

The Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students, v13 p. 37-57, Spring 1994.

A STUDY CONCERNING INSTRUCTION OF ESL STUDENTS COMPARING ALL-ENGLISH CLASSROOM TEACHER KNOWLEDGE AND ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE TEACHER KNOWLEDGE

Rebecca Constantino

Note: This information was originally published and provided by The Bilingual Education Teacher Preparation Program at Boise State University. Every attempt has been made to maintain the integrity of the printed text.

With immigrant populations relocating to all areas of the United States, the nation's public schools are becoming linguistically and culturally diverse. As the twentieth century approaches its final year, it is increasingly evident that non English background or limited English proficient (LEP) students are in all-English or regular classrooms in unprecedented numbers. Yet, the teachers who work in all-English classrooms, most of whom received their training under the assumption that their students would be native speakers of English, continue to be underprepared and sometimes resentful and even fearful of LEP students (Penfield, 1987). This is particularly true at the secondary level where teachers think of themselves primarily as content area teachers and not as language specialists. Nationwide, secondary teachers have been aware for more than a decade that the numbers of LEP students in their classrooms were bound to increase in the coming years (Waggoner & O'Malley, 1985). However, a nationwide movement to prepare secondary teachers for the changing student population has been slow to materialize.

Teacher education programs in secondary education have been slow to change the way in which they prepare teachers for three major reasons. First, since secondary education majors are expected to have considerable content area knowledge, the lion's share of their coursework is taken outside the College of Education where there is considerably more attention paid to content and less attention paid to learners. Moreover, there is a strong push nationally to reduce the number of education courses in favor of increased coursework in liberal studies and subject matter content (Holmes Group, 1986; Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, 1986). Second, and perhaps more importantly, there is virtually no research base for organizing coursework in teacher education specifically designed to prepare secondary education teachers to teach in classrooms containing LEP students (Goodlad, 1990). For example, little is known about the kinds of knowledge and abilities all-English secondary teachers use to teach in mixed language classrooms. In other words, what do these teachers already know about teaching LEP students?

A third major reason that secondary teacher education programs have been slow to incorporate ways to teach LEP students in the all-English classroom relates to the perception that teaching English as a second language (ESL) belongs to ESL teachers (Penfield, 1987). Many secondary teachers believe that ESL teachers are solely responsible for teaching English to LEP students, and that LEP students should not be allowed into all-English classrooms until they are fully English proficient. Underlying this is the belief that ESL teachers are capable of preparing ESL students for the all-English classroom in a relatively short period of time. However, little is known about the kinds of knowledge and abilities that ESL secondary teachers have and whether they differ substantially from the knowledge and abilities possessed by all-English classroom teachers. This information is also crucial for determining the extent and nature of coursework to prepare all English teachers for working with LEP students in their classrooms. In other words, what can all-English teachers learn from ESL teachers' knowledge and experience base about teaching LEP students?

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

This study addresses the second and third reasons why secondary teacher education programs have been slow to prepare teachers for teaching LEP students and the lack of information concerning what secondary teachers need to know and do in their classrooms to more effectively include LEP students. The study assesses two research questions:

1. What kinds of knowledge do all-English secondary teachers have about the following areas of concern: (a) second language acquisition and pedagogical adjustments to facilitate it; (b) the integration of language and content instruction so that as students learn content, they acquire language as well; and (c) involving ESL parents in the schooling process, both at home and at school?
2. How and to what extent does the above knowledge about language acquisition, pedagogical adjustment, the integration of language and content, and parental involvement differ from the knowledge that experienced ESL teachers have in the same areas of concern?

Answers to these research questions will provide much needed information that can be helpful for teacher education. Moreover, the information provided by this study can serve as a rationale for improving secondary methods courses by including ways of teaching LEP students in secondary content areas.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Secondary teachers need an understanding of how language is acquired in the context of classroom instruction and interaction. Penfield (1987) has reported that regular classroom teachers have little understanding of how language is acquired in a mixed language setting. Several teachers expressed concern that placing ESL students in an all-English classroom would be detrimental to the native English speaking students because they would have to slow down to work with the ESL students. Accordingly, Penfield (1987) also found that in classrooms where LEP students were present, the teachers often segregated and isolated LEP students from the very source of academic learning and second language acquisition that could be beneficial to them.

