work and explains the basis for that opinion" (Illinois [Chicago], Level III), could occur within a very teacher-controlled setting or within one where students set the agenda for the discussion.

In inviting response, the teacher may ask students to "tell about personal experiences brought to mind" (Louisiana). Chicago, too, required that the student "recognizes own

experiences in literary pieces" and "applies reading as a means of understanding own life experiences and learning about American culture" (Level II).

But were students encouraged to spend time in discussion where they unraveled their thoughts and challenged each other in their own constructions of the meaning of a text? California attempted to push this approach in its "Language Arts Framework": "Students who are asked open-ended questions and invited to explore many possible answers rather than hunt for the teacher's 'right' one discover that real learning takes place because of their own understanding of what the ideas and answers and issues mean to them." Texas, too, attempted to encourage a constructivist approach to literature: "Students have opportunities to broaden and deepen experience through imaginative and emotional engagement with literature" and "to participate in cooperative learning and a variety of oral activities to elicit meaning from literature"(Grades 9-12).

The discussion of literature did not appear, generally, to be the central element in the use of literature in ESL/bilingual programs. Several of the states made no mention of using discussions of literature to elicit meaning, nor did they insist on student engagement with a literary text (Florida, North Carolina, Tennessee, New York). Other states set out skills for conduct of a discussion but did not go further in explicitly stating the importance of discussion as the means for students to construct meaning from a text (New Hampshire, Maryland, Louisiana).

Culture

Culture was mentioned in some form in most of the frameworks and guides. In its most rudimentary form, lists of aspects of "American culture" were given as a guide for the teacher to teach (New York, Tennessee). Students here were not explicitly encouraged to reflect on their own culture or to make comparisons. Students were encouraged to learn about American culture (Maryland), to identify major holidays, and to understand American attitudes towards money and credit (New Hampshire). Here, direct teaching is meant to fill the gap for the newly arrived LEP student who may be unfamiliar with the new dominant culture. Florida wanted students to "discuss, compare, and contrast the different aspects of multiculturalism and its impact on American society." Chicago was alone in requiring "the student [to] generate and select responses to conflict situations that are socially acceptable in American schools and society" (Level II).

Some states did explicitly suggest that students reflect on and compare their own culture and that of the United States (Illinois [Chicago]). Florida required as a student outcome "an ability to distinguish between the similarities and differences of specific aspects of American culture as they relate to school and community and the students' native culture" (Levels I-III). New Hampshire required students to "compare and contrast student native and English speaking social mores and attitudes." Texas took the

comparison one step further by stating that students shall be provided with opportunities to "recognize and respect differences in behavior and expressions of other cultures." This more empathetic attitude towards culture encourages "learning concepts that result in knowledge and awareness of the history and culture of another people with a range of situations."

Two states went even further and stated it was important for students to value their own culture (Texas, Maryland). Texas wanted students to be provided with opportunities to "value one's own culture and heritage," and required students to "develop an awareness of the relationships between language and culture." Maryland, too, emphasized the interconnectedness of culture and language. Texas stood alone in specifically focussing on the literature and culture of its student population: "Respond to various forms of literature representing the literary heritage and culture of the Spanish Southwest." We can see that California caters to a growing Latino LEP population if we study their adoption lists, which shall be discussed later. Texas clearly shows that it acknowledges its LEP students' cultures and literary heritage, and thus values them.

Montana acknowledged the needs of its native American population with regard to educational opportunity. Cultural diversity and differences among learners was highlighted and cultural and language differences were to be viewed as valuable and enriching resources.

Lastly, only two states explicitly mentioned the importance of students learning the school culture. Delpit (1988) studied the culture of power in the school setting, concluding that it was vital for teachers to explicitly teach the rules and codes of power in order for students to participate fully in the mainstream of American life. Tennessee framed this in having students "understand the various cultural expectations in the American school system," while Texas stated that students need to "learn the behaviors of the school culture."

Some states made connections with the cultural diversity of their LEP populations by recommending books and materials for teachers to use in their classrooms (California, Hawaii). Hawaii has several publications of stories, songs, and math in different languages.

Literary Texts

As was noted earlier, the importance of reading and enjoying quality literature received little mention in these frameworks, except in California, but was instead couched in terms of "passages" and "paragraphs" to read and study. Many adopted the spirit of Florida where beginner ESL classes (Level I) progressed from the simple to the more "literary" in advanced classes (Level III):

Level I—simple reading selection, simplified literary selections

Level II—"simplified examples of world literature"

Level III—samples of representative genres of simplified, high interest American literature

Texas was more specific in describing "meaningful, culturally valuable pieces of literature," which may come in the form of poems, short stories, plays, and nonfiction. Chicago made use of simple, authentic literary texts in beginner or Level I classes. In ESL Level II, it encouraged use of simple short stories, biographies, and one-act plays, and in Level III—or more advanced classes—required the student to be able to analyze literature and evaluate selected simple authentic literary pieces.

