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Welcome to the first issue of Texas English Language Teaching (TexELT)[reprinted]

Several factors compelled me to ask the Board of TexTESOL V to give their blessing to this enterprise. As a college professor engaged in preparing bilingual and ESL teachers over many years, I have encountered difficulties in providing useful readings for my students that would encourage them to do action research in their classrooms and then offer the results in a public forum for others to learn from. Also, as a professor with the obligation to produce research worthy of publication, I found the competitive challenge of seeking to share my voice in major journals often was not compatible with modest research efforts. Only the few and the famous seemed to regularly secure a place at those tables. In addition, publications that welcomed practical applications of research to teaching were often print-only venues with limited dissemination. These venues did not permit access to the work without purchase, fees, or memberships that were typically too costly for students, teachers, or faculty with an interest in a particular article who lacked the funds required for access.

The solution, to my mind, was to provide a legitimately peer-reviewed publication, available only online and without fees or membership requirements. This would assist college professors seeking to present more practical applications of research than what is frequently selected by major professional journals that are published in print and thus incur costs for editing and publication. It would allow these professors to submit well-edited manuscripts to a jury of peers representative of the profession—other university and community college professors, classroom teachers, and graduate students. In turn, this online journal, given the limited time and resources of the peer reviewers and editors, none of whom receive released time or payment for their services, would accept only a few articles for publication each year. For non-selected work, the authors would be given encouragement and suggestions for further developing their articles for consideration in other publications or in a subsequent issue of TexELT.

In addition to our Publications Copy Coordinator, Jey Venkatesan, three other current or former TexTESOL V Board members volunteered to support and assist me in this effort as reviewers. As we worked together to review the manuscripts submitted, it became clear that one particular reviewer, Margaret Redus, had the skills, the time, and the willingness to make an extraordinary contribution as a Primary Composition and Style reviewer. Based on many years of teaching writing, she had the ability to guide the authors in shaping specific portions of their manuscripts so that their messages would be as clear and understandable as possible for the audience we are anticipating. For the always-important copy-editing issues such as spelling, syntax, redundancy, and word choice, we were fortunate to be able to call on an expert who is serving on the TexTESOL V Board as our Publications Copy Coordinator. What allowed me to bring these talented individuals together to produce a valuable contribution to our profession is probably just the good fortune of finding in my professional organization incredibly talented and dedicated teachers and scholars who are willing to let me ask much of them in the name of our readers and their students.

--Rita Deyoe-Chiullan, Ph. D., Publications Coordinator TexTESOL V and Editor, TexELT, 1(1)
Welcome to the second issue of Texas English Language Teaching (TexELT)

Last year, TexELT’s debut presented three full-length articles by experienced academic writers who are all university faculty members in the United States and Canada. This year’s six contributions include three full-length articles and three shorter papers. The six authors are far more diverse, as the reader will see when reading their biographies. More than half of this year’s writers have been and continue to be English language learners themselves; part of a generation of thriving professionals, some of whom came to study and have (thus far) stayed on to become part of this country’s academic landscape. One has become an established academic contributor to noted journals over the past few years, during which time she has been a faculty member in universities in very different parts of the USA. One just completed her doctoral degree this year. Three are doctoral candidates who are working on their dissertations and one is a master’s degree student. All are experienced educators. The reviewers and editors regard this year’s writers as a microcosm of emerging academic scholars, who bring to their articles a rich texture of experiences from teaching, living, and studying in EFL and ESL contexts. We are pleased to have had the opportunity to help them grow their work and polish their skills. This is truly a 21st Century issue and it treats diverse issues with fresh and, at times, startling information about our profession and how it is practiced and perceived by students, parents, and others.

In addition to our Publications Copy Coordinator, Jey Venkatesan, three other current or former TexTESOL V Board members volunteered to continue supporting and assisting me in this effort as reviewers. Due to an extraordinary challenging over-commitment on my part to teaching face-to-face for one university and teaching online for another college, along with some health issues in the summer, our wonderfully talented and hard-working content reviewer, Margaret Redus, had to make an even greater contribution this year as our primary content reviewer and as the primary content editor. She persevered to guide the authors in shaping their manuscripts so that their messages would be clear and understandable. For the always-important copy-editing issues such as spelling, syntax, redundancy, and word choice, we were fortunate to again be able to call on an expert who serves on the TexTESOL V Board as our Publications Copy Coordinator. What allowed me to bring these talented individuals together to produce a valuable contribution to our profession was the good fortune of finding in my professional organization incredibly talented and dedicated teachers and scholars who are willing to let me ask much of them in the name of our readers and their students.

--Rita Deyoe-Chiullan, Ph. D., Publications Coordinator TexTESOL V and Editor, TexELT, 2(1).
Introduction to the contents of this issue

We begin our 2013 volume with an article that offers an example of a timely need for improvement in educational practice. Dr. Lauren Gonzalez reports on research she conducted on a home-school literacy practice involving leveled English readers for kindergarten students and their parents. This work yielded a rare, personal glimpse into the way the parents experienced the schools’ attempts to enrich the literacy of their children. Parental responses clustered into four themes and specific responses are shown to illuminate each. The author closes with implications for expanding cultural awareness within the school environment and improving the effectiveness of home-school literacy programs.

The world of education increasingly employs the use of technology, and innovating with instructional methods is a way to keep pace with this trend. In her article, Nhung Pham writes for those who have never experienced this kind of instruction themselves. She tells of her own first experience developing and conducting an online course, which was an English writing course offered through Vietnam’s Ministry of Education and Training (MoET) to strengthen the English writing skills of EFL teachers throughout Vietnam. As she progresses through her experiences in the article, the author offers readers advice and encouragement based on her own positive experience.

Innovation in terms of a curricular approach to meet the context of a specific population of EAP writing students is covered in depth in Maria Ananyeva’s article. She addresses the gap in curriculum between courses in multilingual (EAP-English for Academic Purposes) writing and those in mainstream composition. After reviewing the literature of current pedagogy in both fields, she advocates that for EAP writing at an advanced level, instructors should step back from the traditional skills-based rhetorical approach and embrace topical writing more aligned with that of the academic work of the university. Then the author offers, as an example, a course she has developed and tested over three years.

As more educational programs consider participating in immersion education, decision-makers and stakeholders need access to current information from the field. Jaime Haile reports on the recently published book titled Immersion Education: Practices, Policies, and Possibilities, an edited compilation of articles by researcher/practitioners in the field. Our author discusses the need for this volume, mentions its intended audience, and then briefly discusses the focus of the main sections. Finally, she brings the relevance of the field of immersion education to life by giving personal examples of her own experiences.
It is always important to improve the overall effectiveness and appropriateness of what we do by considering the context. **Dr. Bogum Yoon** discusses key concepts of sociocultural theory that mainstream instructors working with ELLs are unlikely to have encountered in their academic training. As these instructors work with ELLs within mainstream classrooms, their having an understanding of significant implications of sociocultural theory could increase their effectiveness for all students. After articulating foundational concepts, the author makes specific suggestions for their application in mainstream classrooms.

The closing article offers readers an example of how to use professional research skills to study and improve classroom practice. In his Korean teaching environment, **Tecnam Yoon** had noted that, while Gardner proposed his Multiple Intelligences theory as a means of designing learning activities to meet individual students’ needs, traditional EFL classroom practice often consigned students to a uniform set of practices. Here, he reports on his carefully designed research study, in which students in 6th grade EFL classes were queried on the ways they enjoy learning. The results of those responses were analyzed against the types of activities students were actually provided in their classrooms. This discussion of his work offers interested teachers possibilities for examining and enriching their own classroom practices.

--Margaret Redus, M. L. A., *Primary Content Reviewer and Content Editor for TexELT*, 2(1).
Mainstream “English” Literacy Practices: ESL Parents’ Perspectives *

by

Lauren González, Ed.D.

Texas Woman’s University, University of North Texas, Denton Independent School District
Denton, Texas

Abstract

Parent involvement plays an important role in the success of children’s learning in many academic areas, and a body of research indicates a positive relationship between parent involvement and literacy achievement. Although many schools attempt to involve parents in their children’s literacy development, they rarely consider whether parents perceive these initiatives as respectful of the cultural and material demands of their lives (Dudley-Marling, 2009). The purpose of this study was to examine how ESL parents in two neighborhoods served by a Title 1, under-performing school, and a non-Title 1, high-performing school, experienced home-school literacy practices initiated by their children’s schools. Based on the analysis of data, the author concludes with implications for improving the effectiveness of school-based literacy programs for the ESL parents and children that they are designed to serve.

Particularly, this study focused on the schools’ use of leveled books to involve parents in their children’s reading development. The participants included 7 ESL parents of kindergarten students living in two separate neighborhoods within the same city in the United States. Their responses offer a rare personal glimpse into parents’ experiences with their school’s approach to home-school literacy. The findings are organized into four core themes that emerged from the analysis of the interview data: (1) Language Barriers, (2) Culture, (3) Parent’s Opinion of Teacher Provided Literacy Materials, and (4) Multicultural Literature. Following a brief historical overview as it relates to these topics and based on the analysis of data, the author concludes with implications for improving the effectiveness of school-based literacy programs for the ESL parents and children that they are designed to serve.
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Introduction

In order for schools to be effective, there should be a close relationship between the school and home (David, 1993). The need for parent involvement in schools is based on the belief that parents’ interactions with their children include some degree of teaching elements and that these interactions greatly impact school readiness (Evans, Shaw, & Bell, 2000). Therefore, parent involvement plays an important role in the success of children’s learning in many academic areas, and a body of research indicates a positive relationship between parent involvement and school achievement, specifically in language arts and literacy (Crowe & Reichmuth, 2008). This notion implies that, in order for schools to have effective instructional practices for promoting emergent literacy, they must include a home-school partnership that links the school’s efforts with children’s experiences in the home and empowers parents in supporting their children’s academic development (Goldenberg, 2001). According to the research, the family literacy movement, which seeks to influence literacy beliefs and practices within families, was created due to the growing desire for parent involvement in support of children’s schooling (Dudley-Marling, 2009). Although family literacy initiatives seek to improve parent involvement, they have been criticized for not considering cultural and material needs of some families (de Carvalho, 2001). Some family literacy practices have been said to affect family relationships and threaten cultural traditions (Powell, 2004). Although many schools attempt to involve parents in their children’s literacy development, they rarely consider how parents perceive these initiatives with respect to the cultural and material demands of their lives (Dudley-Marling, 2009).

The purpose of this study was to examine how ESL parents in two neighborhoods served by a Title 1, under-performing school, and a non-Title 1, high-performing school, experience home-school literacy practices initiated by their children’s schools. Particularly, this study focused on the schools’ use of leveled books to involve parents in their children’s reading development.

Review of Literature

Historical Perspective

From the time of the first U.S. colonies and continuing through Civil War times, there was no effort to relate school and home experiences to one another (Finn, 1999). Parental involvement was described as a one-way transaction, from the school to the home (Linder & Foote, 2002). Children’s failure was mainly blamed on the parents, without holding educators or their methods responsible for poor outcomes in any way. The belief was that all children could be taught the same way. If one child was successful, then all should be able to be successful in the same way.

Beginning in the 1890s and lasting until the 1930s, the Progressive Movement greatly impacted education. It arose as a response to the vast changes brought by modernization, such as the growth of large corporations and railroads and fears of corruption in American politics (Progressivism, 2001-2005). The era was notable for a dramatic expansion in the number of schools and students served, especially in the fast-growing metropolitan cities. Finally, after 1910, smaller cities began building high schools...
(Progressivism, 2001-2005). Modernization of society, city leaders believed, necessitated the compulsory education of all children, even if the parents objected (Gamson, 2003). During this era, middle and upper class parents began to believe in the importance of education. School populations consisted mostly of white middle- and upper-class children. However, parents were still unlikely to be involved in their child’s education, leaving the job solely to the schools and educators (Gamson, 2003).

After the Civil War and until the 1970s, culture, class, and race continued to be issues affecting parental involvement in children’s academic success. Nieto (1996) stated that schools did not acknowledge diversity among children. Teaching was predominantly focused on the majority or dominant culture. Teachers claimed they were not being biased because everyone was receiving the same materials and education (Brown, 2007). Then, in its 1974 decision in Lau v. Nichols, the United States Supreme Court claimed that non-English speaking students could not understand the language in which they were being taught; therefore, they were not being provided with an equal education. The Supreme Court further said, “There is no equality of treatment merely by providing students with the same facilities, textbooks, teachers, and curriculum; for students who do not understand English are effectively foreclosed from any meaningful education” (Office for Civil Rights, 2006). The Supreme Court also clarified that equality of opportunity does not necessarily mean the same education for every student, but rather the same opportunity to receive an education, and that an equal education is only possible if students can understand the language of instruction (Office for Civil Rights, 2006). Within weeks of the Lau v. Nichols ruling, Congress passed the Equal Educational Opportunity Act (EEOA) mandating that no state shall deny equal educational opportunity to any individual "by the failure by an educational agency to take appropriate action to overcome language barriers that impede equal participation by students in an instructional program" (Office for Civil Rights, 2006). This ruling forced schools and teachers to pay attention to the diversity that existed among students. Slowly children began to be seen as individuals with different learning styles, characteristics, and abilities.

In one of the earliest research studies on the effects of culture and language on literacy, Heath (1983) investigated language differences between towns in North and South Carolina. The study found that children’s literacy development was affected by their lives and culture, and that language itself was affected by cultural patterns and socialization (Heath, 1983). The communities that Heath studied had different patterns of interaction between oral and written language due to differing cultural patterns (Heath, 1983). This helped shape the idea that the differences among children and their home environments correlate strongly with academic success.