Faltis and Merino (1992) studied what exemplary teachers in bilingual and multicultural classrooms did to accommodate LEP students' academic and language learning needs. They found that effective teachers who work in linguistically diverse classrooms are "skilled in the integration of students' work at mixed levels of linguistic and conceptual complexity" (p. 3). They also reported that exemplary teachers in these two settings tended to adjust their speech and to provide various kinds of extralinguistic support in the lesson.

Another important issue in schooling is the relationship between parents and schools. Parental involvement in academically-related activities at home and in school is positively related to school achievement (Epstein, 1990). Cummins (1986) points out that the extent to which teachers facilitate minority community participation in matters of schooling contributes to the empowerment of minority students in general. Penfield (1987) found that all-English teachers hold strong negative stereotypes concerning language minority parents and families. The teachers typically expressed the view that Hispanic parents don't care about schooling or education in general. More telling, however, is that many of the teachers she interviewed admitted to little or no knowledge or contact with non English speaking minority families. Consequently, it appears that all-English classroom teachers need a better understanding of how to more effectively involve language minority students in the schooling process.

METHODOLOGY

This study was conducted by interviewing five experienced (at least three years) ESL instructors and six regular classroom teachers. Initially the teachers to be involved in the study were to be selected and contacted by school principals. Few teachers contacted by the school principal showed an interest in being interviewed for the study. An employee of the school district was then contacted. The employee provided names of teachers who might be interested in being interviewed. Those who agreed to be interviewed met

the original criteria.

With a total of eleven questions, the study had two questions regarding language acquisition, three dealing with pedagogical adaptations, two involving integrating language and content, and three concerning minority parental involvement. The interview, which was one on one, took approximately twenty minutes. The data were collected through extensive note taking. Then, the interviewer used the ethnographic interview technique devised by Spradley (1979) which begins with an overview question and then uses follow-up questions to learn details and specific information. The researcher wrote the responses and looked for major clusters of responses for each question across groups. The generalities between the two groups were then compared.

The all-English classroom teachers gave three explanations concerning how language is acquired. The three explanations drawn from the data were interpreted into mutually exclusive existing theories of language acquisition, namely behaviorist, receptive, and output/production oriented (Ellis, 1990).

ALL-ENGLISH CLASSROOM TEACHERS

The school district involved in the study is in a relatively small western town with approximately 250,000 people. Of the 16,000 secondary students, 500 are nonnative English speakers. The district also has approximately 13,000 elementary ESL students. The all-English classroom teachers had teaching experience ranging from seven to thirty one years with an average of eighteen years. Content area subjects included Social Studies, English, Home Economics, History, and Child Development. Two teachers had Master's degrees in education or a specific subject matter. With a variety of language groups (Spanish, Tagalog, Vietnamese, Chinese, Japanese, Samoan, and Thai) in the classrooms, each instructor had at least seven years' experience having non-English speaking students in the classroom.

ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE TEACHERS

Five ESL teachers were interviewed. Ranging in experience from three to twenty years, they had an average of fifteen years' teaching experience. Credentials ranged from a Master's in Linguistics to a Bachelor's degree in education with an ESL endorsement (12 credits in Methods, Second Language Acquisition Theory, ESL Curriculum, and Materials and Assessment). Four of the five ESL teachers had taught in other subject areas prior to their ESL teaching experience. All had completed the ESL endorsement which entailed the successful completion at least twelve credits in the areas specified above. Two are currently working on a Master's of Teaching English as a Second Language. All taught English in content area classes such as math, history, or home economics. Four of the ESL instructors have experience studying a foreign language. One is proficient in sign language, and three are at least bilingual in Spanish and English. As with the all-English classroom teachers, the ESL instructors have a variety of language backgrounds in their classrooms-Spanish, Vietnamese, Chinese, Korean, and Hindi.

RESULTS

Teacher Knowledge Concerning Language Acquisition

All-English classroom teachers: How do you think language is acquired?

Behaviorist. Two of the teachers felt that language acquisition is a matter of habit formation and imitation. These processes, habit formation and imitation, are integral in the behaviorist model of second language acquisition most typically found in the audiolingual method (Richards & Rogers, 1986). One teacher felt that language acquisition was a result of imitating parents in the home environment and expressed the opinion that the parents should "take every effort to speak the society language at home." Another instructor said language is acquired in the classroom "through a lot of listening and habit formation."