Support Offered by States

Handbooks

While only 10 states offered a separate curriculum guide or framework for teachers of ESL/bilingual programs, many states appeared to have some kind of publication in the form of a handbook to offer general assistance to teachers in setting up and running ESL programs (see Appendix 5 for a complete list). North Carolina, for example, had a publication entitled "Here They Are, What Do We Do?" These handbooks gave information on assessing LEP students, described legal responsibilities, gave home language surveys in various languages, sometimes listed commercially available tests for LEP students, and gave general information a teacher may need. Some suggested approaches or strategies to use in the classroom (Hawaii, Illinois [Chicago], Idaho, North Carolina, Georgia, Missouri). Hawaii went further by giving sample structured lessons for literature. Maine and Virginia gave descriptions of whole language and its use. These handbook-type books were designed to assist teachers in establishing and developing programs, and sometimes discussed general aspects of reading or literature.

Michigan was alone in offering a separate brochure to teachers, called "What Research Says to the Classroom Teacher About Reading For the Second Language Learner" (1985). This brochure listed goals and instructional strategies in terms of research evidence, classroom implications, and teacher knowledge, and it encouraged critical thinking and the reading of books in their entirety. Idaho gave theoretical perspectives on reading, but the common way of exposing teachers to research was to give a bibliography of research articles or books (Hawaii, Georgia, Missouri, Idaho, Maine, Delaware). The onus would then be on teachers to find this material, read it, and determine its significance and usefulness in their classroom. Only 5 other states had specific sections on reading in their handbooks (Missouri, Maine, North Carolina, Hawaii, Georgia). Georgia discussed the

language experience approach, the importance of reading aloud in the classroom, the use of shared reading, and the teaching of story structure. North Carolina gave a li.t of points to consider when teaching reading; for example:

- Use controlled reading.
- Check reading comprehension with questions or by having students paraphrase what they have read.

Maine and California explicitly persuaded their teachers of LEP students to put a literature-based approach into practice. Maine's short one-page description emphasized the importance of having students read literature for enjoyment. Missouri, like California, stated the importance of giving second language students the "opportunity to listen to and react to a wide variety of literature." Missouri went an important step further in suggesting that speakers of another language have the opportunity to discuss material in their native language. It also suggested, as did Hawaii, that the teacher provide books in that language for the child to read.

Other information appeared in these handbooks that could be of some use to the classroom teacher. Chicago gave a list of publications available from the U.S. Department of Education, Delaware gave a list in their resource manual of Hispanic organizations in the United States, and Delaware and North Carolina gave a list of contact information a teacher might need, such as a bibliography for the education of Hmong students. Maine, too, gave a list of help or expertise available.

One question that was specifically asked of the state directors was what materials they had to offer the classroom teacher to assist them in developing curriculum for reading. Some offered ERIC Clearinghouse or National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education (NCBE) information (Arkansas, Montana, South Carolina, Oregon). Connecticut offered booklets on accepted practice. Some states stated they would give advice over the phone (Minnesota, Mississippi, Tennessee, Wisconsin), while others would network the teachers with successful programs (Wisconsin). Some states had publishing company catalogs to offer teachers (Arkansas, Indiana), while others had lists of reading available in Spanish (California, some districts in Connecticut).

Again, in most states, substantive discussion of literature and its use in the classroom was missing from these general handbook-type publications.

Materials Addressing Specific LEP Populations

Some states made an attempt to enlighten teachers about specific LEP populations in their state. As was mentioned earlier, the handbooks sometimes listed contact addresses for the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages Organization (TESOL) and Hispanic organizations. North Carolina provided quite a lengthy list of common traits of

Asian students and Hispanic students, such as their attitudes toward school and their learning and study habits. Montana had an article to offer its teachers entitled "Montana's Culturally Diverse Students."

Some states referred their teachers to specific books and authors for professional reading. California and Connecticut recommended Ada Flor Ada, Connecticut recommended Hakuta, Idaho suggested Jim Cummins, South Carolina recommended Mary Lou McCloskey, and Kansas recommended "Literacy con carino" by C. Hayes. Alaska had a list of books on native literature for teachers.

Surprisingly, a teacher's request for help from the state in Colorado, Alaska, Delaware, Iowa, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Mexico, Pennsylvania, or New York would be to little avail. Judging from the packages they sent for the purposes of the study, these states had little or nothing to offer the teacher asking for help at the state level.

Local Control

One reason for the absence of a state framework or curriculum guide for ESL/bilingual programs appeared to be the strong adherence to local control in 18 states (New Jersey, Massachusetts, Colorado, Connecticut, Wisconsin, Alaska, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Pennsylvania, Nevada, North Dakota, Idaho, New Hampshire, Montana, Kansas, Iowa, Wyoming, Nebraska). School districts in these states themselves provided support or ideas for approaches to teachers of ESL/bilingual programs. Decisions regarding curriculum in these states are made at the local level. More specifically, then, approaches to teaching are decided at the local level.

Language Arts Guide

In many states, programs for LEP students were aligned with language arts programs. Teachers took direction from the language arts framework and made modifications where necessary (see Appendix 1). Some were state language arts frameworks, and others were local frameworks that might differ from locality to locality. Some teachers followed the framework, and others didn't, but it was there if a teacher needed guidance.

Multifunctional Resource Centers

Sixteen Multifunctional Resource Centers (MRCs) have been established across the United States; their function is to gather and provide information on a particular area of bilingual education and to provide technical assistance and training to teachers and parents of LEP students. The MRC is another source a teacher could contact if they wanted help, advice, or ideas to use in the classroom.