Throughout the 1980s and 1990s, the importance of parental involvement in the child’s schooling continued to grow. In 1999, Finn claimed that educators needed to focus on “the whole child” and his or her experiences. Finn also argued that every child is different, with differing backgrounds and interests that go beyond cultural background to include family issues and socio-economic conditions. He
argued that in order to understand these issues, teachers must develop positive relationships with parents in order for children to be successful in school (Brown, 2007).

**Parent Involvement in Home Literacy Practices and Reading Development**

Parent involvement plays an important role in the success of children’s learning in many academic areas, specifically in language arts and literacy (Crowe & Reichmuth, 2008). Young children develop stronger early literacy and language skills when parents value their role in their children’s literacy and language development, regularly engage their children in literacy and language enhancing activities, organize the home to support literacy and language, are role models for literacy, and are active partners with their children’s teacher (Weigel, Martin, & Bennett, 2006). Consistent parental involvement during the child’s school career can have significant benefits, including motivation to learn and increased academic performance (Crowe & Reichmuth, 2008).

For instance, children whose parents read to them at home recognize letters of the alphabet sooner than those whose parents do not (Nord, Lennon, Liu, & Chandler, 2010). Children whose parents teach them how to write words are able to identify letters and connect them to speech sounds (Haney & Hill, 2004). Children whose mothers use complex sentences in their everyday conversations achieve high scores on literacy-related tasks in kindergarten (Tabors, Roach, & Snow, 2007). Research shows that the earlier parents become involved in their children’s literacy practices, the more profound the results and the longer lasting the effects (Mullis, Mullis, Cornille, Ritchson, & Sullender, 2004). Additionally, of all school subjects, reading has been found to be the most sensitive to parental influences (Senechal & LeFevre, 2002). Overall, “parents impact how much experience children have with reading materials, vocabulary development, reading habits, and experiences they have with school” (Goldenberg, 2001, p. 211).

According to the research, it is evident that there are many kinds of literacy practices that parents provide that can help their children have successful literacy development. However, according to the National Academy of Education, the read-aloud activity or reading aloud is the single most important activity for building the knowledge required for success in reading (Scarborough & Dobrich, 1994). According to Morrow (1997), reading aloud to children is related to reading, language and vocabulary development, knowledge of book language and story structure, and children’s book interests. However, critics state there is not always a strong correlation between the read-aloud activity and literacy development, and, in fact, it is the actual interactions that take place between the parent and child during the read-aloud and any other types of literacy activities that have impact. For example, Bus (2001) found that the key element in quality read-aloud activities is one in which the adult relates the reading experience to the child’s interests, experiences, conceptions, and knowledge.
“Although children generally come to school in possession of considerable knowledge of literacy, not all children enter school with the same knowledge of literacy, nor are all families equally rich in literacy learning opportunities, suggesting for some educators and policy makers a causal link between literacy practices in the home and reading achievement at school” (Carrington & Luke, 2003). “How family literacy educators interpret the relationship between home literacy practices and school achievement is, however, a function of the theoretical perspective they take on reading and reading development” (Dudley-Marling, p. 1716).

**Literacy In The Home And Deficit Perspectives**

Morrow (1997) found that the literacy experience a child has at home determines the success he or she will have in school literacy programs. This finding has led many educators to believe that some children fail to develop adequate literacy skills due to the lack of parent involvement in providing school-based literacy experiences in the home. Thus, children who are provided those literacy experiences in the home by the parent are more likely to develop literacy skills needed to be successful in school. Boethel (2003), for example, asserted that children whose parents are poor reading models were found to be less developed in their literacy abilities and skills.

There is substantial research indicating that the learning environment in the home greatly impacts children’s acquisition and development of literacy abilities (National Assessment of Educational Progress, 2003). Children who come from low income families tend to have less success in their literacy development compared to children who come from middle class homes due to the difference in their learning environment (Purcell & Gates, 1993). According to Goldenberg (2001), when low-income children begin school, it appears as though they have fewer literacy experiences that promote their literacy development. These children have limited experiences with literacy because they do not have access to books or other reading materials in their homes (Nueman, 1996). “Perhaps because books and other print materials are less available in their homes, on average, low income children are less likely to be read to by their parents or siblings” (Dudley-Marling, 2009, p. 1717). When reading to their children, low-income and minority parents interact differently when compared with middle-class parents and their children (Vernon-Feagans, Hammer, Micco, & Manlove, 2001). For example, parents from low-income families have been reported as being less likely to motivate their children to make text-to-text connections or to help their children focus on phonemic awareness strategies (Pelligrini, 1991).

On the other hand, middle class parents have been reported to interact with their children during reading activities in terms of asking comprehension questions and giving feedback about the text and their children’s reading abilities (Lesar, Espinosa, & Diaz, 1997). “A significant body of research indicates that both the quantity and quality of literacy interactions found in the homes of many poor and minority children do not resemble interactions around literacy found in middle-class homes or in school, to the detriment of poor and minority children” (Dudley-Marling, 2009, p. 1718). According to Lesar et al. (1997), there is a discrepancy that exists between how Hispanic parents teach their children in the home and how they are taught in the classroom. White-American parents are more likely to teach
their children in ways that resemble the classroom teaching. Therefore, low-income children receive fewer quality literacy experiences at home, putting them in danger of failing to develop the literacy skills needed to be successful when they enter school.

The deficit perspective connects failure in schools to missing literacy experiences in the home, specifically in the homes of minority and low-income children who are often unsuccessful in school (Dudley-Marling, 2009). According to Taylor (1997), low literacy skills among poor children are directly related to their parents; therefore, it is a “family problem” that must be fixed (p. xvi). Consequently, literacy interventions that teach parents specific literacy strategies to use with their children have been implemented in many schools and have been found to improve children’s success in school, although the success is in only the areas directly related to the strategies used (Purcell-Gates, 1993). “Relatively little attention, however, has been given to examining how parents experience family literacy, including the degree to which various family literacy initiatives are considerate of the cultural and material circumstances of the families to whom these programs are targeted” (Dudley-Marling, 2009, p. 1719).

**Dominant Perspectives Of Literacy**

One perspective that has taken over the family literacy movement classifies low-income and minority families as “differently literate” (Dudley-Marling, p. 1719). Yet, according to many researchers, literacy does not equal a set of independent skills that people do or do not possess (Gee, 1996). Instead, literacy involves specific uses of language, sets of values, interpretations, and interactions among different cultures (Bloome, Harris, & Ludlum, 1991). According to Ferdman (1990), literacy is the manipulating of symbols that represent values and beliefs of a culture. Therefore, one learns to read texts in ways that are appropriate to their own culture (Gee, 1996). The perception of family literacy that views low-income and minority families as lacking opportunities for literacy learning has become the normal way of thinking among many school professionals (Carrington & Luke, 2003).

However, research reveals that low-income and minority families value literacy and their children’s literacy development (Fishman, 1988). “Although Purcell-Gates reported that many of the genres that are valued by schools (poems, journals, worksheets, and textbooks) were outside the experience of many low income and ESL children when they entered school” (Dudley-Marling, p. 1720), she found many literacy genres in the homes of low-income families such as magazines, letters, comics, catalogs, and messages. Limited-English proficient parents lack critical information about their children’s education and often have no way to communicate with their children’s teacher (Yasui, Wong, & Lau, 2006).

So, it is not that low-income and minority families lack literacy experiences, but rather, that the literacy practices that take place in their homes are less valued by the school professionals. “Many middle class students don’t so much learn literacy in school as practice literacies that they come to school already knowing” (Dudley-Marling, p. 1720). The deficit way of thinking has become the guiding notion, so much so that school personnel feel the need to fix or change the way non-middle-class
families practice literacy in their homes. Instead, educators and schools must acknowledge and encourage the different literacy practices that take place among the diverse populations that they serve. The family literacy initiatives that schools use should be considerate of the social and cultural conditions of the families.

**Methodology**

To address the question of how ESL parents experience home-school literacy programs, open-ended qualitative interviews were conducted with 7 ESL parents living in two separate neighborhoods within the same city in the United States. The question protocol that guided the interviews is provided in Appendix A. The interviewees included 5 mothers and 2 fathers. The ESL parents had immigrated to the United States from Africa (n=1), Iran (n=1), Mexico (n=2), Turkey (n=1), China (n=1), and Russia (n=1). All of these parents had immigrated to the United States within the last 10 years. All of the parents had children in kindergarten in a public elementary school at the time of the interviews. Various characteristics of the interviewees are summarized in Table 1. Participant names have been replaced with numbers to uphold confidentiality. The table includes the parent’s age, gender, martial status, ethnicity, household income, education, employment, and the primary language spoken in the home at the time of the interview.

Table 1. Demographics of Interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Marital status</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Household Income</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Primary language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Black/African</td>
<td>$3500/mo.</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>White/Iranian</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Some High school</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>Persian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>White/Hispanic</td>
<td>$25,000/yr.</td>
<td>High school</td>
<td>Homemaker</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>White/Istanbul Turkish</td>
<td>$22,000/yr.</td>
<td>High school</td>
<td>Homemaker</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>White/Asian</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
<td>High school</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>White/Hispanic</td>
<td>$20-$30,000/yr.</td>
<td>Some High school</td>
<td>Wal-Mart clerk</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>White/Russian</td>
<td>$78,000/yr.</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Homemaker</td>
<td>Russian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A single interview was conducted with each of the parents, and all interviews were conducted in parents’ homes. Interviews ranged from 45 to 60 minutes in length. All interviews were conducted by this researcher. All parents interviewed lived in the two neighborhoods targeted for this study and had a child who attended either school number 1 (a Title 1, low performing school) or school number 2 (a non-Title 1, high performing school).

The teachers were provided with parent consent letters to send home with each and every kindergarten student. If a parent was identified as speaking only Spanish, a translated consent letter was sent home. Once a parent returned the consent form and agreed to participate in the study, the researcher contacted the parent by phone. The researcher explained the format of the interview process to the
parent participant, describing the purpose of the interview and survey. The parent participants were assured of the privacy and confidentiality of their responses through secured numeric coding. The researcher scheduled the interview date and time with each individual parent participant.

The interviews were conducted in the homes of the parent participants and were recorded using an I-Phone. Within twenty-four hours of each interview, the researcher transcribed the recorded interview using the program Dragon Naturally Speaking. Transcriptions were uploaded to the software program, NVivo10, which conducted a search for emerging themes among the participant responses. As the researcher read and reread the data from NVivo10, these categories emerged as themes from parents’ accounts of their response to school to home literacy practices: (1) Language Barriers, (2) Culture, (3) Parent’s Opinion of Teacher Provided Literacy Materials, and (4) Multicultural Literature. These themes are prevalent among many research studies pertaining to education and ESL parents as mentioned in the review of literature, and the researcher used them to organize, structure, and interpret the data.

Findings

The purpose of this study was to examine how ESL parents of kindergarten students in two neighborhoods served by a Title 1, under-performing school, and a non-Title 1, high-performing school, experienced home-school literacy practices initiated by their children’s schools. Particularly, this study focused on the school’s use of leveled books to involve parents in their children’s reading development.

Parents were asked about their perceptions regarding home-school literacy practices and how well these practices fit with their culture, values, and beliefs. The findings are organized into four core themes that emerged from the analysis of the interview data: (1) Language Barriers, (2) Culture, (3) Parent’s Opinion of Teacher Provided Literacy Materials, and (4) Multicultural Literature. The analysis continues with summaries of parent responses as they relate to each theme.

Language Barriers

Language barriers prevented many limited-English proficient (LEP) parents from participating fully in their children’s literacy development activities that were developed primarily for English-speaking children. All of the parents reported that English was not their primary language. Parent 2 spoke only Persian at the time of the interview and indicated she was unable to help her son with reading and homework activities because they were written only in English. Parent 4 stated that she did not feel confident in her ability to help her son with his homework. She indicated that she did not want to read to her son because she was not a “good reader.” Parent 3, who primarily spoke Spanish, did speak English but not in the academic sense; therefore, she could not read or write in English. She indicated that she did not want to interfere with her son’s ability to learn to read in English fluently. Parent 1 indicated that his son did not speak English fluently and was unable to read the leveled books the kindergarten teacher sent home every day. He stated that instead of requiring the child to read the leveled books the kindergarten teacher sent home every day, he practiced English vocabulary words using picture flashcards. Further, he stated, “Sometimes the teacher gets angry with my son because he does not read,
but it is my fault because I do not think the books are appropriate for him because he can’t speak English yet.” Parent 6 indicated that he did not want his Spanish language to interfere with his son’s learning to read in English.

Culture
The importance of culture and diversity was also a theme among the participant responses. Parent 5 indicated that she wished her son’s kindergarten teacher would incorporate more multicultural books to send home that specifically related to the family’s Chinese culture. Parent 4 indicated that she felt the teacher devalued her Turkish culture. She stated that her kindergarten child’s teacher disagreed with her decision to replace the weekly reading homework of leveled books written in English with children’s books written in Hebrew. Parent 6 indicated that he wanted his child to become a fluent English reader and that his lack of the English language would prevent the child from doing so. Parent 7 stated, “One day when he was sick and absent from school, I told his teacher that we had written a story in Russian together, and I asked if it could take the place of missed work. The teacher said no because it was not written in English, that she would not be able to read it, and therefore could not count it as an assignment.”