Reception Oriented. Two teachers stressed the importance of the learner having an exposure to a rich environment to acquire language. "Study helps, but you need frequent contact with native speakers," and "being constantly exposed to the language motivates students to need and want to study and communicate," are statements emphasizing the importance of exposure for language learners. With little emphasis placed on learners' speech, these statements fit into a reception based model which relies heavily on the students receiving an extensive amount of "language which the learner hears or receives" (Richards, Platt, & Weber, 1985, p.143). Included in the receptive model is the frequency hypothesis which states that "learners acquire linguistic features according to their frequency in the input" (Ellis, 1990, p. 95).

Productive/Output. With a dependence on the opportunity to talk and negotiate meaning, an Output/Production orientation sees input alone as insufficient for language acquisition and asserts the importance of learner production to "develop the necessary grammatical resources" (Swain, 1985, p. 248). Two teachers interviewed appeared to support this hypothesis. With a strong belief in the use of language, the teachers felt that students need "to use language, not just talking but use." One said, "school helps at the beginning levels, but the student needs to really talk and have something to say."

English as a Second Language Teachers: How do you think language is acquired?

With the exception of one instructor who followed a behaviorist/audiolingual model of learning, the ESL teachers held common views on how a second language is acquired adhering to the notion of stimulus response, one instructor emphasized "giving them sounds and they put correct sounds together." Following Richards and Rogers' (1985) description of the audiolingual method with a presentation of the language in the order of listening, speaking, reading and writing, this instructor sees language as "a progression." Supporting the Input Hypothesis, made popular by Krashen, which states that "language is acquired by understanding input that is a little beyond the current level of competence" (Krashen & Terrell, 1983, p. 32) and Swain's Output Hypothesis (1985), the other teachers placed heavy emphasis on the two-way exchange of meaningful language which is comprehensible. Long (1983) extended this further saying that a second language learner needs more than comprehensible input but also an opportunity to negotiate meaning in an "information gap" in "two-way exchange" activities. One instructor stated, "through two-way interaction the student can use it to communicate-language is a give and take." Seeing the importance of the language environment surrounding the students one instructor said, "students need to use language in a variety of experiences and learn to look at language in many ways for communication." Along those same lines, one teacher asserted that, "students need opportunities to use language naturally, and this motivated them to want to communicate with others."

All English Teachers: Facility of second language acquisition-whose responsibility?

The participants were also questioned as to (a) whether they thought their classrooms facilitated language development and (b) whether language development was their responsibility. With the exception of one instructor, the all-English classroom teachers felt that English language acquisition was not facilitated in their classrooms because, primarily, they were teaching content not language; therefore, language was not developed: "I'm teaching the content, not language." Another teacher added, "I'm not sure any regular classroom can do that; the students need a different environment for that." And another contributed, "It's difficult enough to teach content to these kids, let alone language." Also with one exception, the instructors felt that language development was not their responsibility, but rather that of the school community or district. One teacher asserted, "language is the responsibility of the school culture. The students need to know the language of the dominant culture; they need to assimilate, and that's the job of the school and district." Believing that language growth is his responsibility, the one dissenting teacher, an English instructor, felt that language is the key to understanding the content, so the students' language development is dependent upon "good instruction." He did not elaborate on what "good instruction" entails in a mixed-language classroom.

ESL Teachers: Facility of second language acquisition--whose responsibility?

A significant aspect of Krashen's (1985) Input Hypothesis and the Natural Method (Richards & Rogers, 1985) is the notion of the affective filter. When the learner is unmotivated, anxious, or lacking self-confidence, the affective filter, a mental block that "prevents acquirers from fully utilizing the comprehensible input they receive for language acquisition" (Krashen, 1985, p.3), goes up. Clearly, though not explicitly stating it, the ESL instructors felt their classrooms facilitated language development because the affective filter is lower in their teaching environment. "My classroom is a place where they feel comfortable and they have a friendly environment." Complementing this, one teacher stated, "the students feel comfortable because we are friends, and we discuss topics which are close to their emotions, and once you get the emotions going, the heart is engaged, and they can't help but learn."

Enright and McCloskey (1988) emphasize the importance of a "think language" environment in which the student is saturated with language. With language being presented in different forms, this includes labeling pictures, hanging signs, putting up written letters, and using music. Also, under this practice, the lessons are relevant, tie in and back to previous knowledge, and are useful. Two of the ESL teachers appear to use "think language" when they plan and implement their lessons. "I surround my students with language. Everything on the board is labeled, and we have a lot of reading materials. Also, we use tapes and videos that interest the kids." Another teacher conveyed that her classroom facilitates language because "I saturate them with language. We use everything we can think of."