Workshops and Conferences

Workshops and conferences offered to teachers of ESL/bilingual programs appeared to be offered by all states, mostly as a requirement for Title VII funding. Some were

offered at the local level. The most common topics included in these workshops and conferences seemed to follow the common topics of the handbooks offered by states—practices, strategies, assessment, and placement of LEP students (Delaware, Maine, Mississippi). Some states encouraged whole language to be included in the topics offered by workshops (Arkansas, Indiana, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Vermont). Louisiana alone mentioned the inclusion of multiculturalism in its workshops with a focus on minority authors. Few states mentioned the issue of multiculturalism at all, which is surprising considering the prominence multiculturalism has been given in language arts programs for native speakers.

When states were asked specifically whether reading and literature were included in workshops and conferences, answers such as "sometimes," "if requested," or "to a minor degree" were forthcoming. Some states did acknowledge that reading and literature were included (Alaska, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, New Hampshire, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Vermont, Wisconsin). It became apparent, however, that reading and literature were not an integral part of these workshops and conferences, though they appeared to be included at some time or other.

There were two exceptions. First, Alaska had organized a conference which focussed on the oral tradition of native Alaskan narratives. The aim of the conference was to put together a panel of practitioners who use oral tradition in their classroom. Second, Montana organized a conference where the literature of native Americans was the focus. Native Americans themselves were the speakers in discussing the teaching of literature.

Adoption Lists

Eight states have state core adoption lists for ESL/bilingual programs: California, Florida, Louisiana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas, and Utah. Those states with adoption lists also tended to have higher concentrations of LEP students (see Table 3).

Table 3. States with core adoption lists.

State	*# LEP Students*
California	986,462
Texas	313,234
Florida	83,937
New Mexico	73,505
Oklahoma	15,860
Utah	14,860
Nevada	9,057
Louisiana	8,345

The adoption lists generally came in the form of a list of texts without any lengthy discussion or guidance given to teachers—only title, publisher, grade, and price were given (Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas, Nevada, Utah). Florida made brief mention of the approach used in the text, and gave a suggested instructional time also. New Mexico offered some very brief comments on texts, such as stating that a text was "appropriate for special needs." As far as support for the classroom teacher of LEP students, no state approached California in number of publications, extensive discussion of goals and frameworks, or critical appraisals of texts. Its five adoption and recommended-readings publications (see Appendix 5) all stress the need for a literature-based program and the importance of high-quality literature for *all* students, not just the academic elite. Its "Bilingual Language Arts" booklet calls for high-quality materials reflecting the literature focus of the "English Language Arts Framework" and the rich literary heritage of the Spanish-speaking world. It then focuses on the text series that were chosen for adoption, only 2 out of 7 of which were adopted. Further, it gives a critical description of each of the text series that were and weren't adopted. Such an approach can only be helpful to the teacher in tying in the framework to the text by highlighting the strengths of a text and the weaknesses. As an example, here is part of the discussion of one of the texts considered for adoption: "There is an absence of original Spanish selections. There is limited exposure to various types of literary forms within the basic program" ("Adoption Recommendations 1989, Bilingual Language Arts," p.13; see Appendix 5). Another discussion included the following: "Most questions engage the students in recall and low-level inference responses rather than in higher levels of critical thinking skills" (p.14).

In the "ESL Adoption Recommendations 1991," only 3 out of 16 programs were recommended. One recommendation the adoption panel made was to encourage publishers and producers to upgrade the quality of ESL materials. California does not appear to accept the status quo of what textbook companies offer in their materials.

California also had a publication entitled "Recommended Readings in Spanish Literature 1991 K-8," which listed some 300 titles of "real" books intended for foreign language programs in Spanish and for Spanish-speaking LEP students.

What reading/literature was adopted in the 8 states that did have core adoption lists? Except for California's careful descriptions of materials adopted, the other 7 states all set out their lists in inventory form. In ESL, the overwhelming majority of materials listed in the adoption list were ESL programs or kits, in which a publishing company presented its program in the form of a student book, activity book, teacher edition, audiocassette(s), testing kit, and maybe black-line masters. But what of the literature content? One has to know the program or see it in order to know whether the literature used is authentic, whether it promotes literature that covers an array of cultural diversity, and whether it is a literature-based program. But in these programs, the "literature" is the stuff in the text.

In the lower grades, "big books" were a common offering. This kind of program again came along with the activity-book paraphernalia. Readers were the popular literature for lower and middle grades. The higher grades appeared to rely on the literature in the text (program), although New Mexico did recommend "Five Minute Thrillers" and Utah recommended "Oxford Progressive English Readers" for the higher grades (7-12).

It was interesting to look at the adoption lists and to compare them with the original laudable goals found in the frameworks. While Texas did state the importance of responding to "various forms of literature representing the literary heritage and culture of the Spanish Southwest," this was not supported in the reading chosen in the adoption list. The bilingual programs relied solely on basal readers, which are hardly a reflection of the "literary heritage" of the Spanish Southwest. The ESL programs in Texas used large textbook-company programs listed in the adoption list. It appears that states must carefully consider what is chosen in the adoption lists and ensure that it is compatible with the goals of the frameworks. On the other hand, they may choose the way of California by presenting to teachers materials in the adoption lists but adding critical discussions of each choice, including strengths and weaknesses of the textbook or program to be adopted.