Parents’ Opinions of Literacy Materials Provided by the School
All of the parents disagreed with the literacy materials the teacher provided due to the child’s inability to read the leveled book or because the books lacked multiculturalism. Parent 1 stated, “Sometimes the teacher gets angry with my son because he does not read the books she sends home, but it is my fault because I do not think the books are appropriate for him,” and also, “They are too hard for him because he can’t speak English yet.” Parent 2, who spoke only Persian, said, “I can’t read the books, so I don’t know if they are good or not.” Parent 3 indicated that she did not think the leveled guided reading book was hard enough for her son; however, she was not confident enough in her English speaking skills to speak with the child’s teacher. Parent 4 stated, “I do not know how to be involved in my son’s English reading and writing when I can’t understand it myself. I think he should be able to read Turkish books too.” Parents 5 and 7 both indicated they felt as though the teacher did not value their culture due to his/her lack of incorporating multicultural literature into the reading curriculum.

Multicultural Literature
As mentioned in the reporting in Culture above, Parents 5 and 7 both felt the lack of multicultural literature in the reading curriculum indicated the teacher did not value their family’s culture. Parent 5 stated, “I want Connor to value his culture as well as his American culture and read books about it.” Parent 7 stated, “One day when Igor was sick and absent from school, I told his teacher that we had written a story in Russian together, and I asked if it could take the place of missed work. The teacher said no because it was not written in English, that she would not be able to read it, and therefore could not count it as an assignment.” This parent also said, “I still have Igor read and write in Russian; we just don’t tell the teacher.”
The results of the survey, although not surprising, provide concrete evidence of schools using mainstream literacy practices. They demonstrate clearly the negative impact those practices have on ESL parents’ involvement in their children’s literacy development. These parents indicated that their lack of understanding of the tasks and limited English language abilities prevented them from helping their children complete reading assignments from their children’s teachers. These parents also felt as though their culture was not valued by the school and teachers. Although this study took place in one school district, other researchers have also reported that this problem exists for many ESL parents across the country.

**Corroboration of This Study’s Themes with Results of Other Researchers**

The following conclusions of other researchers corroborate the findings of this study. Language barriers prevent many limited-English proficient (LEP) parents from participating fully in their children’s literacy development; because of this, Limited-English proficient parents lack critical information about their children’s education and often have no way to communicate with their children’s teacher (Yasui, Wong, & Lau, 2006). Because many families speak only their native language in the home, the children may have difficulty transferring their knowledge from one language to another; and Nieto (1996) stated that this causes parents to be unable to reinforce literacy concepts in English. These children may not be receiving the same amount of rich literacy experiences that other children may be getting at home because their parents are unable to speak and read in English or the children are unable to speak English appropriately.

Culture plays a major role in shaping literacy in the home. Yet, in many cases, school culture is very different from family culture (Nieto, 1996). According to Nieto (1996), literacy is valued and perceived differently depending on cultural values and experiences of the parents. Due to these differing values, children are faced with the challenge of making sense of their different environments and finding a way to exist in both worlds. Differing cultural values in the home also causes differences in how homework is completed and valued. Because culture and values greatly influence literacy development, it is important that educators understand the culture and values of each child in order to help him or her to be successful (Linder & Foote, 2002).

**Recommendations for Teachers of English Language Learners**

As the U.S. population grows each year, more and more non-English speaking children are entering into the classroom. English language learners may be very different in their background, skills, and past experience from the other students in the classroom. Teachers and administrators should be prepared to meet the needs of these children so that they can be successful learners. They should consider the following recommendations and insights as they work with English language learners:
Appreciation of Cultural Differences

- Cultural differences can mean different rules for classroom behavior. Students from other cultures can have different views of how to be a student such as when and how they should participate in activities. By knowing the culture of the ELL child, the teacher will better understand his or her behaviors within the classroom (Writing Center, 2013).

- Cultural differences can affect students' understanding of content. Students whose experiences are not from life in the mainstream, therefore, will often need additional explanations and examples so they can draw connections between new material and their existing knowledge base. Teachers should move away from using only mainstream practices and develop curriculum to better meet the diverse needs of ELLs (Writing Center, 2013).

- Cultural differences can affect interactions with others. Actions of students with culturally different ways of showing interest, respect, and appreciation can be misinterpreted. Teachers need to be sensitive to student reactions and try to respect them, while also helping the other students to understand cultural differences. (Writing Center, 2013).

Curriculum and Instruction

- Instructional activities should maximize opportunities for language use such as dialogue and should involve ALL students as active participants (Goldenberg, 2001).

- Teachers should ensure that students understand the concepts and materials being presented (Goldenberg, 2001).

- Curriculum content should bring diversity into the classroom. Culturally diverse content provides ELL students with social support, offers all students opportunities to recognize and validate different cultural perspectives, and provides all students information on other cultures and exposure to other languages (Goldenberg, 2001).

- Teachers should make learning relevant to the students’ experiences (Goldenberg, 2001).

- ELL students need additional support and materials for understanding English. These can include pictures, graphic and visual organizers, extra notes, and discussion time (Writing Center, 2013).

- ELL students should be allowed to use their native language when needed to expand upon their knowledge (Goldenberg, 2001).

Development of Partnerships with Parents and Caregivers

- Teachers need to inform parents about what is happening in the classroom and in the school and invite them to visit to become aware of what students are doing (Brown, 2007).

- Teachers should find ways to motivate parents of ELL students and provide opportunities for them to be involved in the classroom (Brown, 2007).

- Teachers also need to find ways to incorporate their students’ families’ cultures into the curriculum (Brown, 2007).
Conclusion

Because the classroom today is much more diverse than it has been in past years, it is imperative for students to learn to accept and understand people of different races, ethnicities, and cultures while valuing their own. To help these parents and their children feel that their cultures and languages are valued, teachers should incorporate multicultural literature into the reading curriculum. The analysis of the data revealed, however, that the school-to-home literacy practices (leveled readers) in the school programs under investigation were not always compatible with the specific cultures and values of parents. “How parents and children experience school literacy practices imported into the infinitely complex cultural spaces of families and communities can never be anticipated with any certainty” (Dudley-Marling, 2009, p. 1744). It is very possible that minority and ESL parents will always have difficulty integrating mainstream English literacy practices into their homes due to differing values, beliefs, and expectations (Morrow & Paratore, 1993). Yet, parents from minority cultures who do not accept mainstream literacy practices like “leveled readers” risk receiving the label of being unsupportive for their children’s learning development and school success. “Through the deficit lens that dominates educational reform, low income, minority, and immigrant parents are blamed for low levels of academic achievement” (Dudley-Marling, 2009, p. 1744).

Educators must find a way to infuse school-based literacy practices with those specific literacy practices that take place in the homes of diverse families. School-based literacy practices must not be reduced to merely a child reading a leveled book out loud to their parent. Researchers such as de Carvahlo (2001) and Morrow and Smith (1990) suggest the ideal family-school partnership would embrace cultural diversity in such a way that teachers would learn from families causing a partnership between the two. “Foregrounding the cultural and linguistic needs, values, and expectations of parents will reduce the conflict, blame, and dysfunction that characterize the frequently tense relationship between families and schools” (Goldenberg, 2001, p. 221).

In order to have effective communication, both parents and school personnel must feel respected and feel valued. The parents interviewed did not feel that the teacher respected their cultural values and language abilities. Schools that use only mainstream literacy practices are inherently disrespectful to anyone who is not part of the dominant culture. Unfortunately, deficit perspectives continue to dominate the relationships of schools and ESL and low income parents (Dudley-Marling, 2009). On the other hand, some educational researchers, teachers, administrators, and policy makers have come to view home environments as a “likely source of experiences that can enhance children’s literacy development” (Dudley-Marling, 2009). Educators and administrators must tap into the rich resources within the home environment.
Although there has been an abundance of research on parental involvement, much of the data has focused on the potential of family literacy as a means for nurturing literacy development in the homes of poor and minority children whose home language and literacy experiences have often been deemed inadequate for future school success (Dudley-Marling, 2009). Therefore, little is known about how parents are involved in and perceive mainstream literacy practices. Additional research is needed to help educators better understand the types of literacy practices they can use to involve all parents in their children’s literacy development.
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Appendix A

Interview Protocol Questions

1. Do you find it hard to find time to read or work with your child on reading activities? If so, why?

2. What aspects of your home make it difficult for you to work with your child?

3. What is your child’s after-school routine like?

4. What does an average evening in your home look like?

5. What are your child’s activities that interfere with the time you spend on his/her homework and reading activities?

6. What types of activities do you currently do to help your child? How often do you and your child do reading activities? How long?

7. What makes it easy to work with your child on literacy activities?

8. What types of reading materials do you have at home?

9. How do you feel about being a teacher at home for your son/daughter? Do you feel it is part of your responsibility? If not, whose is it?

10. If you could change one aspect of your home environment that would help your son/daughter perform better in school, what would you change?

11. What can the teacher do to help you perform better as a parent?

12. What guidance are you currently getting or not getting from the teacher?

13. What would you like the teacher to do differently?

14. What would you like the teacher to do the same?

15. Have you currently developed strategies to work with your teacher to make a strong connection between home and school?

16. Your child’s teacher says that she does ___________. How do you feel about this? Is it helpful?
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Abstract

Online learning has become very popular in many countries in the world. According to Dawley (2007), in the United States, at least 15 states already provide some form of virtual schooling; over 2.3 million students take online college courses, about 25% of K-12 public schools across the country offer some form of online instruction, and 80% of all doctoral degree-granting universities also offer online Ph.D. degrees.

The purpose of this paper is to share the experience of online course design for teachers who have never taught any online courses or who lack adequate online teaching experience.

In this article, the author describes the key points to designing a successful online course. These include selecting online course content, developing an online syllabus, providing for online communication, and choosing an appropriate method for online evaluation. To provide a clearer picture of the process, the author illustrates with examples from an online writing course that she taught for an E-TESOL program (http://etesol.edu.vn) in April 2012, to help English language teachers in all cities in Vietnam to improve their language competency.

Key words: Online learning, course design, communication tools and alternative evaluation.
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Introduction

Teaching online means conducting a course partially or entirely through the Internet, using the World Wide Web as a primary means of communication (Ko & Rossen, 2010). Teaching college courses online is a type of e-learning, a form of distance education that traditionally was conducted through the use of mail, DVD, telephone or TV. Nowadays, with the application of advanced technology, online courses are an answer to highly demanding learners. Students can study on their own schedule, progress using their own learning style and most importantly, work at their own level and pace. Recognizing the benefits of online courses (i.e., time savings, easily adjustable and flexible scheduling), educators in at least 15 states in the United States already provide some forms of virtual schooling; over 2.3 million students take online college courses, about 25% of K-12 public schools across the country offer some forms of online instruction, and 80% of all doctoral degree-granting universities also offer online Ph.D. degrees (Dawley, 2007). Online learning has become a significant type of learning in many countries in the world.

The author herself has experienced this new online forum for learning and teaching. She first took several online instructional technology courses about instructional design, online distance learning, instructional software design, and curriculum applications of the Internet. Then, using the knowledge and experience from these courses as background, she designed and taught a successful online writing course for English teachers in Vietnam.

This work was done to deliver a course for an E-Tesol program (http://etesol.edu.vn ) in April, 2012 to help English teachers in all cities in Vietnam improve their language competency. In terms of background, Vietnam’s Ministry of Education and Training (MoET) realized that the English language competency of teachers in the country was low in quality. To improve the English language proficiency, MoET initiated a project to boost English skills throughout the country by 2020. In order to facilitate their learning, this writing online course was developed to help learners prepare for a test. Learners in this writing course were the P12 teachers of English throughout Vietnam. They participated in this writing course as a preparation for a test of their language proficiency required by MoET. The course was five weeks in length. Moodle was used as the learning management system to conduct this course. The design of this course was based on the requirements of the MoET proficiency test. Most of the learners were not familiar with online learning, so there was a short training course about Moodle by administrators before they participated in the course.

The objective of this article is to provide the lived experience of online course design for teachers who have never taught any online courses or who lack adequate online teaching experience. The author discusses the main steps an online instructor needs to consider in designing a course.
These include selecting online course content, developing an online syllabus, providing for online communication, and choosing an appropriate method for online evaluation.

**Steps in Online Course Design**

**Selecting Online Course Content**

The first issue that the instructor needs to consider is the content of the online course. Normally, in face-to-face classes, hardcopy books are the main resources; in contrast, in online courses, the instructor can use many different online resources such as websites and social media such as YouTube or Web 2.0 Tools. For example, in her online course, the author wanted to illustrate the new technology of the “wiki,” a Web 2.0 Tool. She was able to provide her students with YouTube videos in addition to reading materials to explain a wiki in a more understandable way. The instructor also introduced websites that had information related to the course topic for learners to discover for themselves. In this way, the gaining of knowledge becomes more vivid. The learners do not lose interest through having only one kind of material to read. Various types of resources also accommodate different learning styles. Some students find it helpful to read books, but others find it better to watch videos. Online materials provide both, and it is the learners who choose what fits them best. In order to get in-depth knowledge, learners can choose to read multiple types of sources since the reading materials support the information in the videos and vice versa.

**Developing an Online Course Syllabus**

The syllabus should be brief, clear, and friendly to learners. It should not overwhelm the students at the beginning. The length of the syllabus should not exceed seven pages. Since the syllabus is the first impression that students get from the course, teachers need to spend time polishing the content in the syllabus to make sure it covers briefly all the necessary information of the course.