COMPARISON OF THE TWO GROUPS OF TEACHERS

The differences between the two groups are both quantitative and qualitative. With the exception of one teacher, the ESL teachers produced more and longer responses about second language acquisition than the all-English classroom teachers. The ESL teachers, for the most part, held similar beliefs as to how second language is acquired (negotiated output). The all-English classroom teachers, on the other hand, had little to say about the nature of language acquisition, and they had a wide range of explanations. There is clearly a difference in the all-English classroom teachers' responses. Some of the teachers were "intuiting" the Natural Method (Krashen & Terrel, 1984) and in turn, providing Comprehensible Input (Krashen, 1985) which automatically contains $i+1$ (Input Hypothesis). Also, some of the teachers, including the ESL teachers, had a reductionist view of language, for example, using techniques found in the Audiolingual Method (Richards & Rogers, 1988).

Krashen (1982) asserts that all teachers draw from their personal learning theories, and this theory is carried over into pedagogical practices in the classroom.

The next section will consider to what extent the two groups of teachers adjust their language and instruction and to what extent these adjustments reflect their personal theory of language acquisition.

TEACHER KNOWLEDGE CONCERNING INSTRUCTIONAL ADAPTATIONS

All-English Classroom Teachers: Adapting Teacher Talk

This section was driven by the following two questions: (a) "What kinds of adaptations or adjustments do you make during whole class instruction to make sure ESL students understand and participate in the lesson?" and (b) "Are there certain points in the lesson that you feel are more critical for these adaptations? If so, what are they?"

Enright and McCloskey state (1988), "it's not just what you say but how you say it that makes the difference in turning your regular speech into real input" (p. 134). How one turns input into meaningful input involves four types of adaptations: nonverbal, paraverbal, discourse, and contextual (Enright & McCloskey, 1988). Concerning adaptations of talk, five of the six all-English classroom teachers indicated that they made none

of the four types of instructional adaptations. Rather, they "shoot for the middle." Said one instructor, "I have no time to make adjustments. I do nothing special for the ESL kids. They are getting the same diploma as all the rest. They'll have to cut it." Added one instructor, "They have a difficult time understanding me, but I don't treat them any differently. Frankly, I have a hard time passing them." These instructors saw no particular point in the lesson where adaptations are crucial for LEP students. One teacher explained, "There's no particular point. I'm teaching them content so they need to understand it all." One instructor does make adaptations, mainly by "speaking at a slower rate." Finding the regular classroom tasks too difficult for LEP students, one teacher modified assignments and tasks because she found the "LEP students just can't do a lot."

English as a Second Language Teachers: Adapting Teacher Talk

The ESL teachers were asked the same questions. Three of the five ESL teachers adapt talk by either speaking slowly, modeling, or asking many yes/no and comprehension check questions. The other two said they do not adapt talk. One teacher even remarked that she does not adapt talk "because math concepts are not language dependent but rather understanding dependent."

All-English Classroom Teachers: Social and Physical Adaptations

In this section, the following questions were asked: "Are there social and physical arrangements in your classroom that you feel are beneficial to second language learners? If so, what are they?" Hudelson (1989) posits that by interacting with others to carry out activities, students learn both content and language. Accordingly, success for students in culturally diverse classrooms depends on the degree to which there are "strategies that encourage all students to talk and work together" (Devillar & Faltis, 1991, p. 10). Carrying this further, Vygotsky (1978) posited a social learning theory which involved social interaction with a more capable peer. Within both groups of teachers, there was no consensus or consistency concerning social and physical arrangement of students.

Three of the six all-English classroom teachers placed their students in groups. One did not adapt the groupings for LEP students but rather followed practices for general heterogeneous classroom groupings: "I don't make any special social or physical arrangements for my ESL students, but I do a lot of group work anyway. I just want them to know I'm close by." Another teacher grouped her students by language groups, separating the LEP students from native speakers: "I put my LEP students with non-LEP students and found there was too much animosity, so I keep all the LEP students together. I do try, if possible, to put a more advanced language speaker with a lower level speaker, though this is not always possible." The third teacher used groups if he found the students were "having trouble." The remaining three instructors did not use group work but, rather, after whole group instruction tried to work with the students one on one. Said one teacher, "I don't have the chance or time to put them in groups, so I tell the students to write down what they don't understand, and I will work with them one on one after class."