Real books seemed to be missing from these state adoption lists, except for California's substantial recommended lists.

State Issues

The study required contact with the directors of ESL/bilingual programs of 50 states. Some lengthy conversations with many of the directors appeared to highlight common issues among states:

1. Many states are in the throes of reorganization, which has disrupted any initiatives they may have had to develop areas of curriculum such as reading and literature. A common reply was that they try to do the best with what they have, in terms of less money and fewer staff. Morale may not be at an all-time high.

2. Some states complained of having few trained ESL/bilingual teachers. There are states which have no ESL certificate. Others rely on the universities to prepare teachers for the job.

3. A lot of "fugitive" material is known to be in a state, but the state has insufficient funding to collate and disseminate material that could be of use to all teachers. Workshops and conferences become the places where such material may be brought to teachers' attention, yet only a small percentage of ESL/bilingual teachers may be able to attend workshops and conferences over the space of a year.

4. Some ESL/bilingual directors work in extraordinary pressure-cooker situations with demands and deadlines present every day. Some indicated interest in developing and

disseminating ideas on the teaching of literature, but that given staff cuts, less funding, and more pressing issues already on hand, it was just not possible at this time.

CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to see what each of the states valued and recommended to teachers in the teaching of reading and literature to second language learners. How do state departments of education view reading and literature in the ESL/bilingual classroom? Each state director sent materials that they would regularly send to any teacher who asked for help or ideas in the teaching of reading or literature to second language learners.

This study found that 10 state education agencies offered frameworks or curriculum guides to teachers of LEP students. These appeared to be states with higher LEP student populations. New Mexico and Arizona provided guidance to teachers by means of a competency framework (New Mexico) anda document entitled "Literature Essential Skills" (Arizona), both of which targeted *all* students, not just second language learners. An additional 18 states were able to support teachers of LEP students at the local level with regard to curriculum and the teaching of reading/literature in the classroom (New York and Tennessee did both). What of the other 20 states? How do these states support their teachers? Teachers appear to rely heavily on workshops and conferences to disseminate material and to encourage dialogue; states rely on teachers to initiate contact with local resource centers.

The study found generally that the bulk of what frameworks and curriculum guides call "reading" tends to have a functional goal of treating reading as skill development. This development of reading skills, and the activities which take place, seem to be structured and text-based.

This insistence on reading as skill development fits in with the view that second language students need to be taught language in a structured sequence. The study found that students were often labelled according to their language experience:

(a) "basic" or "beginner" or "Level I"

(b) "intermediate" or "Level II"

(c) "advanced" or "Level III"

The curriculum offered to each level differed in quality and sophistication. Level I students were rarely allowed to read real literature but were given "simple" passages to read. The justification for not permitting Level I students to read widely appears to stem from the judgment that they are a novice group. The emphasis is on what they can't do and on what they lack in reading skills, processes, and strategies, and so the presumption is that they need to learn these in isolation first. Later, they can apply what they have learned to real literature. The novice group receives much practice in reading skills, even though it would seem that "beginner" students could be more easily supported in their language

development by being offered appropriate and challenging real books to read on a regular basis. It was only at Level III—the "advanced" level—that a student might be assured of reading lengthier pieces. This practice of reducing the intellectual level of the curriculum to match students' real or perceived oral language difficulties is common in the second language classroom (Moll, 1986). Instead of marching ahead of development, as Vygotsky (1978) would advise, students learn a homogenized and sequenced curriculum.

Where literature was mentioned in frameworks and curriculum guides, it tended to take the form of a topic of study, one of genre and of analysis. While some mention was made of "responding" to literature, it came as an afterthought, with little substantive attention given to the development of literary thinking.

One very surprising finding was the lack of attention to the reading of literature by LEP students. While many of the frameworks and handbooks did attend to reading skills, there appeared to be a disturbing lack of attention to the reading of literature. A more disturbing exclusion was the lack of use of literature in the classroom to engage students in literary experiences. The adoption lists generally showed that "real books" were missing from the LEP student's experience, particularly if they were classified as beginner students. The focus has changed in the past decade in instructional practice in the language arts classroom, shifting from a focus on strategies to improve reading comprehension to a focus on how to conduct discussions where students share their envisionments and constructions of meaning of the text. The study found a continuing smug regard for teaching reading skills to LEP students. Rarely did the study find encouragement for students to be involved in sharing, developing, and challenging their interpretations of a text. There seemed to be little focus on students' own personal reflections and responses. On the other hand, the study found that students read so few real books anyway that there was little to reflect on. Rarely did the study find explicit mention of the importance of nurturing dialogue among students to question each other on their interpretations. Rarely did the study see frameworks and guides discussing reading as an experience of growing understanding that changes over time. Reading in the ESL/bilingual context is perhaps still stalled in the functional approach: the teaching of reading in the second language classroom still appears to focus solely on the practice of skills, and students seem to read very little real literature. A change is needed where the LEP student, not the text and not the teacher, becomes the source of meaning. The LEP student needs opportunities in and out of the classroom to read real books on a regular basis. Classroom time needs to be used for discussion and the development of interpretations rather than solely for reading-skill development and answering written questions about literature.