To make the instructor approachable to new online learners, the teacher needs to include various types of contact such as email and appointments for synchronous meetings or asynchronous chat with Yahoo Messenger or Skype. Offering different types of contact meets the diverse demands of learners. For email, teachers need to be available as often as possible to answer all the questions and emails from learners. If the waiting time is long, it may affect the learning process of learners. In the syllabus, the instructor needs to state how long learners can expect it to take to get instructor feedback. It is a good idea to give feedback within 24 hours, but from the author’s online teaching and learning experience, response to learners is often faster than that.
The syllabus is considered as a map for learners to help them avoid getting lost during the semester. For new online learners, detailed mapping is of great significance so they can find the information they need during the course. Unclear pathways for getting to information may cause confusion for the learners. The syllabus is also a good place for learners to look for detailed information about the course. For example, the instructor needs to give directions to access an assignment such as Moodle → Blog. The map in the syllabus will help learners access the information quickly and easily. Expectations about class participation, assignments and grading criteria in the course are stated in detail in the syllabus. Last but not least, an area labeled Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) allows the instructor to answer a lot of common student questions from the beginning of the course. As the course progresses, the online instructor should keep a list of such questions as they arise and integrate them in the FAQs to use when teaching the course again. Above all, online course design is a cycle of review, reflection and continual revision (Ko & Rossen, 2010).

Here is a sample online syllabus checklist that the author used to design her online writing syllabus.

**Online Syllabus Checklist**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Criteria/Essential Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course Information</td>
<td>• Course title, registration number, and term/semester information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Course description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Purpose of the course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Prerequisites or special technical requirements for the course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor Information</td>
<td>• Trainer and/or instructor name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Instructor contact information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Office hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content &amp; Objectives</td>
<td>• Course objectives /expected outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Learning Environment</td>
<td>• Course textbook, readings, online resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading &amp; Assignments</td>
<td>• Accessing course web site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Contact information for technical support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Course communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Explanation of grading criteria and components of total grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How to submit assignments; any special instructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A list of all quizzes, exams, graded assignments, and forms of class participation,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with grade percentages or points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Criteria for a passing grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Policies on late assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Activities</td>
<td>How the online classroom is organized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participation standard: minimum number of postings per week in discussion and any standards for quality of participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies</td>
<td>Institutional policies, procedures, or resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religious observances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incompletes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Outline and Schedule</td>
<td>Week-by-week schedule: topics, assignments, readings, quizzes, activities, and web resources for each week, with specific dates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Adapted from Inan, 2012]

### Providing for Online Course Communication

The second issue in online course design is the methodology for communication. In a face-to-face class, the teacher uses chalk and the blackboard in giving the lecture. In contrast, in an online class, the teacher uses a computer and the Internet. Within the online environment, the instructor needs to use many different types of communication options such as email or chat, discussion forums, video/audio conferences, Web 2.0 tools, and Project-Based learning. It is very important for the instructor to know the ways to fully maximize the technology chosen by using various options effectively. For example, if an instructor uses discussion forums as the main communication tool in the course, he begins by posting questions that cover the main ideas in each module. Learners then need to present their opinions and also reply to at least two responses from peers.

Another type of communication is having students provide peer feedback to each other. Students can be placed in groups of three to five depending on the class size. In the author’s class, classmates were asked to provide feedback on their peers’ assignments before the writers of the assignments sent them to the professor. There were specific deadlines for the peer review and the instructor assessment. Peer feedback can be a heavy workload for brand-new online learners but when students get used to it, they find that their critical thinking skills improve a lot. Meyer (2003) also supported this idea. Her survey stated that learners’ collaboration improved learners’ higher-order thinking.
Here are some common tools that the instructor may consider using for a writing class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>Suggested use</th>
<th>Level of interaction</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion Board</td>
<td>Students can express their ideas, gathering feedback and help with refining their opinions and plans.</td>
<td>Medium &gt; replies and related posts from all course members</td>
<td>Post ideas for projects and papers and ask colleagues to weigh in; share initial thoughts about a topic before it is discussed in-depth in individual blogs; brainstorm ideas for a wiki project; express opinions to help divide students into work groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blogs</td>
<td>Students can interpret what they learned; showcase their grasp of the material, and present information to their colleagues. Students often incorporate rich media into their posts to entice and inform others.</td>
<td>Medium &gt; commenting from others</td>
<td>Interpret a case study; submit the final draft of a written, graded assignment; analyze a topic, adding information over several weeks or the entire term; deliver arguments and supporting evidence; provide commentary on a subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journals</td>
<td>Students can express their thoughts, questions, and concerns to you privately</td>
<td>Low &gt; private feedback from the instructor</td>
<td>Ask students to record observations; question the content; identify areas for help; develop a plan for improvement; set goals; evaluate their educational journeys; submit prewriting for a graded assignment for guidance and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wikis</td>
<td>Students can create course content together. Divide students into pairs or groups, or generate work as a class unit. Because each course member is a trusted source of information, everyone may edit and organize the content.</td>
<td>High &gt; intense collaboration through edits and comments</td>
<td>Class summaries and outlines; course glossary; resources repository; lab experiments; group project presentations; research notebooks; connecting student writing to form a book; student solutions for scenarios and case studies; final test reviews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Adapted from Blackboard, 2012]
Instructors can use discussion boards and wikis in combination, journals and blogs in combination, or discussion boards and blogs in combination (Blackboard, 2012). In the author’s writing class, all of these tools were used. Blogs, journals, and discussion boards were combined in one type of assignment and wikis were used in another type of assignment.

The first tool learners were asked to create was a blog to post their journal assignments. The peers read the posts and made at least two comments to the blog. Their comments in this case were considered as discussion forums. The blog was a place for learners to share their feelings, their online learning experience and their professional development. In the realm of online education, blogs have great capacities as educational tools for teaching writing in English as a foreign language (EFL) writing classes (Hashemi & Najafi, 2011) and also for improving students’ writing performance and their perceptions (Ciftci & Kocoglu, 2012). Indeed, blogs create refreshing, interesting and motivating learning environments for language learners.

The second tool learners used was wikis, in which peers edited writing assignments for each other. This type of peer feedback provides feedback quickly to the peer so that students progress efficiently, and it encourages positive collaboration from learners. Lin and Yang (2011) stated in their findings that wikis play a significant and beneficial role in the collaborative process. Their students said that with wikis, they could get immediate online responses from instructors, recognize the grammatical mistakes indicated by peers, and fix them. Also, wikis provide more opportunity for peer feedback and collaboration. Meyer’s survey noted that online discussions increased the amount of time students spent on class objectives. The learners also appreciated the extra time for reflection on course issues (Meyer, 2003).

Choosing an Appropriate Method for Online Course Evaluation

Finally, evaluation is an indispensable part in the course design. The instructor needs to make sure that there is a close alignment among the objectives of the course, the online learning tools, and the evaluation activities. In her course, the author emphasized continuous assessment to evaluate the learners’ attempts throughout the semester. Also, in her online writing course, both summative and formative assessments are used. The final exam, a summative assessment, was still used as a reliable resource to evaluate each learner’s performance. At the same time, formative assessment was used to evaluate different types of assignments: wiki, blog, discussion, writing practice and portfolio. A formative approach to assessment provides learners opportunities to discover, diagnose, and understand the writing tasks better. Lee (2011) stated that formative assessment in the writing classroom maximized student learning.
Here is an example of the evaluation activities the author used for her online writing course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Assignments</th>
<th>Points (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wiki</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Blog</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Writing practice</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Portfolio</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Final exam/Quiz</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This grading rubric requires learners to try their best in all the assignments for the whole semester to get the best results. The final exam, a summative assessment, did not take the major part in the grading scale. The various types of evaluation activities avoid the wash-back effect (the effect of “teaching to the test”), which has existed in the Vietnamese education system for a long time.

Many people are concerned about the quality of an online course compared with a face-to-face class. However, with the fast growth of options in technology, instructors can adapt the use of those tools to their online teaching context to meet the needs of the learners to learn at any time, at any location and, especially, at their own pace. Neuhauser’s study (2002) showed that learning activities can be equally effective for online and face-to-face learners. The online course is indeed more rigorous than many people think. Learners have to study very hard to meet the requirements of the online instructor. The author used to be against online courses, but now she has changed her mind.

Also, it is important to state that from the author’s own personal experience, neither the instructor nor the students have to be very good at technology. With just a short training period, they all can use it well.

**Conclusion**

Online teaching is relatively new; many people do not know what it is like or how it works. Others may have a notion of what is involved, but they do not know how to get started. This article describes the essential steps for online course design with the hope of breaking the ice for any teachers who would like to adopt this new way of teaching but still feel hesitant because of inexperience. The author recommends that teachers should experience an online course themselves before they attempt to implement their own course as the teacher.
Teachers can learn more about the online teaching environment by exploring free online classes on the website sponsored by Blackboard at [www.coursesites.com](http://www.coursesites.com) or they can also learn about the online teaching environment by joining the discussion forum at [www.moodle.org](http://www.moodle.org) to exchange ideas and opinions. Using these sites, teachers can experience all the updated methods in online teaching and learning. They can also share their concerns and online teaching information with other experienced teachers in this forum. With the background steps in this article, teachers can try to design an online course in Moodle and see how it works in their contexts.
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Being an EAP educator with a degree in both Composition and TESOL, whose scholarship involves both fields, I have always found it interesting to discover ways of uniting the two fields in complementing ways in my teaching practice. Thus, this study is an attempt to share such a way with my colleagues in a wider TESOL field and teaching contexts as well as EAP and Intensive English Programs educators. This time my interest has specifically fallen into the Second Language Writing or EAP writing realm. Therefore, with this study I critique existing EAP and ESL writing pedagogies and offer an insight into writing or, better, composing as it exists in composition. I also present a developed pedagogy of teaching composing in the context of an EAP program, which I have worked out during my three years of teaching writing within an EAP program. In order to unpack this pedagogy and its grounding, I will briefly lay out key literature in the fields of both Composition Studies and TESOL that constructed my pedagogy and practice.

The development of my EAP writing pedagogy is a gradual process of bonding the works by leading compositionists (Hurlbert and Blitz, Tobin, Owens, O’Reilley, Luce-Kapler, Ann Berthoff, Patricia Bizzell) and EAP/ ESL scholars (Benesch, Canagarajah, Pavlenko, Hanauer, Morgan) under an eternal motto of Paulo Freire that teaching is a human act (Freire, 1998). Notably, the way composition scholars regard writing as a social act (Luce-Kapler, 2004; Hurlbert & Blitz, 1999), nurture (Tobin, 1993), and a sustainable practice of intervening in the world (Owens, 2001; Welch, 2008) has found deep connection with the role writing has played in my own life and my current research and pedagogy. However, the challenge for me as a researcher in this particular study is to bring the composition lens into an ESL/EAP domain.

Claude Hurlbert and Suresh Canagarajah.

My aspiration to create a study at the intersection of Composition and Second Language Writing fields has been strengthened by scholarly work already situated at the crossing of these fields. There have been attempts to pull the fields closer by both composition and critical EAP scholars. Thus, Hurlbert (2013) calls for internalization of composition and quotes Canagarajah, who has outlined ways of accomplishing this goal: “pedagogy of shuttling” and “critical engagement approach” to handling academic discourses. Both approaches encourage students to rely on all the languages at their disposal and create written works that challenge the established forms and meanings of academic writing genre. Canagarajah’s extensive critique of the monolingual formulaic approach to EAP writing echoes with Hurlbert’s critique of a nationalist view of composition, which “is not sufficient for teaching writing, or for fostering the intellectual health of a well-developed subjectivity” (Hurlbert, 2013, p.18).

Canagarajah (2006) asserts that “the dominant approaches to studying multilingual writing have been hampered by monolingualist assumptions that conceive literacy as unidirectional acquisition of competence” (p. 589). In other words, EAP and other second language literacy instructors have so far focused mainly on their students’ “immediate objective of becoming proficient in writing” in English (Canagarajah, 2002, p. 33).
Thus, even in Advanced English proficiency EAP writing classrooms, the focus is still on error correction, clarity of thesis statement, paragraph sequencing, and other matters of skill and form in writing. Canagarajah (2002) continues, posing that “the attitude encouraged is to orientate more towards achieving academic success and communicative fluency, rather than developing a critical awareness of the underlying knowledge-making process” (p.33). In such an environment there is little space for reflection (S. Canagarajah, 2002). Hurlbert (2013) continues by saying that the view of composition as skills-based "does not sufficiently expand the processes needed to write for an even more interdependent world population, where, for instance, propriety in writing and school decorum do not even look or sound the same for one as for another" (p.17). The harm of such a focus, as seen by Canagarajah (2002), is in routinely predicted and unchangeable outcomes of writing pedagogies: use of the “established knowledge” in the expected way. This environment of “conformity” to the standards and conventions of mainstream monolingual linear writing hampers creativity and passion and hinders the students’ learning possibilities. In such an environment, multilingual students see their monolingual counterparts as privileged and the mainstream academic community as rule-setting and dominant. As Benesch (2001) pointed out, such education puts the students in very narrow boundaries, in which larger questions are not being asked. Thus, both compositionists and critical ESL scholars call for “reclaiming imagination” (Berthoff, 1984) and opening possibilities for students to explore how “the difference,” including multilingualism, can contribute to the knowledge-making process in the academy.

While Berthoff refers to this phenomenon as “imagination”, Canagarajah, juxtaposing it to a multilingual context, compares it to “double vision” (Canagarajah, 2006), which, as he states, multilingual students inherently possess. Thus, siding with Hurlbert, who calls for international dialogue for the sake of the intellect, the field of composition, and new ways of making meaning out of the world, I believe that multilingual writers have a lot to offer to the fields of Composition and TESOL and to the whole world. Therefore, allowing composition to become international or allowing multilingual writers to compose, to my mind, will open new ways of living, new hopes, and new peace. Thus, the scholars, who publish at the intersection of mono- and multi-lingualism, specifically Hurlbert and Canagarajah, increased my own confidence as an EAP writing scholar to step out of the well-established space of conformation into the much less explored space of the multilingual EAP writing class.