English as a Second Language Teachers: Social and Physical Adaptations

Of the five ESL instructors only one does not group her students, explaining that, "There are too many language levels. It would be impossible to have groups." Among the other four, there was no system of grouping. One grouped them "according to birthdays or interests" while another grouped them within terms of who would "tolerate" whom, and yet another grouped them according to numbered sequences.

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE TWO GROUPS OF TEACHERS

Comparing the two groups of teachers shows there is no clear difference in the practices of grouping or pairing the students in social or physical arrangements to ensure equal opportunity for LEP students in the schooling process. Two of the all English classroom teachers do use extensive group work; however, this group work is not equitable for LEP students in that it is not based on an understanding of social

arrangements that encourage language acquisition. Though this grouping is not conducive to the ESL students' complete participation, it is a step in that the teachers are encouraging ESL students to participate in the lessons.

TEACHER KNOWLEDGE CONCERNING INTEGRATING LANGUAGE AND CONTENT

To truly participate in the schooling process students must be able to take part in content area instructional activities. Many contend that to participate in the lesson the student must understand all the language. Others see content as a "vehicle for language development" (Hudelson, 1989, p. 149). Anticipating language difficulties, the instructor provides necessary support and scaffolds to include LEP students in the lesson. Enright (1988) states that these scaffolds include exposure to key concepts, vocabulary, and discourse of the unit. The teacher integrates language with content in all aspects of instruction from the content of an activity to the procedural organization and the discourse (speech and print). The next section was driven by the following questions: "When you plan your lessons, do you anticipate language difficulties?" and "Do you select and organize the content around language activities? If so, how do you do this?"

All-English Classroom Teachers: Integrating Language and Content

Among the six all-English classroom teachers, two said they anticipated language difficulties for the LEP students. Unfortunately, these anticipations do not lead to additional assistance but rather, to lowered expectations of the LEP students. As one instructor said, "I plan for difficulties so I don't have to expect as much from them." Another teacher said, "I scale down the material." This practice was found to be prominent by Chamot and O'Malley (1989) who reported that quite often instructors water down content and demand fewer cognitively difficult tasks and, quite often, require only simple recall tasks. The remaining three instructors indicated that they do not anticipate language difficulties or integrate the language with content. Along the lines of previously mentioned material, the LEP students are instructed in a similar manner to the mainstream students. "I don't anticipate difficulties because I just try to treat them as part of the school community," said one teacher. Added another teacher, "I try to anticipate the content difficulties for the class as a whole, but I don't anticipate language problems because I don't see them as individuals but as a class. For me they're no different from the regular kids."

English as a Second Language Teachers: Integrating Language and Content

The English as a Second Language instructors all teach English in content areas such as math, social studies, or history. One instructor (the least experienced three years) indicates that she takes great measures to integrate the language and content by anticipating difficulties and devising scaffolds to insure comprehension. She said, "my goal is to teach them content, and this can only be done by carefully analyzing the lesson plan in advance for the necessary items they will need." The remaining four say they pick out key vocabulary items and present them before the instruction of the content.

Comparison Between the Two Groups of Teachers

Clearly, for instruction of the LEP students to be successful, the students must be able to understand, take part in, and contribute to the content area instruction. While two of the all-English classroom instructors said that they anticipate language difficulties, their anticipation does not lead to additional assistance to assure participation and understanding on the part of the LEP students. Rather this anticipation results in lowered expectations of these students' capabilities. The remaining all-English classroom instructors see the LEP students as "members of a whole class" and therefore do not attempt to plan in advance for language difficulties. With the one deviating practice, the English as a Second Language instructors anticipate difficulties only in terms of vocabulary items. The two groups are deficient in combining language with content. By providing additional contextual support such as demonstrations, hands-on experiences, and visuals, instructors can make challenging content comprehensible. As Johnson (1983) asserts, the teacher is integral in creating and controlling a social climate and classroom organization that changes classroom

dynamics, so they encourage full participation and language development.

COMPARING LANGUAGE ACQUISITION THEORY WITH CLASSROOM PRACTICES

The all-English classroom teachers had no unanimity in theories of language acquisition yet were fairly harmonious in their instructional practices concerning LEP students.