The study also found a lack of culturally responsive real books to be used by LEP students. The frameworks, guides, and handbooks seemed to cover American mainstream culture, perhaps suggesting some comparison with a child's own culture; but clearly an

LEP student's culture and literary heritage is still given only token acknowledgement. The cultural and literary heritages and linguistic backgrounds of LEP students need to be acknowledged, valued, and given a place in the classroom. Historically, literature and reading for second language learners have rested within the literary canon. In the past, teachers taught the best that English literature had to offer in order to provide good models of writing and to foster aesthetic appreciation. The teaching of these more highbrow selections of English literature tended to focus on "hidden meanings" to be found by the student.

Students need more opportunities to read literature from culturally diverse authors. When students can identify with characters and events in a story, then they tend to respond more positively to literature (Purves & Beach, 1972).

The numbers of students attending school from varied language and ethnic backgrounds has increased dramatically in the past decade. The second language learner is no longer a rarity, yet how much have schools enriched the curriculum to offer the best possible education to these and to all students? Dropout rates remain high and widespread school failure exists among minority students (Cummins, 1989).

Further research studies need to look at literature teaching in the ESL/bilingual classroom. How can LEP students be engaged in thoughtful dialogue regarding material they have read? What happens to the LEP student who is able to engage in literary thinking? What happens in classrooms when real books are made available to LEP students, in both English and in a student's native tongue? What happens in ESL/bilingual classrooms when real books reflecting the culturally diverse backgrounds of students find their place in the classroom?

A teacher's own view of how "literature" or "reading" can be used in the classroom will strongly determine what takes place in that classroom. If the bulk of handbooks, adoption lists, frameworks, and curriculum guides tend to value "reading" as skill development and "literature" as a field of study, then is this what happens in the classroom? The vision of the curriculum for LEP students offered by states through their publications tends, with few exceptions, to be narrow and traditional in its approach to literacy. Second language students continue to be shortchanged in the quality of education they receive. LEP students appear to have much practice in studying how to develop their reading skills, but appear to be encouraged to read very little in the way of real books. There appears to be a lack of attention to the seriousness of the issue, despite the fact that the number of second language learners has increased and will continue to increase in our schools. Finally, second language learners are given very little encouragement to use language to develop their own ways to talk and think about what they read.

REFERENCES

Allington, R.L.(1991). Children who find learning to read difficult: School responses to diversity. In E.H. Hiebert (Ed.), *Literacy for a diverse society: Perspectives, practices and policies* (pp. 237-252). New York: Teachers College Press.

Applebee, A. N. (1990). *Literature instruction in American schools* (Report Series 1.4). Albany, NY: National Research Center on Literature Teaching and Learning.

Applebee, A. N., Langer, J. A., & Mullis, I. (1988) *Who reads best: Factors related to reading achievement in grades 3, 7 and 11.* Princeton: National Assessment of Educational Progress, Education Testing Service.

Barnes,D. (1976). *From communication to curriculum.* Boynton/Cook.

Cummins, J. (1989). The sanitized curriculum: Educational disempowerment in a nation at risk. In D.M. Johnson & D.H. Roen (Eds.), *Richness in writing. Empowering ESL students* (pp. 19-38). New York: Longman.

Delpit, L. (1988). The silenced dialogue: Power and pedagogy in educating other people's children. *Harvard Education Review, 58*(3), 280-298.

Freeman, Y. S. (1988). The contemporary Spanish basal reader in the U.S.: How does it reflect current knowledge of the reading process. Occasional paper no. 18. Tucson: Program in Language and literacy, College of Education, University of Arizona.

Langer,J.A.(1991). *Literary understanding and literature instruction* (Report Series 2.11). Albany, NY: National Research Center on Literature Teaching and Learning.

Langer,J.A.(1992). *Critical thinking and English language arts instruction* (Report Series 6.5). Albany, NY: National Research Center on Literature Teaching and Learning.

Moll, L.C. (1986). Writing as communication: Creating strategic learning environments for students. *Theory Into Practice, 25,* 102-108.

Oakes,J. (1985). *Keeping track: How schools structure inequality.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Pallas, A. M., Natriello, G., & McDill, E. L. (1989). Changing nature of the disadvantaged population: Current dimensions and future trends. *Educational Researcher, 18*(5), 16-22.

Purves, & Beach (1972). *Literature and the reader.* Urbana,IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Shepard, L. A. (1991). Negative policies for dealing with diversity. In E. H. Hiebert (Ed.), *Literacy for a diverse society: Perspectives, practices & policies* (pp. 279-298). New York: Teachers College Press.

United States Department of Education, Office of the Secretary. (1992). The condition of bilingual education in the nation: A report to the Congress and the President.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society. The development of higher psychological processes.* M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner & E. Souberman (Eds.). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Appendices

1. Table of study findings.
2. Frameworks and Curriculum Guides published by states.
3. States and numbers of LEP students.
4. Numbers of LEP students by geographic region.
5. Publications by states for teachers of LEP students.