Ann Berthoff and David Hanauer

Hanauer (2012) in his article Meaningful literacy: Writing poetry in the language classroom advocates for ESL/EFL pedagogies to become more human and meaningful for the learners (Hanauer, 2012). Hanauer points out that in 2006 a well-known applied linguist Claire Kramsch argued that second and foreign language pedagogy and research have lost the perception of ‘the flesh and blood individuals who are doing the learning’ (Kramsch, 2006, p.98). Thus, Hanauer’s work is aimed at developing the concept of meaningful literacy and offers a classroom methodology that manifests this
approach. Hanauer defines a meaningful pedagogy as one that allows the students to make sense of the world through a holistic activity, which involves intellect, “[…] affect, and intention, and integrates personal history (p. 108)”. Meaningful pedagogy does not reject such aspects of being a human as affect, emotions, personal history, and sense of “self”, but actively engages these aspects into a learning process. Hanauer’s work is devoted to the concept of meaningful literacy and how it plays into an ESL/EFL writing classroom. Hanauer’s ESL/EFL literacy pedagogy is founded on the following principles:

• Sense of the richness of the internal world of the multilingual individual

• Learning as widening and deepening the ways an individual can understand, interpret, feel, and express her or his personally meaningful understandings

• Interaction with everything that makes up the experience and understanding of the learner, including issues of identity and self (Hanauer, 2012, p. 108).

Thus, meaningful literacy pedagogy designed for multilingual learners places every subtle aspect of being a multilingual human at the center of a language classroom, sharpens the focus on “self” and “identity”, and opens up space for constructing rich identities and confident senses of “self” among multilingual learners. Hanauer (2012) formulated a number of core principles that inform his Second Language Writing Pedagogy, among which are the utilization of autobiographical and emotional writing with personal insight, which help the writer explore and understand self, “endorse the expression of personal feelings, and deepen understanding of personal experiences” (p. 108). Hanauer (2012) believes that the goal of meaningful literacy pedagogy is “to make the literacy work in the class meaningful on the personal and social levels, as well as giving a sense of depth and ownership to the writing itself” (p. 108). The researcher states:

Furthermore, this way of designing writing instruction overcomes the absence of a sense of voice, authority and ownership so characteristic of the majority of language learning experiences, which are required to conform to conventionalized expression (p. 108).

Interestingly, personal narrative writing pedagogy, to which I will refer as meaningful narrative writing pedagogy, largely encompasses the principles of meaningful literacy, stated above by Hanauer (2012). It not only incorporates every principle, but also combines such meaningful writing experiences as autobiographical, emotional, and personal insight writing into one entity: the narrative, or, the Book.

However, while the notion of meaningful literacy or meaning making have just recently started being conceptualized and developed in applied linguistics and second language writing, it has well-established itself and its importance in the field of composition since the late 1970s and the works of Ann Berthoff. Ann Berthoff had begun her work on the relationship between meaning and writing within the process approach. In fact, Berthoff in the late 1970s moved away from the positivists’ vision of writing as product oriented towards acquiring and forming of knowledge through “making of
meaning” (Berthoff, 1981). In her book *Making of Meaning*, she argues that students “learn to write by learning the uses of chaos...[by] rediscovering the power of language to generate the sources of meaning” (Berthoff, 1981, p. 70).

Furthermore, Hanauer’s understanding and conceptualization of the notion “meaningful literacy” as being quite multi-faceted and complex, however, fails to include certain aspects of meaning making which come out in a second language classroom. I have found that the Books that my students develop throughout the semester are highly political and touch on such aspects as world politics, socio-economics, and ideology. The Books that my students write, apart from being meaningful on personal and social levels, explicate the students’ political views and socio-economic struggles as well as issues of gender, class, ethnicity, and so on. As Hurlbert (2013) points out, “even when not overtly political, writing is always these things because it is a life impulse, an impulse toward freedom and independence that makes healthy forms of belonging possible” (p. 25). Thus composing is inherently ideological. Ann Berthoff states: “Pedagogy can mean simply the old normal schools’ ‘materials and methods’ or it can name the means to a profoundly political awakening, as in Paulo Freire’s ‘pedagogy of the oppressed’...” (Berthoff, 1981, p. 48). Thus, Berthoff argues for composition pedagogies of the second type, stating:

Composing involves the writer in making choices all along the way and thus has social and political implications: we aren't free unless we know how to choose [... ]. It is not too much to claim that the composition classroom is a place where students can discover their humanity in both a moral and a political sense (Berthoff, 1981, p. 22).

Therefore, if we intend to turn writing in its formulaic and skills-based version into composing, which is a “process of discovery and interpretation, of naming and stating, of seeing relationships and making meanings” (Berthoff, p. 20), we will encounter compositions which are not merely personal, involving affect and intellect, but also highly ideological and political, raising “larger questions” (Benesch, 2001). Therefore, whenever writing or composing are taught as a meaningful part of life and as meaning-making processes, they involve meaningful experiences, help construct and reconstruct those experiences in a variety of ways, and, inevitably, expand the connotations of the concept of “meaningful literacy” to involve affective, intellectual, social, and political ways of being and knowledge construction.

Finally, as a teacher of multilingual writing, I believe that multilingual learners, bound within a pragmatic, English-intensive EAP, are in need of space to develop meaningful literacies and creative confident writer identities, or identities of “a person, who writes” (Brook, 1988, p. 85). I propose that EAP students, similarly to other multilingual learners in a variety of contexts, are inherently creative and capable of producing new genres and literacies (S. Canagarajah, 2002). This inherent creativity manifests itself in the Books I receive at the end of each semester. The Books come out in different formats, with different fonts, margins, and designs. Students design creative covers, which emerge from
their passion and contain by-hand drawings, photos, or excerpts from a Holy Book. These books have poems, pictures, drawings, and sketches; they contain a variety of creative poems, mixed-genre stories, and narratives. Canagarajah (2006) claims that multilingual learners are “endowed with that mysterious ‘double vision’ that enables them to understand the possibilities and constraints of competing traditions of writing and carve out a space for themselves within conflicting discourses” (p. 602). These personal spaces could be carved within an IEP in a writing class, where multilingual students can explore and build off of their rich multilingual identities in writing their Books, which bring personal stories into a larger social arena. Books help multilingual students make meaning of their lives and seek creative ways of engaging with the academic writing practices in ways that are meaningful for them. Books also enhance a sense of ownership of academic discourses among multilingual students, who don’t just adopt the followed practices, but adopt them for their purposes, like answering larger questions, which they pose in the introductory chapters of their Books. Therefore, my role is to provide EAP multilinguals with the classroom space that will allow for such “carving” of their personal spaces within writing in the academy. Notably, the above-mentioned scholars provided me with a better understanding of the constituents of such classroom space and confidence to construct and research it within the IEP context.

Introduction: The Gap

The number of international students who come to the US to pursue an academic degree is increasing in a stable and consistent manner. According to the Open Doors, international enrollment has enjoyed a 5% increase in 2011 in comparison with the previous year. In 2011 and 2012 the number of international students in Intensive English Programs (IEPs) in the U.S. increased by 18.6% (n.d., 2012).

A vast majority of IEP graduates enter the doors of a variety of U.S. colleges and universities with hoping to successfully complete undergraduate and graduate level programs in majors of interest. IEPs provide international students with initial induction into the U.S. academy and quality English instruction, the result of which is a required English proficiency test score and the long-desired admission letter. Typically, an IEP offers a number of courses as part of its English for Academic Purposes program (EAP) designed to help international students develop English literacy and academic skills in order to enter the academic communities of choice. Hence, EAP is a not-for-credit pre-admission program aimed at providing support to international students striving to gain admission to a U.S. institution of higher education (Hong-Nam & Leavell, 2006). Therefore, EAP’s curriculum focuses on discovering the expectations of the academic community, which the students are aspiring to join, and “reducing this information to teachable units taught over a specified and often limited time period” to help students comply with these expectations (Benesch, 2001, p. ix). So, EAP is known for its highly pragmatic skills-based curriculum.

EAP programs are focused on understanding the requirements of the academic disciplines and helping their international students meet those requirements in writing, reading, and academic communication. Benesch (2001) points at the gap between such a normative-pragmatic curriculum of an EAP and drastically different, ideological, mainstream academic classes. Benesch (2001) asserts that
mainstream literacy educators focus on encouraging students to ask large questions related to their lives beyond the academy and tackle issues of significant socio-cultural and socio-economic impact. Some of the examples of what mainstream college students tackle in their compositions are issues of world peace (Morgan & Vandrick, 2009), violence (Blitz & Hurlbert, 1998), sustainability (Owens, 2001), and self-actualization (Tobin, 2004) At the same time EAP’s pragmatic nature prevents multilingual writers from tackling issues which go beyond the score on the English proficiency test and a set of skills for academic success (Benesch, 2001). Therefore, composing “for a better world” (Hurlbert, 2013) at an EAP gets reduced to “filling in the slots of a drill sheet or a performed outline” (Berthoff, 1981, p. 20)

Hence, I argue that while certain academic skills such as time management, prioritizing, and study skills are often hardly of any harm to international students, a pragmatic attitude toward literacy, writing in particular, presents a problem for the development of international students as independent, confident, and critical learners who are capable of expressing themselves in writing on issues of far-reaching impact, and of being personally invested in their compositions, capabilities that are highly valued by mainstream educators.

Limitations of dominant approaches to multilingual writing

Canagarajah (2006) asserts that “the dominant approaches to studying multilingual writing have been hampered by monolingualist assumptions that conceive literacy as unidirectional acquisition of competence” (p. 589). In other words, EAP and other second language literacy instructors have so far focused mainly on their students’ “immediate objective of becoming proficient in writing” in English (Canagarajah, 2002, p. 33). Thus, even in Advanced English proficiency EAP writing classrooms, the focus is still on error correction, clarity of thesis statement, paragraph sequencing, and other matters of skill and form in writing. Canagarajah (2002) continues, posing that “the attitude encouraged is to orientate more towards achieving academic success and communicative fluency, rather than developing a critical awareness of the underlying knowledge-making process” (p. 33). In such an environment there is little space for reflection (S. Canagarajah, 2002): academic discourses get reduced to skills to be mastered “through carefully focused practice” (p. 33); EAP teachers see it as their duty to “provide their students with the writing skills and the cultural information that will allow their students to perform successfully” (Reid, 1989, p. 232). The harm of such focus, as seen by Canagarajah (2002), is in routinely predicted and unchangeable outcomes of EAP writing pedagogies: use of the “established knowledge” in the expected way.

In other words there is a misconception of, or inconsistency in, understanding of what constitutes academic success as related to writing in English. Quite clearly, EAP educators consider the ability to use acquired skills of academic writing as expected in an academic discipline to be a core component for academic success of an international student. However, mainstream composition educators agree that conformation to the “established” and the “expected” hardly guarantees success.

Bishop (2006) points out that in the past, composition was taught as a skills class (Bishop & Strickland, 2006). She asserts that students used to be asked to write particular essay forms
(narration, description, exposition, and argumentation) and to bring in a finished essay each week for grading. Such classes, according to Bishop, are now labeled “current-traditional.” This researcher concludes that, being product-oriented, those classes resulted in formulaic writing and rarely offered students glimpses into the messy, generative, exciting process of writing (p. 228). Thus, according to mainstream educators, the ability of students to write meaningful works of importance to their lives and to wider communities combined with excitement and passion for the process of writing is characteristic of academic success. Unfortunately, while the field of composition reshapes its classroom practices and changes its emphasis in literacy instruction, EAP professionals still hold tight to the irrevocable image of a stagnant U.S. academy and “assumed” expectations of conformity and uniformity in academic writing (Baik & Greig, 2009; Bailin, 2006; Carroll & Dunkelblau, 2011; Ian, 2005; Kim, 2006; Lambert, 2008; Liu, Chang, Yang, & Sun, 2011; Min-fen & Bakken, 2004; Nordmeyer & Barduhn, 2010; Silva, 2001).

Thus Benesch (2001) alleges that EAP professionals could misinterpret the students’ needs and trap the students inside of a tightly bound “assumed” academy, which so much values skills and forms at the expense of deep thought and higher-order meaning. Benesch (1996, 1999, 2001, 2009) unveils this argument among researchers as being relevant to the actual needs of multilingual students in pre-admission EAP programs, which go beyond the admission letter and “current-traditional” composition classroom. In another argument, Benesch (1999) cautions against a normative-pragmatic, short-term needs based approach to EAP writing pedagogies, which teach multilingual learners to accord privilege to U.S. university classrooms and lose individuality and creativity, reducing them to the role of apprentices, and leaving their rich multilingual potential outside of EAP and mainstream academic classrooms (Benesch, 2001; Ellwood & Nakane, 2009).

Consequently, Benesch (2001) calls for recognizing the gap between EAP and college composition curricula. She claims that EAP is in need of reshaping current writing pedagogies and closing the gap (Benesch, 2001). Therefore, EAP professionals have to develop new visions of writing in and beyond the academy. By changing the EAP focus to the students’ long term needs and well-being, EAP programs will educate international pre-admission students to place the personal and social aspects of writing ahead of the form, to see their multilingual realia as complementary and not subordinate to the monolingual and to view their literacy in the first language as a resource and not a non-desired interference.