The English as Second Language instructors held relatively common views (with the exception of one) concerning the acquisition and development of language. Adhering to the Negotiated Input and Output theories of language development, they see comprehensible input and the opportunity for authentic communication as the integral aspects for language acquisition. In this belief system, content must be made meaningful with plenty of opportunity for negotiated exchanges. However, what ESL instructors said they did in their classrooms seems to be at odds with this belief system. With the exception of one, they provided no evidence that they make adequate adjustment in discourse or in the social and physical arrangements of the classroom. Moreover, when planning the lessons, they made no changes in the content organization to facilitate exchanges, yet they believe exchanges are the way to facilitate language.

ESL PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT

It would be difficult to dispute the value of parental involvement in the schooling system, and this carries over to ESL parents. The instructors were questioned concerning methods used to involve ESL parents in the educational system. Torres Guzman (1991) points out that practices used to involve middle class parents are inadequate for ESL parents because they "fail to take into account the linguistic and cultural environment of the school" (p.529). As Faltis and Merino (1991) point out, effective instruction of LEP students involves knowledge of appropriate behavior and an understanding of minority cultures. Similarly, Ovando and Collier (1985) assert that culture is more than a list of favorite foods and practices but, rather a broader understanding of cultural norms and practices. Accordingly, it is essential that teachers have a cultural understanding so they can involve parents in school practices, both at home and in school. To assess the extent to which teachers understand this group, the researcher asked questions concerning an understanding of LEP parent involvement in the educational process and where information concerning what works best for LEP parents is obtained. Four questions dealt with involving ESL parents in the schooling system: (a) "In what ways do you think ESL parents are involved in educational activities?"; (b) "Are ESL parents involved in educational activities at home?"; (c) "How do you involve ESL parents in the schooling system?"; and (d) "How do you find out what works best with ESL parents?"

All-English Classroom Teachers: ESL Parental Involvement

Of the six all-English classroom teachers interviewed, none uses instructional practices or makes adjustments to deal with the ESL parents. Three of the teachers rely solely on the ESL teacher in the school to "act as a liaison." Added another, "the ESL department gives progress reports so they keep in contact." One posited that it's the ESL department's job to involve the parents: "I don't have the time or opportunity to see them." Two other instructors said they treat the ESL parents the same as mainstream parents. Said one instructor, "I don't treat the kids any differently, so I don't treat the parents any differently; I do what I do with the regular parents." One instructor gave bonus points to the students if their parents came to Open House. The last instructor questioned said she "tries to deal with the kids directly so I don't involve any parents." Two did make comments that they are culturally sensitive to the LEP group at parent assemblies because they "have the Tongans do native dances at the meetings."

Most of the instructors do not think the ESL parents are involved in the formal education process. Without prompting from the interviewer, some gave opinions concerning different ethnic groups. Most felt the Hispanic parents were not involved for several reasons such as "trepidation and fear about the mainstream teacher," "shyness and insecurity about talking to the mainstream teacher," and "inability to speak English." Two teachers felt the Hispanic parents were not involved in their children's education at home or in school

because, "most parents have two jobs and no time to be involved." Of the Asian involvement, one teacher said, "Asians are more involved because they are more financially secure and have more time; at least they are home to receive more calls."

The instructors either don't try to find out what works with ESL parents or rely on the ESL instructors in the school as the experts. The ESL instructors are responsible for contacting the parents and giving information concerning school. Said one teacher, "the ESL teacher, because she speaks some Spanish, can and should connect with the parents. I have enough trouble getting the American parents in." Several years ago, one did attend a workshop on LEP student instruction and ESL parental involvement, but said he found the information "inadequate."

English as a Second Language Teachers: ESL Parental Involvement

All but one felt the ESL parents were not involved in the schooling process. As with the all-English classroom teachers, the ESL instructors had opinions concerning different ethnic groups and their involvement in the schooling process. Said one instructor, "The problem with the Hispanics is they're not Americanized into the community, and that's why they aren't involved." Added another, "It's the tradition in the Hispanic community that the school knows what it's doing so you leave it alone." One felt that "The Hispanics are overwhelmed with just everyday life." Seeing that the Hispanic parents have "literally abandoned their kids," one teacher saw absolutely no involvement. "The Asians know the system, make kids study, and are college bound" was another opinion.

The ESL teachers used procedures such as Open House, Parent Night, dinners, and dances. They had little response from parents: "I had Open House and out of fifty parents, two came." Said one instructor, "the Hispanics love to party so we should have parties, but the Asians are then left out." One expressed the wish to do home visits but has "absolutely no time."