Appendix 1: Table of Study Findings

	IDENTIFIED LEP STUDENT TOTALS*	DOES A GUIDE/ FRAMEWORK EXIST FOR 2ND LANG. LEARNING	ARE RESOURCES AVAILABLE FOR TEACHERS FROM STATE?	WORKSHOPS, CONFERENCES?	DO YOU GUIDE TEACHERS TO USE LANGUAGE ARTS GUIDE?	IF NOT, WHAT?	INTENTION TO DEVELOP FRAMEWORK IN FUTURE?	STATE CORE ADOPTION LIST FOR SEC. LANG.LG.?
ALABAMA	1,052		YES	YES	YES		YES	
ALASKA	11,184			YES	YES		YES	
ARIZONA	65,727		YES	YES	YES			
ARKANSAS	2,000		YES	YES	YES		YES	
CALIFORNIA	986,462	YES	YES	YES	YES			YES
COLORADO	17,187		YES	YES		local decision	MAYBE	
CONNECTICUT	16,988		YES	YES		local decision	MAYBE	
DELAWARE	1,969		YES	YES		local decision	MAYBE	
FLORIDA	83,937		YES	YES	YES			YES
GEORGIA	6,487		YES	YES	YES		MAYBE	
HAWAII	9,730		YES	YES	YES		IN PROGRESS	
IDAHO	3,986		YES	YES	YES		MAYBE	
ILLINOIS (CHICAGO)	79,291	YES	YES	YES		local decision		
INDIANA	4,670		YES	YES	YES		YES	
IOWA	3, .5			YES	YES			
KANSAS	4,661		YES	YES	YES			
KENTUCKY	1,071		YES	YES	YES		IN PROGRESS	
LOUISIANA	8,345	YES	YES	YES	YES		YES	YES
MAINE	1,983		YES	YES		local decision		
MARYLAND	12,701	YES	YES	YES	YES			
MASSACHUSETTS	42,606			YES		local decision	YES	
MICHIGAN	37,112			YES		teacher training		
MINNESOTA	13,204		YES	YES	YES		MAYBE	
MISSISSIPPI	2,753		YES	YES	YES		YES	
MISSOURI	3,815		YES	YES	YES			
MONTANA	6,635		YES	YES	YES		YES	
NEBRASKA	1,257		YES	YES		local decision		
NEVADA	9,057		YES	YES		local decision	YES	YES
NEW HAMPSHIRE	1,146	YES		YES	YES			
NEW JERSEY	47,560			YES	YES			
NEW MEXICO	73,505		YES	YES		competencies		YES
NEW YORK	168,208	YES		local level		local decision		
NORTH CAROLINA	6,030	YES		YES	YES		IN PROGRESS	
NORTH DAKOTA	7,187			YES	POSSIBLY		YES	
OHIO	8,992			YES	YES		MAYBE	
OKLAHOMA	15,860		YES	YES	YES			YES
OREGON	7,557		YES	YES	YES			
PENNSYLVANIA	15,000			YES		local decision	MAYBE	
RHODE ISLAND	7,632		YES		YES		YES	
SOUTH CAROLINA	1,205		YES	YES		local decision	MAYBE	
SOUTH DAKOTA	6,691		YES	YES		local decision	MAYBE	
TENNESSEE	3,660	YES	YES	YES		local decision	YES	
TEXAS	313,234	YES	YES	local level		ref frameworks	REVISE	YES
UTAH	14,860		YES	YES	YES		YES	YES
VERMONT	500		YES	YES	YES		YES	
VIRGINIA	15,130		YES	"Institute"		local decision		
WASHINGTON	28,646		YES	YES			YES	
WEST VIRGINIA	231		YES	YES	YES			
WISCONSIN	14,648		YES	YES		local decision		
WYOMING	1,919			YES		local decision		

* from "The Condition of Bilingual Education in the Nation," U.S. Dept. of Education Office of the Secretary.

Appendix 2: Frameworks and Curriculum Guides published by states.

1. California: *English-language arts framework* (California Department of Education, 1987).
2. Texas: *Essential elements: Primary language for bilingual education pre-K to 5, and English as a second language pre-K to 12.*
3. New York: *The New York State core curriculum for English as a second language in the secondary schools* (The University of the State of New York, The State Education Department, Bureau of Bilingual Education, Albany, NY, 1983).
4. Florida: *Curriculum framework for ESOL draft* (Florida Department of Education, 1993).
5. Illinois (Chicago): *Scope and sequence for high school English as a second language instruction* (Chicago Public Schools, Board of Education, City of Chicago, 1992).
6. Maryland: *ESOL bilingual education programs: Instructional handbook* (Maryland State Department of Education).
7. New Hampshire: *Standards series for appropriate and effective educational programs for limited English proficient students. Module 2: Curriculum Guide* (New Hampshire State Department of Education, Concord, NH, 1985-86).
8. Louisiana: English language arts curriculum guide for limited English proficient students grades K-12 (State of Louisiana Department of Education 1989, revised 1991).
9. Tennessee: *Language arts. Curriculum framework English as a second language. Grades K-12* (State of Tennessee Board of Education).
10. North Carolina: *English as a second language curriculum handbook. K-6, 7-12* (Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools, 1983).