In this paper I propose an EAP writing pedagogy that is intended to minimize the gap between pragmatic EAP and ideological composition classrooms. This pedagogy is foregrounded on four main principles, formulated by both TESOL and composition scholars: writing as nurture (Tobin, Luce-Kapler), writing as a human act (Freire), writing as a social act (Canagarajah, 2002), and difference as resource (Canagarajah, 2006). Undoubtedly, there are different ways of closing the above-mentioned gap and educating EAP students at advanced English proficiency levels to write beyond the form for the meaning and to develop a passion for composing. Thus, in their EAP programs, Brian Morgan and Sarah Benesch have done considerable work to move their students beyond writing and researching to
acquire a set of skills. Also, Morgan (2009) engages his multilingual learners in the exploration of “diverse notions of the common good and implications for peace and war” (Morgan & Vandrick, 2009). Furthermore, Sarah Benesch invited her EAP students to conduct an analysis of their rights in a course in which it was intended for the students to explore western academy in a mainstream Psychology class (Benesch, 1999). Also, having taught Advanced EAP Writing, I have developed my own vision of addressing the gap, which is, indisputably, specific to my context and student population. Therefore, by discussing my pedagogy, developed from the works by composition and TESOL scholars, and implemented in the context of an Intensive English for Academic Purposes program, I do not call for generalizing it to wider contexts. Rather, I invite the readers to reflect on another humble attempt among EAP educators to move the highly pragmatic skills-based EAP approach to teaching writing into the realm of the political and ideological composition classroom.

Thus, this study is an exploration of an EAP writing pedagogy of nurture, rich in classroom examples and teacher reflections. With this study I intend to start a dialogue between the two fields: EAP and Composition studies, and re-shape the vision of multilingual writing practices and possibilities in the academy.

Towards New Forms, Genres, and Meanings:
Writing a Book in an Advanced Level EAP Writing Course

I teach in an Intensive English Institute, English for Academic Purposes Program, in western Pennsylvania. The pedagogy I developed in my Advanced Written Communication course (AWC), engages Advanced English proficiency pre-admission EAP students in a semester-long book-writing project.

All the students in the class are asked to write a Book on the following topic: “What are you burning to tell the world?” The Book is a creative piece, in which the message, genre, and form are chosen solely by the students. The Book is 15-20 double-spaced pages long. It contains an Introduction (which resembles a literature review), in which the students scientifically discuss the problem they are touching on in their books, a Story or a Narrative that provides the students’ personal insights into the problem(s), and a Foreword written by a peer. The semester is heavy in writing assignments since the students work on the Book in steps while being constantly engaged in peer-review sessions, or “Readings,” in which each of them has a chance to share a page from his/her Book and receive feedback from their peers and the teacher.

To prepare students for writing an Introduction, I set up workshops on research writing, in which I cover such topics as: formulating a research question, developing an argument in writing, writing a literature review, evaluating academic work (designed to help students choose between data sources and evaluate academic articles they choose for literature reviews), and plagiarism. I feel this more “traditional” piece of the Book a necessary step for my EAP students intended to move them beyond formulaic academic writing. This step will remain in their memory not as an ultimate goal, but as only a first step in the construction of a meaningful story.
The Book is an on-going semester-long project, the progress in which I track together with my students during our Readings. Additionally, I collect a mid-term draft of the Book to provide the students with a more formal evaluation of their work, including thorough feedback on their punctuation, grammar, and structure upon the student’s request. The amount of feedback I give to the students is decided by the students themselves. In the beginning of the semester I negotiate the questions of grading and feedback on a whole-class and individual basis.

The topics, genres, forms and messages that my AWC students explore in their Books vary richly from the discussion of women’s rights in Saudi Arabia in poems, to symbolic allegories on the topics of greed and hate in a seemingly made-up country “Srabia”, to journals, graphic novels, short stories, and creative nonfiction.

The Book project and the book writing process have established themselves in my EAP writing classrooms as pathways to the state of critical engagement with the academy (Canagarajah, 2006). Critical engagement, as stated by Canagarajah, is achieved through “discursive struggle [when] students adopt creative strategies to reshape academic conventions to represent their interests and values. Consequently, as dominant discourses are taken over by the students, new genres and literacies are born” (p. 40). Thus, book writing allows EAP students to explore and reshape traditional academic writing, making it more socially and personally meaningful, and, at the same time, revealing new visions, possibilities, and forms of meaning negotiation.

What Academic Writing Can Be:

**Book Writing and its Implications in an EAP Advanced Written Communication Course**

The Book project combines a more traditional-academic introduction with a personal story and a foreword by a peer under the umbrella of a meaningful social problem, which the students are tackling in their books. Below I will describe the Book project in detail, focusing on its practical application within the EAP and its theoretical foundations. Specifically, I will focus on how it contributes to what composition scholars call “pedagogy of nurture” (Tobin, 1993), or what EAP scholars refer to as “critical engagement pedagogy” (A. S. Canagarajah, 2002). This pedagogy is aimed at moving academic writing away from formulaic and meaningless practice to creative and personally and socially meaningful practice formulated on the principles of nurture, writing as a human and a social act, and “difference as a resource.”

**Writing as Nurture**

In his book *Reading Students’ Writing: Confessions, Mediations, and Rants*, Tobin discusses the importance of personal writing, which is created off of a student’s need, in Freshmen Composition classes (Tobin, 2004). The author dismantles all arguments put forth against personal writing, asserting that “if composition teachers marginalize and even outlaw personal and confessional writing, our students may not get any chance within their college education to write about what they take to be important aspects of their life before and outside the academy” (p. 113).
Thus, I found the Book form a way to let meaningful personal writing happen in an EAP context. A Book has become an open forum for international students to discuss the issues that worry them and impact their lives. I found Book writing nurturing not just for the students’ identity, which finally found a way to manifest itself in an academic environment where important questions get addressed, but also for their writing development. The Book gave EAP students a chance to choose their own forms and ways of saying what has to be said, and the result of such writing, in which students argue, critique, construct hypotheses, and provide support, is startling.

Writing as a Human and Social Act

As Freire once posed, educators who let students convey the “concrete aggressive reality” of their lives in their compositions make teaching English literacy a true “human act” (Freire, 1998). This human act nurtures not just the students engaged in writing, but the whole environment surrounding the students.

Luce-Kapler, O’Reilley, and Tobin talk about the nurturing potential of composition classrooms (Luce-Kapler, 2004; O'Reilley, 1993; Tobin, 1993). The researchers reveal that “like all relationships, writing relationships are dynamic, fluid, and multi-faceted; and like all good relationships, they can allow us to accomplish and become all sorts of things that we could not do or be on our own” (Tobin, 1993, p.17). The writing relationships, as Canagarajah (2002) explains are those between “the writer, reader, and the community” (p. 1). In other words, a mere understanding of writing as a web of relationships takes a written work into the realm of personal and social space. In my AWC course, the students were constantly engaged in this web of relationships through brainstorming meaningful book topics, discussion of ideas, and peer-review sessions or Readings.

The idea of Readings comes from a professional community of writers, in which it is quite common for a guest-author to visit a place with a reading from his newly published work. Hence, I juxtaposed this realia onto an EAP writing course, in which I moved away from student-apprentices to multilingual writers, who come to class to read their works.

Each writer in my class has half a class session to read a page from his/her Book and receive feedback from the classroom community of writers. The readings are quite informal. The feedback that the writers give one another is provided orally and in writing. These readings are spent in an atmosphere of equality with the class sitting in a circle and the reader presenting his/her work from a podium. As Tobin puts it, a teacher in a nurturing composition class is someone who “writes herself as a teacher within it” (Tobin, 2004) and is also deeply impacted by writing, reading, and discussing students’ written lives as a community of writers in class. Thus, I feel that my role in the Readings is to keep the community of writers, to which I equally belong, engaged in the process of social construction of texts and writerly identities. In fact, in final class evaluations, students stressed the importance of these Readings for them as writers, posing that the Readings contributed to formation of their confident professional writerly identities. Readings also help multilingual writers feel what their texts mean, not just for themselves, but also for the wider communities of writers and readers from around the world.
Difference as a Resource: “Double Vision”

As Tobin (2004) asserts, the argument that personal writing is “inherently non-rigorous and relentlessly narcissistic” is constructed by educators with “lack of respect for students’ abilities” (p. 106). Thus, as an EAP teacher, I feel the pressure on the part of my program administration and often my students to focus on the development of “traditional” academic writing skills. However, I often argue that teaching my students the skills of “academic writing” takes me only two weeks, but developing the students as creative, content, and inspiring writers who are capable of going beyond the established forms and formats is the work of the whole semester. I feel that by reducing EAP classrooms to drill on the construction of an argument or a thesis statement is treacherous towards our students, who deserve more of our abilities, talent, and time.

According to Canagarajah (2002), EAP literacy courses became reduced to skills or product construction under the influence of the “structuralist bias” (A. S. Canagarajah, 2002) of applied linguistics, which has pushed ESOL writing to “product-oriented studies on linguistic and textual structures and process-oriented studies on cognitive strategies of text production” (p. 26). Such a direction of an EAP literacy curriculum has strongly impacted the writers’ dignity. Multilingual EAP writers striving for near-native writing patterns have not been allowed to build off of their “differences” and multilingual competencies and have been forced to reject vernacular communities as soon as their feet stepped into an EAP writing classroom.

Canagarajah (2002) claims that when teaching multilingual writers, a “difference-as-resource” perspective needs to dominate in order to “safeguard writers’ dignity” (S. Canagarajah, 2002). In other words, pedagogically, EAP and mainstream literacy educators need to value linguistic and multilingual peculiarities that multilingual students display and allow them to appropriate academic discourse to express their unique voices and identities.

Thus, writing a Book provides multilingual writers with an open space for the manifestation of their identity and “reshaping of academic conventions to represent their interests and values,” to “take over” dominant discourses and give birth to “new genres and literacies” (Canagarajah, 2002, p. 40). Canagarajah (2006) believes that multilingual students inherently possess that ability to creatively engage with discourses and create new forms and meanings:

In fact, it is their very multilingualism that may account for their creativity. They are endowed with that mysterious “double vision” that enables them to understand the possibilities and constraints of competing traditions of writing, and carve out a space for themselves within conflicting discourses (Canagarajah, 2006, p. 602).

Thus, this inherent creativity manifests itself in the Books I receive at the end of each semester. The Books come out in different formats, with different fonts, margins, and designs. They have creative covers, often designed based on a by-hand drawing, photo, or an excerpt from a Holy Book. These books have poems, pictures, drawings and sketches, and they contain a variety of creative poems, mixed-genre stories and narratives and even excerpts in Arabic, Chinese or other languages that my
students consider native. This abundance of forms and literacies is inspirational for both EAP teachers and students, who claim that they do “the impossible” in my writing classes.

**Teacher Insights and Reflections**

Above I have tried to describe and provide a rationale for my three-year work devoted to building a nurturing and inspirational EAP writing classroom that will develop confident writers ready to conquer the U.S. academy and the whole outside world. In the beginning of this paper, I admitted that I spend about two weeks in my AWC course to develop students’ western-conventional or traditional academic writing skills. Interestingly, most of my students dislike those two weeks the most; however, they all ask for those skills in the initial needs-assessment questionnaires. Also, later, most of the students find the “academically” written literature reviews a daunting and incredibly boring introduction to their books and often ask to take them out, keeping just the foreword, which also has research in it. Thus, as an EAP teacher, working in a highly pragmatic context, stuck in “traditional” understanding of writing as a skill, I have to be careful and slowly break the stereotypes. I understand that initially most of my students feel frustrated that the main course project in my AWC class is Book writing, since they expect to acquire “academic” writing skills. So, my job, as an EAP educator, is to gradually guide the change in EAP literacy education practices and pedagogies, allowing time for everybody to develop awareness of what academic writing truly is or can be.

However, I truly believe that the EAP writing pedagogy that I have assembled from both ESL and Composition practices will bear fruit in both fields: EAP and Composition studies. I see that with every new class I receive different Books, new genres and forms, which seldom repeat one another. My students, so concerned about their writing skills, grammar, and punctuation, silently work on those in the Writing Center, and come to my classes to talk about meaning. They leave the form of their writings aside, but do not neglect it since they want to publish their books and make them “look good.” But, as my students tell me, they do not want to waste our class time on the form since they still have to discover with the help of our writing community the right genre, style, font, design, and tone that will help them convey their personally and socially important meanings. Also, my teacher evaluations constantly demonstrate that the students seem to view my course as a key course in their curriculum since it develops the two critical, in their opinion, skills: reading and writing as self-expression. The students note that at the end of the course they have discovered ways to write that are motivating and engaging. They also point out that they have learned to write “longer” works, “made friends” with the white page, and lost their fear of academic prose and any writing in English. They also admit that they have developed as individuals through writing Books and, for the first time, forgotten that they are “ESL” students and that English is their second language.

**Conclusion**

As Canagarajah (2002; 2006) and Benesch (2001) stated above, a big problem of the second language literacy field, EAP in particular, is the underestimation of multilingual writers’ abilities and the false
assumptions about multilingual students’ needs. For a long time second language writing pedagogies have been building off of traditional “coverage of language system” (Benesch, 2001) approaches, which tended to present writing as “instrumental” (Canagaragah, 2002; Zamel 2011), proficiency-based (Raimes, 2001), and “vulgar pragmatic” (Pennycook, 1997). Influenced by audio-lingual methodology and structuralism, second language writing has been seen as a habit-formed skill, to develop which, error is to be avoided, correction and revision are to be provided continuously, and monolingual writing processes and patterns are to be acquired for academic success (T. J. Silva & Matsuda, 2001). In such an environment, second language learners are bound to writing courses that teach them to conform to and imitate “native-like” practices and forms.