ESL instructors get information for parental involvement by relying on the district ESL specialist, other ESL instructors, and conferences such as TESOL. Most see a need for more involvement but don't know how to proceed. Said one, "I want to find out, I need help." Another felt that the district emphasizes elementary parental involvement while "completely neglecting the secondary students."

One ESL instructor, following guidelines learned in a class recently taken at the Master's level, saw increasing parental involvement. She started an ESL PTA in which the parents choose topics for discussion ranging from preventing children from joining gangs to what the students need to study every night. She sends home a monthly newsletter and calendar, so her students' parents are kept abreast of the students' school activities.

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE TWO GROUPS OF TEACHERS

In comparing the two groups of teachers, one can see several similarities. Both had strong opinions concerning ethnic group involvement about at least two large groups: Hispanics and Asians. These opinions reflected a view that Hispanics were not involved and, in some cases, not interested in the education of their children. Neither group of teachers knows how to involve parents in culturally appropriate ways. Practices such as parent night and open house are inadequate in reaching ESL parents. The all-English classroom teachers quite often rely on the ESL instructors to involve the parents, and herein lies a problem because generally, the ESL teachers are using the same inappropriate knowledge base as the all English classroom teachers.

The two groups are also similar in that, with a few exceptions, they are interested in involving the parents and would like information and help. Both groups expressed frustration. Said one all-English classroom teacher, "I feel that I do my students a disservice because I can't communicate with their parents, and this I want to be able to do." An ESL teacher said, "I feel like I'm doing the job of three people. Involving the

parents would be a full time job in itself."

SUMMARY

The results of this study are meaningful in several ways. With this information, mainstream teacher educators will be better informed about the attitudes towards and instruction of LEP students in the all-English classroom and be provided with an understanding of all-English classroom teacher views concerning language acquisition and the subsequent instruction aligned with these views. Also, this study informs ESL teacher educators about the strengths and weaknesses of ESL teachers. And, the analysis shows whether the ESL instructors or experts in the field actually reflect what researchers say needs to be and should be done in assisting equal education for LEP students.

As Penfield (1987) points out, in most cases, the all-English classroom teachers have "no training in how to deal with LEP students" (p.21). She further points out that often these instructors see that they need to make changes in the instruction but do not know how to do so. The all-English classroom teachers have varied understanding of how language is acquired and developed. They do not see the all English classroom as a rich source for intellectual and language development. This lack of understanding is seen in instructional practices in the lack of adaptations and social and physical groupings. With a need for cultural understanding, the all English classroom teachers do not understand appropriate norms to include parents in the educational system.

Most of the all-English classroom teachers place a large amount of responsibility on the ESL instructor in the school. By seeing language development and parental involvement as the obligation of the ESL instructor and treating LEP students the same as regular students, the all-English classroom teachers do not grasp the importance of their role in the language, intellectual development, and eventual success of the LEP students.

Most all-English teachers don't feel they are getting adequate support from the school district. Several have requested training seminars. Contrary to the finding of Penfield (1987), most of the all-English classroom teachers in this school district were concerned and frustrated about the instruction and lack of success of the LEP students. One all-English teacher expressed her concern by saying the district "is sweeping these kids under the rug."

Seen as the experts in working with ESL students and their parents in the district, the ESL teachers have a tremendous amount of responsibility. They all seem to be genuinely concerned about the instruction and success of the LEP students. Unfortunately, they tended not to engage in practices which research shows are beneficial for LEP students. With a general understanding of language development, the ESL instructors do not seem to adequately furnish an environment conducive to language development. This environment includes adapting instructional practices and teacher talk while also providing an academic and social integration in the classroom.

The all-English classroom teachers see the task of ESL parent involvement under the auspices of the ESL teacher. For the most part, the ESL teachers used practices devised to involve mainstream middle class parents, and these practices fall short.

CONCLUSIONS

The data show clearly that all-English as well as ESL teachers interact with students and their parents in ways that Cummins (1986) refers to as disabling. For example, both types of teachers held low expectations of students, blamed the students for low academic performance, and downplayed the significance of prior language and cultural experiences in facilitating language and content learning. The philosophical and subsequent pedagogical practices of a teacher strongly influence the educational progress of a student. In the case of the language minority students, this progress is highly dependent on the inclusion of community

and cultural practices and the affirmation of a student's intellectual and linguistic talents while implementing "pedagogical approaches that succeed in liberating students from instructional dependence" (Cummins, 1986, p. 32). According to Cummins (1986), these kinds of teacher beliefs and behaviors disable language minority students in particular because they represent teacher behaviors found in ineffective schools with high dropout rates among language minority students.