Appendix 3: States and numbers of LEP students

High # LEP: 25,000 and above		
California	986,462	has frameworks
Texas	313,234	has frameworks
New York	168,208	has curriculum guide
Florida	89,937	has frameworks draft
Illinois	79,291	City of Chicago has curriculum guide
New Mexico	73,505	has competency frameworks for all
Arizona	65,727	has "Literature Essential Skills" for all
New Jersey	47,560	
Massachusetts	42,606	
Michigan	37,112	
Washington	28,646	
Mid # LEP : 6,000-25,000		
Colorado	17,187	
Connecticut	16,988	
Oklahoma	15,860	
Virginia	15,130	
Pennsylvania	15,000	
Utah	14,860	
Wisconsin	14,648	
Minnesota	13,204	
Maryland	12,701	has frameworks
Alaska	11,184	
Hawaii	9,730	
Nevada	9,057	
Ohio	8,992	
Louisiana	8,345	has curriculum guide
Rhode Island	7,632	
Oregon	7,557	
North Dakota	7,187	
South Dakota	6,691	
Montana	6,635	
Georgia	6,487	
North Carolina	6,030	has curriculum guide
Low # LEP : 6,000 and below		
Indiana	4,670	
Kansas	4,661	
Idaho	3,986	
Missouri	3,815	

Low # LEP : 6,000 and below (cont.)		
Iowa	3,705	
Tennessee	3,660	has frameworks
Mississippi	2,753	
Arkansas	2,000	
Maine	1,983	
Delaware	1,969	
Wyoming	1,919	
Nebraska	1,257	
South Carolina	1,205	
New Hampshire	1,146	has curriculum guide
Kentucky	1,071	
Alabama	1,052	
Vermont	500	

Appendix 4: Numbers of LEP students by geographic region

* indicates the state has an ESL/bilingual framework or curriculum guide

Northeast	
New York*	168,208
New Jersey	47,560
Massachusetts	42,606
Connecticut	16,988
Pennsylvania	15,000
Rhode Island	7,632
Maine	1,983
New Hampshire*	1,146
Vermont	500
Midwest	
Illinois*	79,291
Michigan	37,112
Wisconsin	14,648
Minnesota	13,204
Ohio	8,992
North Dakota	7,187
South Dakota	6,691
Indiana	4,670
Kansas	4,661
Missouri	3,815
Iowa	3,705
Nebraska	1,257
South	
Texas*	313,234
Florida*	89,937
Oklahoma	15,860
Virginia	15,130
Maryland*	12,701
Louisiana*	8,345
Georgia	6,487
North Carolina*	6,030
Tennessee*	3,660
Mississippi	2,753
Arkansas	2,000
Delaware	1,969
South Carolina	1,205
Kentucky	1,071
Alabama	1,052
West Virginia	231
West	
California*	986,462
New Mexico	73,505
Arizona	65,727
Washington	28,646
Colorado	17,187
Utah	14,860
Alaska	11,184
Hawaii	9,730
Nevada	9,057
Oregon	7,557
Montana	6,635
Wyoming	1,919

Appendix 5: Publications by states for teachers of LEP students.

Alabama

None.

Alaska

None.

Arizona

Arizona Literature Essential Skills (Arizona Department of Education, 1990)

Arkansas

None.

California

Annotated List of Publications in Bilingual Education (California Department of Education, Sacramento, 1992).

English-Language Arts Framework for California Public Schools K-12 (California Department of Education, Sacramento, 1987).

English-Language Arts Model Curriculum Guide K-8 (California Department of Education, Sacramento, 1988).

Bilingual Education Handbook: Designing Instruction for LEP Students (California Department of Education, Sacramento, 1990).

Adoption Recommendations of the Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission to the State Board of Education, 1989: California Basic Instructional Materials in Bilingual Language Arts and Visual and Performing Arts (California Department of Education, Sacramento, 1989).

Adoption Recommendations of the Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission to the State Board of Education 1991: California Basic Instructional Materials in ESL and Foreign Language (California Department of Education, Sacramento, 1991).

It's Elementary! Elementary Grades Task Force Report (California Department of Education, Sacramento, 1992).

Publications Catalog: Educational Resources (California Department of Education, Sacramento, 1993/4).

Recommended Literature Grades 9-12 (California State Department of Education, Sacramento. 1990).

Recommended Readings in Spanish Literature (California State Department Of Education, Sacramento, 1991).

Colorado

None.

Connecticut

A Profile of Our Schools. The Condition of Education in Connecticut 1991-02 (State of Connecticut Department of Education, 1993).

Delaware

A Handbook on the Education of Children of Limited English Proficiency for the State of Delaware: A Resource Manual for Educators.

Guidelines and Procedures for the Identification, Assessment and Placement of Limited English Proficient Students. A Resource Manual for Educators (State Board of Education and Department of Public Instruction, Maine, 1992).

Florida

ESOL Curriculum Framework draft, grade 6-12 (Florida Department of Education, 1993).

1992-93 Florida Catalog of State-Adopted Instructional Materials.

Georgia

English to Speakers of Other Languages: A Resource Guide (Georgia Department of Education, Atlanta).

Hawaii

Content Area Instructional Strategies for Students of Limited English Proficiency in Secondary Schools: A Sheltered Approach (Office of Instructional Services/General Education Branch, Department of Education, Hawaii, 1991).

Hawaii Bilingual/Bicultural Education Project Materials.