Canagarajah (2006) asserts that “bilingual competence integrates knowledge of two languages and is, thus, qualitatively different from monolingual competence” (p. 591). Therefore, multilingual EAP learners are capable writers with unexplored potential who should be given a chance to manifest their competences in a number of discourses and to engage with the academy, writing meaningful creative texts. EAP Book writing pedagogy is one of the ways for EAP writing instructors to help their students see beyond “text construction” and “native-like” writing practices towards regarding writing as a “rhetorical negotiation for achieving social meanings and functions” and to carve a space for themselves within academic discourses (Canagarajah, 2006, p. 602). I found Book writing a powerful nurturing pedagogy, which gradually moves multilingual writers to the achievement of that “critical engagement” with the academy and establishment of their own unique spaces and voices in and beyond their academic communities.
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Throughout the world, interest continues to build in developing a more competent and fully prepared citizenry that has fluency and literacy in two or more languages. Recent research, including that in this book, indicates that immersion education is an effective method for achieving this goal. Immersion in this context means an enrichment approach to language learning in which the learners add fluency and literacy in another language through content instruction in that language. Tedick, Christian, and Fortune’s edited volume, Immersion Education: Practices, Policies, Possibilities, explores various aspects of this approach. The articles in the book consider three types of immersion programs: one-way immersion, where speakers of the majority language learn subject matter in a minority or foreign language; dual language immersion, where speakers of both minority and majority languages learn subject matter in both languages; and indigenous language immersion where speakers seek to revitalize dying languages by using them as a medium for content learning.

Considering the magnitude of details involved in creating, implementing, and promoting such programs, one can imagine there might be some obstacles along the way. One challenge is changing the mindsets of individuals within the community. Many of them, including some parents, have the concern that it may be too overwhelming for young learners to manage learning two languages at the same time. Not only is there no proof to support this idea, but based on current research studies, the authors of one of the most respected textbooks for language acquisition courses Patsy Lightbown and Nina Spada (2011), assert that numerous ‘simultaneous bilinguals’ (children learning more than one language from early childhood) are able to successfully master a high level of proficiency in both languages.

Another challenge is the reluctance of government entities to fund such programs, as such programs require proficient bilingual professionals with competence in implementing immersion programs as well as appropriate instructional materials in both languages. Noted second language learning expert JoAnn Crandall (2012) states that though many teachers are currently ill-equipped to handle these extended responsibilities, some teacher education and professional development programs are addressing these issues to better conform to teaching standards that now focus on language and communication.
An insightful and honest look at the topic of immersion education is provided in a recent edited volume entitled *Immersion Education: Practices, Policies, Possibilities*. Divided into four parts, the book provides an in-depth look at the design of programs that deliver language instruction by immersion, program outcomes and their implications, language use and assessment, and policy and practice in immersion education. It shares challenges faced by programs from different parts of the world while offering suggestions and possibilities for further research and program improvements. The intended audience includes professionals in the field of ESL and immersion education, school administrators interested in exploring immersion education, and parents considering enrolling their children in immersion programs.

The first section discusses different types of immersion programs. Bjorklund and Mard-Miettinen describe immersion education in Finland, where Swedish is introduced in preschool, a third language is added in first or second grade, and an option to learn a fourth language is provided later. Wilson and Kamana share their perceptions of indigenous language immersion in Hawaii by highlighting a model infant/toddler-through-high school immersion program in Nawahi. The section concludes with Zehrbach’s analysis of program characteristics and student body compositions in two-way immersion charter schools in the U.S.

The second section focuses on program outcomes and implications for practice. Lindholm-Leary discusses programs in which participants in two different two-way Chinese-English immersion programs in California performed at or above their grade level in academic areas. De Jong and Bearse report on a program outcome where high school students expressed a desire for more content in the minority language. Burger, Weinberg, Hall, Movassat, and Hope examine the program evaluation and pedagogical challenges of French immersion studies at the University of Ottawa and suggest improvements.

The third section of the book examines language use and assessment practices. This includes Duibhir’s research on whether Irish students notice errors and why they consciously choose inaccurate forms, Broner and Tedick’s observations on language choice in a one-way Spanish immersion program in a fifth grade classroom, and the efforts of Peter, Sly, and Hirata-Edds to design language assessment to inform instruction in a Cherokee language immersion program.

The final section is devoted to policy and practice. Hoare considers the challenges of community pressures and public policy. Dorner describes the needs of immigrant families to have access to “sense making processes” to better understand the availability and advantages of immersion programs. Fortune explores the struggling learner in the immersion classroom with an emphasis on the distinction between a language delay and a language disorder. The concluding chapter by Genesee summarizes the main points of the book with a focus on advocacy, parent involvement, assessment, and accessibility.
A helpful feature of this book is the fact that the contributors reference the programs and findings of other contributors to the book. This interaction of the contributors enhances the inter-relatedness of themes and issues and provides a sense of unity. In terms of the readability of this book, it might be mentioned that the quantity of facts, figures, and references may seem intimidating to someone not used to reading research literature. However, the chapters are organized clearly. The authors highlight main ideas, provide background information, describe challenges to be faced, and suggest possibilities for the future.

As a graduate student and professional in the ESL field with some experience in immersion programs, I found the contents of this book fascinating. The book provided me with a deeper understanding of important issues within immersion education. Shortly after obtaining my Multiple Subject Teaching Credential and TEFL certificate, I flew off to Korea to have an adventure before settling down in my career. It was an interesting experience to be faced with a room full of two-to-four-year-olds who not only did not speak English, but also had never seen a foreigner like me up close before. This was a one-way immersion program in which the teacher was a native speaker. It was a full day kindergarten (structured after an American style kindergarten) with 50-minute blocks of instruction in English and 10-minute breaks. The Korean-speaking teaching aides assisted during the breaks. I was amazed at how much these children flourished in their second language acquisition. Through music, art, PE, library time, and computer class, these children were reading and writing in simple journals in response to simple prompts like “My name is___. I am happy today. Today is sunny.” Because these were preschoolers, this experience taught me never to underestimate the power of a child’s mind.

I knew that I would want this same experience for my own children when I had them. So, a little over a decade later, I enrolled my son in the Spanish-English Dual Immersion Program being offered at our local school. He has completed his first year and is about to begin first grade. The Spanish class uses native speakers of Spanish to model for the native speakers of English. School celebrations include songs and announcements communicated in both languages, which provides a sense of pride for all community members. Homework packets include some worksheets in Spanish along with notices in both languages. When I first read this volume, my son was about to enter the program. It was reassuring to read research that consistently showed that students in immersion programs performed at or above their grade levels in academic achievement assessments. Having read *Immersion Education* as a requirement in a graduate course, I felt this book contained such useful information that I recommended it to the teachers and the principal of my son’s school.

One final reason this book was compelling to me was my involvement in ESL education for the past thirteen years. As an academic director of an intensive English program, I am always seeking ways to make the experience for our students more engaging and rewarding. Some of the concepts within the volume prompted me to want to try some new ideas in the intensive English program where I work.
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Abstract

The academic success of English language learners (ELLs) depends to a great extent on the quality of instruction of mainstream teachers. However, research shows that many such teachers lack understanding of their roles and how their teaching practices can best support ELLs’ needs in the classroom. Given these issues, the purpose of this conceptual article is to offer suggestions to regular classroom teachers to effectively teach ELLs. These suggestions, which are grounded in key concepts of sociocultural theory, include the teacher’s use of ELLs’ background knowledge, understanding of the different processes of the first and second languages, implementation of cooperative group activities, and respect of ELLs’ individual differences.
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The population of culturally and linguistically diverse students in the United States of America is growing in the mainstream classroom across urban, suburban, and rural areas (Nieto, 2000). Enrollment of English language learners (ELLs) in U.S. schools, currently 4.7 million, will surpass 10 million by 2015 and almost one out of every four public school students will be an English language learner by 2025 (National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition, 2012).

The responsibility for instructing ELLs no longer rests only on the shoulders of English as a Second Language (ESL) or bilingual teachers. ELLs spend most of their time with mainstream teachers, except when they are in a daily pull-out program for one or two hours (Peregoy & Boyle, 2008). This arrangement for instruction means that ELLs’ success depends to a great extent on the quality of instruction of regular classroom teachers. However, in reality, many mainstream teachers do not seem to recognize that they are responsible for teaching ELLs (Fu, 1995; Harper & de Jong, 2009; Yoon, 2007). Many such teachers also lack understanding of how their teaching practices, guided by theories, can best support ELLs’ needs in the mainstream classroom (Lee, Penfield, & Buxton, 2011; Yoon, 2008).

Given these issues, the purpose of this conceptual article is to offer suggestions to regular classroom teachers for effective instruction of ELLs. These suggestions are based on the framework of sociocultural theory (Vygotsky, 1962, 1971, 1978). Although sociocultural theory is often used as a theoretical lens in the field of literacy, it has not been widely utilized in discussing mainstream teachers’ roles and practices for ELLs. These suggestions based on the key concepts of sociocultural theory will be useful for teachers to take into consideration for effective strategies for ELLs in their mainstream classrooms.

Sociocultural Perspectives * (see addendum on page 68)

Sociocultural theory (Vygotsky, 1962, 1971, 1978) gives us a new lens with which to view ELLs’ language and literacy learning as a culturally and socially situated practice. Through the major concepts of the zone of proximal development (ZPD) and language as mediation, sociocultural theory provides important implications for the teacher’s roles in ELLs’ language and literacy education.

Zone of Proximal Development

No notion might be more widely discussed than the ZPD that Vygotsky (1978) used to explain the teacher’s role for children’s learning. In Mind in Society, Vygotsky (1978) explained the ZPD in detail along with the definition: “It is the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers” (p. 86). This definition offers the vital ideas that learning and development are continuous interactive processes between the teacher and the student. The analysis of the ZPD includes the teacher’s role in various ways.
First, the ZPD illustrates the teacher’s role as a facilitator for ELLs’ learning. It focuses on how teachers should notice ELLs’ current states and levels to promote their learning and development. In the regular classroom where the zone is constructed, the teacher’s understanding of the student’s current independent level is important, which level Moll (1992) and his colleagues including González (2001, 2005) expanded as “funds of knowledge.” Funds of knowledge, defined as “the historically accumulated bodies of knowledge and skills essential for household functioning and well-being” (González, Andrade, Civil, & Moll, 2001, p. 116), is aligned with the ZPD since regular classroom teachers need to know the background knowledge that ELLs bring to the classroom. The students’ psychological tools such as cultural and social knowledge are important resources that regular classroom teachers can utilize to assist and scaffold their learning.

Second, the ZPD demonstrates the teacher’s role to promote ELLs’ possibility and flexibility. Vygotsky (1978) views the zone as being under construction and constantly moving, rather than being fixed. What ELLs can accomplish with the help of teachers (the potential development level) and what they can do independently (actual developmental level) are not stable. The processes of the developmental levels are continuously evolving so that ELLs’ potential development level transitions into actual developmental level. This notion demonstrates its focus on future language learning of ELLs. As Vygotsky (1978) stated, development is a qualitative transformation from one level to another. The regular classroom teacher’s role is to assist ELLs to achieve this possibility, to (re)construct their own zones, and to develop their language and literacy learning. The regular teacher’s role to promote peer interaction is another way to create a “third space” (Gutiérrez, 2008), an expanded concept of ZPD. As Gutiérrez and her colleagues point out, a third space is a hybrid space between the home culture and the school culture (Gutiérrez, Baquedano-López, Alvarez, & Chiu, 1999). In order to help ELLs build a bridge between home-based knowledge and school-based knowledge, regular classroom teachers need to scaffold instruction based on the ELLs’ current zones so they can create the third space. The zone and space can be continuously constructed and reconstructed through the interaction of ELLs and native English-speaking peers and through the facilitation of the teacher.

Finally, the ZPD implies the teacher’s role for individual students’ differences with tailored guidance. In contrast to Piaget, who stresses the developmental stages of children’s learning, Vygotsky focuses on the dynamic nature of human development through the concept of ZPD. This notion provides regular classroom teachers with insights that they might consider to modify their instruction based on individual ELLs’ current levels and needs. Since every individual student’s level and cultural knowledge that he/she brings to the classroom is different, it is important for teachers to consider how they can adjust their instructional approaches based on the students’ different levels and statuses. In short, Vygotsky’s sociocultural theory views the teacher’s role as assisting, and this assisting teacher’s role is manifested through the ZPD. The ZPD is closely connected to the concept of mediation as described below.
Language as a Mediational Tool

Another key concept that provides insights to the teacher’s roles for effective strategies for ELLs is language as mediation. Mediation has a special meaning when it is applied to human learning, given that individuals’ mental and social activities are shaped by tools and signs (Vygotsky, 1962, 1971, 1978). These tools and signs are historically, culturally, linguistically, and socially contextualized entities that have been transmitted and changed from generation to generation (Wertsch, 2007). Individuals think and learn through these tools and signs including language. Vygotsky particularly emphasized the role of language among other mediated signs. The regular classroom teacher’s role as a mediator is to help ELLs move from assisted to independent performance. As the ZPD, the Vygotskian concept of mediation represents well the mainstream teachers’ roles in three different ways.

First, language as mediation provides the teacher’s role for ELLs’ learning by using language as a tool. The notion of scaffolding (Bruner, 1975) demonstrates the regular classroom teacher’s assistive role in this respect. To assist ELLs in transferring their learning from the interpsychological plane (social) to the intrapsychological plane (individual), the regular classroom teacher, who is considered more experienced, appropriates her/his language to facilitate the students’ learning. In this scaffolding process, the regular classroom teacher’s forms of repetition, expansion, and questions are important examples of using language as a mediational tool for ELLs’ learning.