This study shows that much work needs to be done in the preparation of all English and ESL teachers for working with ESL students. As Handscombe (1989) concludes, "every teacher is an English-as-a-second-language teacher, whether assigned that function or not" (p.12). Regardless of their area of expertise, the teachers in this study were not good teachers of ESL students. Clearly, it is imperative that teachers receive extensive preparation during their teacher education program in ways to teach effectively in a multilingual classroom, so that ESL students can participate in all aspects of classroom learning.

REFERENCES

Chamot, A.U., & O'Malley (1989). *The Cognitive Academic Language Approach*. In P. Rigg & V. Allen (eds.), *When They Don't All Speak English: Integrating the ESL Student into the Regular Classroom* (pp. 108-125). Urbana IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Cummins, J. (1986). Empowering minority students: A framework for intervention. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56(1), 18-36.

Devillar, R., & Faltis, C. (1991). *Computers and cultural diversity: Restructuring for school success*. NY: State University of New York Press.

Ellis, R. (1990). *Instructed language acquisition*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Enright, D.S. (1986). Use everything you have to teach English: Providing useful input to young language learners. In P. Rigg & D.S. Enright (eds.) *Children and ESL: Integrating Perspectives* (pp. 115-62). Washington, DC: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.

Enright, S., & McCloskey, M.L. (1988). *Integrating English: Developing English language and literacy in the multilingual classroom*. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.

Epstein, J. (1991). Paths to partnerships: What can we learn from federal, state, district, and school initiatives? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 72(5), 34-349.

Faltis, C., & Merino, B. (1992). Toward a definition of exemplary teachers in bilingual and multicultural settings. In R.V. Padilla and A. Benavides (eds.) *Critical perspectives on bilingual education research* (pp. 277-302). Tempe, AZ: Bilingual Review Press.

Goodlad, J. (1990). *Teachers for our nation's schools*. Oxford: Jossey-Bass.

Handscombe, J. (1989). A quality program for learners of English as a second language. In P. Rigg & V. Allen (eds.), *When they don't all speak English: Integrating the ESL student into the regular classroom* (p. 1-14). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Holmes Group. (1986). *Tomorrow's teachers: A report of the Holmes Group*. East Lansing, MI: Holmes Group.

Hudelson, S. (1989). "Teaching" English through content-area activities. In P. Rigg & V. Allen (eds.) *When they don't all speak English: Integrating the ESL student into the regular classroom*. (pp.139-152). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Johnson, D.M. (1983). National language learning by design: A classroom experiment in social interaction and second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17(1): 55-68.

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practices in second language acquisition research*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Long, M. (1987). Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation in the second language classroom. In M. Long & J. Richards (eds.) *Methodology in TESOL* (pp. 339-354). NY: Harper and Row.

Penfield, J. (1987). ESL: The regular classroom teacher perspective. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21(1): 21-38.

Ovando, C.J., & Collier, V. (1985). Language. In C.J. Ovando & V. Collier (eds.) *Bilingual and ESL classrooms: Teaching in multicultural contexts*. (p.57-100). NY: McGraw Hill.

Richards, J., Platt, J., & Weber, H. (1985). *Longman dictionary of applied linguistics*. London: Longman.

Richards, J., & Rogers, T. (1988). *Approaches and methods in language teaching: A description and analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Spradley, R. (1979). *The ethnographic interview*. New York: Rinehart and Winston.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass and C. Madden (eds.), *Input in second language acquisition*, Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Task Force in Teaching as a Profession. (1986). *A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century*. NY: Carnegie Forum in Education and the Economy.

Torres-Guzman, M. (1991). Recasting frames: Latino parental involvement. In M. McGroarty & C.J. Faltis (eds.) *Language in school and society: Policy and pedagogy*. NY: Mouton de Gruyter.

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

Waggoner, D., & O'Malley, J.M. (1985). Teachers of limited English proficient children in the United States. *NABE Journal*, 9(3), 25-42.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Rebecca Constantino, PhD, is the coordinator of the SPOuse English Language Program, Office of International Students and Scholars at the University of Southern California at Los Angeles, California.

[Return to JEILMS v.13 Table of Contents](#)

The HTML version of this document was prepared by NCBE and posted to the web with the permission of the author/publisher.

[go to HOME PAGE](#)

www.ncela.gwu.edu