Title VII Instructional Materials for Assisting Students with Limited English Proficiency (Hawaii Education Projects).

Idaho

A Handbook for Classroom Teachers of Limited English Proficient Students (Department of Education, State of Idaho, Boise, Idaho, 1988).

Illinois

Scope and Sequence for High School English as a Second Language Instruction, Chicago Public Schools (Board of Education,e City of Chicago, 1992).

Basic Guidelines for the Selection of Second Language Curriculum Materials, Chicago Public Schools (Board of Education, City of Chicago).

Implementation Handbook: Bilingual Education Programs in the Elementary Schools, Chicago Public Schools (Board of Education, City of Chicago, 1991).

Implementation Handbook: Bilingual Education Programs in the Secondary Schools, Chicago Public Schools (Board of Education, City of Chicago, 1991).

Indiana

None.

Iowa

None.

Kansas

Bilingual Funding Guidelines (Bilingual/ESL, Program Support Services, Kansas State Board of Education, Topeka, Kansas, 1993).

Kentucky

None.

Louisiana

English Language Arts Curriculum Guide for Limited English Proficient Students Grades K-12 (State of Louisiana Department of Education, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, 1987, revised 1991).

NEWS from the Bilingual Education ESOL Section of the Louisiana Department of Education Newsletter (Bilingual Education/ESOL Section, Louisiana Department of Education, Baton Rouge, Lousiana, Winter 1993).

1991 Textbook Adoption (ESL) (Louisiana Department of Education).

Maine

Practical Practices for ESL Teachers (Maine Department of Education, Division of Curriculum, Federal Projects for Language Minorities, 1991).

Book of Solutions: Frequent Questions on Concepts, Issues and Strategies for the Education of Language Minority Children (Maine Department of Education, Division of Curriculum, Federal Projects for Language Minorities, 1990).

Maine's Common Core of Learning: An Investment in Maine's Future (Commission on Maine's Common Core of Learning, Maine 1990).

Maryland

ESOL Bilingual Education Programs: Instructional Handbook (Maryland State Department of Education, Baltimore).

Massachusetts

None.

Michigan

What Research Says to the Classroom Teacher About Reading for the Second Language Learner (Michigan Reading Association, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1985).

Minnesota

None.

Mississippi

None.

Missouri

Collins, Carolyn, *The Second Language Learner: Strategies for Classroom Teachers* (Missouri Department of Elementary & Secondary Education, 1990).

Montana

Accreditation Guidelines.

Montana's Culturally Diverse Students.

Nebraska

None.

Nevada

Elementary Textbook Adoptions 1992-1996 (Nevada Department of Education).

Secondary Textbook Adoptions 1991-1995 (Nevada Department of Education),

New Hampshire

Standards Series for Appropriate and Effective Educational Programs for Limited English Students, Module 2: Curriculum Guide (New Hampshire State Department of Education, Concord, New Hampshire).

New Jersey

None.

New Mexico

New Mexico Competency Frameworks (New Mexico State Department of Education, Learning Services Division, School Program and Professional Development Unit, 1992).

State Department of Education Instructional Materials: Publisher List (New Mexico State Department of Education, 1990).

New York

The New York State Core Curriculum for English as a Second Language in the Secondary Schools (University of the State of New York, State Education Department, Bureau of Bilingual Education, Albany, New York, 1983).

Guidelines for Programs under Part 154 of Commissioner's Regulations for Pupils with Limited English Proficiency: Bilingual Education, English as a Second Language (University of the State of New York, State Department of Education, Division of Bilingual Education, Albany, New York, 1991).

North Carolina

English as a Second Language Curriculum Handbook K-6, 7-12 (Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools, Charlotte, North Carolina, 1983).

Here They Are . . . What Do We Do? An Orientation Handbook for Immigrant Children (Second Language Studies, Department of Public Instruction and Carolina TESOL, Raleigh, North Carolina, 1991).

North Dakota

None.

Ohio

Publications on selecting instructional materials, setting up a program, and strategies for developing programs for language minority students.

Oklahoma

Adoption list.

Handbook for serving LEP students.

Oregon

None.

Pennsylvania

Guidelines for setting up ESL programs.

Rhode Island

None.

South Carolina

None.

South Dakota

None.

Tennessee

Language Arts Curriculum Framework: English as a Second Language Grades K-12 (State Of Tennessee Board of Education).

Texas

Essential Elements: Primary Language for Bilingual Education and English as a Second Language Pre K -12.

State Adopted Materials for Bilingual Education and English as a Second Language Programs. Pre-K–12, 1993.

Utah

List of Official School Textbooks (adoptions).

Vermont

Currently working on a handbook for ESL teachers.

Virginia

English as a Second Language: Handbook for Teachers and Administrators (Virginia Department of Education, Foreign Languages and ESL, Richmond, Virginia, 1992).

Clarification of Legal Responsibilities for Limited English Proficient (LEP) Students (Virginia Department of Education, Richmond, Virginia, 1992).

Washington

Classroom Materials; ESL Instructional Materials; Materials for Content Area Instruction in the ESL Classroom; ESL Technology Assisted Instructional Materials.

Guidelines for implementation of ESL/bilingual programs.

West Virginia

None.

Wisconsin

None.

Wyoming

None.