Second, language as mediation illustrates the teacher’s role for promoting interaction by utilizing language as a cultural, social, and political tool. Language does not include only linguistic aspects, but also includes ideological perspectives. The regular classroom teacher might intentionally or unintentionally deliver particular messages through language. The regular classroom teacher might position ELLs as powerful or powerless through classroom activities. As Vygotsky (1978) noted, internalization is “the internal reconstruction of an external operation” (p. 56). ELLs’ internalization occurs and is elevated when the regular classroom teacher shares authority and implements certain approaches as external operation, helping the students to internally construct meaning. In this aspect, the sociocultural perspectives of language as a tool are extended to social, critical, and political perspectives to help ELLs develop their critical thinking.

Finally, language as mediation demonstrates that the teacher’s supporting role is to improve ELLs’ learning through meaningful language and literacy activities in context. The teacher’s assisting discourse could motivate and advance students’ learning through meaning-making activities. The meaningful activities are not only for the development of ELLs’ oral language. Often, Vygotskian sociocultural theory has been associated with the use of oral language as a mediation tool. However, modern applications include written language as well (e.g., Carbone, 2012). Although it is hard to observe the students’ inner speech that Vygotsky mentioned as a key mediating tool for learning, these activities of inner speech also need to be considered when we discuss the teacher’s assistive role.
In summary, Vygotsky’s concepts of the ZPD and language as a mediational tool provide regular classroom teachers with important insights to assist ELLs to engage in language and literacy activities. The common use of teacher as a facilitator in the field of second language might be derived from these concepts.

**Practical Suggestions for Regular Classroom Teachers’ Effective Instruction for ELLs**

Effective mainstream teachers understand that good strategies are grounded in theory. These major concepts of sociocultural theory above provide practical suggestions for effective instruction for ELLs’ learning. There are four main aspects that mainstream teachers need to take into consideration for helping ELLs develop their language and literacy learning: 1) Activating background knowledge, 2) understanding the different processes of the first and second languages, 3) encouraging cooperative group activities, and 4) respecting ELLs’ individual differences.

**First Implication: Understand and Activate ELLs’ Background Knowledge**

Based on the ZPD concept, it is important for regular classroom teachers to recognize the kinds of background knowledge ELLs have in order to activate it. The students, who might not have the experiences that most native English speaking students have, will evidently have difficulties understanding the content of texts and discourse in class between mainstream teachers and peers. For example, ELLs, who have never been to Subway, a fast food shop, do not have a schema for Subway. In this case, the students cannot link Subway to a new context when teachers discuss it. Having a schema allows us to predict meaning, visualize events, and draw inferences. Conversely, having no schema makes it difficult for us to perform these functions. As a regular classroom teacher, the specific strategies to activate a schema include these:

- Making explicit instructions by using visuals such as videos and pictures to build a schema.
- Using relative clauses, such as “I often go to eat a sandwich at Subway, which is a fast food restaurant.” ELLs who might not have had the previous concept of Subway might build it as new knowledge and schema.

According to David Ausubel (1963), learning occurs through a meaningful process of relating new events to current cognitive concepts. He states that knowledge is sustained longer in memory if a new concept can be connected with a preexisting schema. If there is no schema, (background knowledge), there is no place where new knowledge can be linked, so it eventually disappears. Therefore, scaffolding to help ELLs build a schema becomes a crucial task for mainstream teachers regardless of content areas including math, science, and social studies.

**Second Implication: Understand the Different Process of L1 and L2**

The premise of understanding ELLs’ background knowledge is the teachers’ understanding of the different learning processes between the first language (L1) and the second language (L2) and utilizing the students’ L1 for L2 learning. As implied in the concept of the ZPD, the teacher’s understanding of ELLs’ L1 is to assess their actual developmental level in order to help them...
reach the potential development level. Even though there are more similarities than differences between L1 and L2, such as the children’s development of comprehension competence before performance competence by listening to others, there are large differences in learning L2 (Jameson, 1998; Reiss, 2012). The differences that mainstream teachers need to understand include these:

- ELLs already know the structure of their first language, which influences their learning of a new language. When the structure of sentences in the first language is different from that of the second language, ELLs evidently have more difficulties in acquiring English. For instance, in English a subject (S) is followed by a verb (V) and an object (O), such as “I love you.” However, in Japanese, the subject (S) is followed by an object (O) and then a verb (V). In addition, the absence of articles in their L1 such as “a,” “an,” and “the” in their language might challenge ELLs’ English learning. The English language includes this form, but some languages, such as Korean, do not.

- In the process of acquiring L2, ELLs might be conflicted between sustaining their current identity and losing it by using the targeted language. ELLs who are close to the age of puberty, have their cultural self-identity, which they do not want to lose, and accordingly, this identity affects L2 learning. This aspect particularly applies to adolescents who might have more peer pressures than younger ELLs. Indeed, L2 learning is closely related to ELLs’ cultural and social identity (Norton, 2000).

- If the alphabet of the L2 is similar to that of the student’s first language, it is harder for the student to spell and read well in the second language. The similarity of the letters is confusing, and ELLs have a tendency to pronounce the letter as it sounds in their first language (Brown, 2006). The same confusion applies to learning to spell in the L2. For example, ELLs who speak Spanish as their primary language might have more difficulties in spelling accurately since Spanish and English share many alphabet letters.

- ELLs’ content knowledge in L1 and language proficiency level in L2 are different. For instance, some ELLs might already have an understanding of the “food cycle” in their primary language, but they might not express it verbally or in written form in L2. Content area teachers should not assume that ELLs do not understand the food cycle because they are unable to speak about it. In this case, teachers might need to evaluate the content knowledge of ELLs separately from their language knowledge. To evaluate ELLs’ content knowledge, the teacher might allow the students to do their assignment in their first language. When teachers are not able to understand ELLs’ first language, they might use resources including peers in the classroom who can speak the student’s primary language.
Considering these differences between first and second language acquisition, teachers should not routinely attribute ELLs’ slow pace in acquiring the English language to their ability to learn. Although it takes about one or two years to acquire basic English language skills, it might take about five to eight years for ELLs to have a linguistic and academic level in English that is similar to that of their native English speaking peers (Cummins, 2000: Jameson, 1998).

**Third Implication: Implement Cooperative Activities**

Sociocultural theory also implies that regular classroom teachers might need to consider using a lot of cooperative learning activities for ELLs. As Vygotsky (1978) views it, learning is dependent upon the social interactions that take place in the classroom. Given that learning occurs from the social and cultural spaces in the classroom, teachers might need to promote interactions and relationships among students themselves. The rationales that mainstream teachers need to consider for implementing cooperative activities include these:

- Unlike mainstream students in an individual society, many ELLs come from collectivistic societies. Research (e.g., Yoon, 2007) shows that ELLs feel more comfortable when they are involved in a group activity by interacting with peers. Withdrawal from this interaction has perhaps the most harmful effect on English language learning (Pappamihiel, 2002).
- Much research shows the benefits of cooperative learning for ELLs. For instance, positive interdependence is developed by giving individuals specific role assignments within the group through cooperative learning (Cohen, 1994).
- Vygotsky (1978) also emphasized group work by addressing the individual’s cognitive system as being a result of communication with teachers and peers. ELLs, who are mostly anxious in mainstream classrooms before achieving English fluency, need teachers’ careful consideration. By acting as facilitators or guides in a group activity, teachers can assist ELLs’ language and literacy learning.
- In the process of promoting cooperative activities, regular classroom teachers might need to consider power structures in the classroom. Although Vygotsky did not address the issue of power structure in the mainstream classroom, it is important to consider the issue to have the ZPD and language as mediation function successfully. Mainstream teachers might need to take time to think about how mainstream students position ELLs in the classroom. It is important that ELLs are accepted as “legitimate” learners in the mainstream classroom. Building a culturally inclusive and relevant environment is essential for successful implementation of cooperative activities.

Implementing cooperative activities is particularly helpful for the content area teachers in courses such as math, science, and social studies in upper grade levels. These teachers might often be unsure about how to best serve ELLs’ academic, cultural, and social needs in their classrooms.
Fourth Implication: Understand ELLs’ Individual Differences

Sociocultural perspectives also provide insights on how to teach ELLs effectively by understanding their individual differences. Since learning is considered to be a cultural practice, it is important for mainstream teachers to learn about ELLs’ cultural backgrounds. However, ELLs are often treated as one homogenous group. ELLs have different learning styles (Oxford, 1990, 2003) and approach L2 learning with their own strategies, just as their native English-speaking peers do. ELLs need to be understood in several layers, from ethnic identity to individual identity.

Considerations regarding Ethnic Identity

• Students who come from collective societies, such as some found in certain parts of Asia, have a tendency to enjoy group work.
• Some students do not have many opportunities to present in front of peers and teachers in their countries, so expressing themselves in front of a whole class can be “torture.”
• Some students bring different attitudes towards teachers. In many countries, teachers are considered highly authoritative figures. The students in this context usually do not make eye contact with teachers; a behavior that can appear disrespectful to many American teachers.
• Another consideration for mainstream teachers is that ELLs’ attitudes and behaviors can seem strange to mainstream students. Teachers should help mainstream students understand differences. Indeed, these differences should be respected and celebrated. There are many ways to promote understanding of cultural differences; but, among them, the model of the mainstream teacher when interacting with ELLs is key (Yoon, 2007). Through this teacher’s model, students will learn how to respect other cultures and other people as they want to be respected in their own culture.

Considerations for Working with ELLs in terms of Individual Identity

• ELLs who are from the same country approach language and literacy differently. Overgeneralization and stereotypes might be dangerous to understanding ELLs’ learning. Some ELLs might be stronger at listening skills, and some might be stronger at speaking skills. Some students from Asian countries might be more competent at math, but some might not.
• It is important for regular classroom teachers to recognize that one simple method and style of instruction does not fit all students, as they are individually unique (Duffy & Hoffman, 1999; Reiss, 2012). Modified lesson plans and instructions are important for all students, but they are particularly essential for ELLs who are in the situation of having to learn a new language and content knowledge at the same time.
In sum, this conceptual article based on the key concepts of sociocultural theory provides practical applications for effective instruction for ELLs: the teacher’s use of ELLs’ background knowledge, understanding of the different processes of the first and second languages, implementation of cooperative group activities, and respect for ELLs’ individual differences. Given that theories inform practices and vice versa, regular classroom teachers’ consideration of sociocultural theory might be useful for their teaching with ELLs in a regular classroom setting. For future research, this article invites the regular classroom teachers, who apply sociocultural perspectives in their own classrooms, to develop their own theories informed by their practice for ELLs.
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Introduction

Over the thirty years since Gardner (1983) proposed Multiple Intelligences theory, educators have often referred to multiple intelligences as a basis for choosing activities to meet learners’ individual needs. It is true that in teaching one of the most problematic concerns for English teachers is students’ low motivation toward learning, and that factor interferes with academic progress. One possible reason could be a lack of innovative teaching approaches. When teachers merely lecture in a traditional way and assign a uniform activity, students are discouraged. In this environment, it is difficult to expect active involvement of the students in class. Teachers and educators agree that all learners have different needs, interests, learning styles and strategies, motivations, and cognitive abilities, and that the differences directly affect the academic success of the students (Gardner & Hatch, 1990; Moran, et al, 2006; Tomlinson, 1995, 2000). Thus, multiple intelligence theorists claim that teachers should diagnose their students’ personal profiles, provide curricula reflecting students’ diverse intelligences and plan teaching activities that are meaningful for them (Haley, 2004; McMahon & Rose, 2004; Rubado, 2002).

No matter how hard teachers try to involve students in English learning, they may fail to engage their learners if the material they use does not trigger their students’ motivation, learning preferences, or even their multiple intelligences. The traditional way of thinking in Korea is ‘to teach to the average,’ which may result in discouraging struggling and advanced students’ motivation. Gardner & Hatch (1990) claim that students display performance differences depending on activities they are provided. As each activity involves use of different types of intelligence, a student may do well in some activities but may be weak in other areas (Gardner & Hatch, 1990; Rahimi & Abedini, 2009). It is thus important to detect each learner’s learning preference and the proportion of his or her multiple intelligences and then to provide instruction accordingly, to the extent possible.

Review of Literature

Multiple Intelligences

Multiple intelligence theory has emerged largely through the work of Howard Gardner who challenged the definition of intelligence that is assessed mostly by traditional IQ tests (Shearer, 2004). It has been widely assumed that traditional intelligence tests are useful in providing information about learners and their learning style, but the underlying problem with those tests was that the information they provide is about a fairly narrow range of abilities. In other words, there was a deadly weakness in spite of overall strength in those IQ tests in terms of measuring human intelligences, since they focus heavily on a narrow definition of intelligence, one involving verbal-linguistic abilities and logical-mathematical intelligence that students can learn (Fogarty & Stoehr, 2008; Gardner, 2004; Morris, 2004; Schirduan & Case, 2004). Therefore, Gardner argued that human intelligence, to be fully understood, should be perceived in a much wider, holistic way. In this sense, Gardner defined human intelligence as “the capacity to solve problems or to fashion products that are valued in one or more
Based on the biological and cultural research he conducted, he proposed viewing intelligence as a grouping of eight different human intelligences that can account for the diversity of ways in which human beings learn and utilize knowledge. According to Gardner (2004), each individual has all eight intelligences (verbal, logical-mathematical, spatial, kinesthetic, musical, interpersonal, intrapersonal, and naturalistic), although a learner may be weak in some of these intelligences and strong in others. Following is a brief discussion of the eight multiple intelligences proposed by Gardner (Armstrong, 1999; Gardner, 2004):

1) **Verbal-linguistic intelligence**
These learners are strong with words, possess great auditory skills, and enjoy reading. They learn best through hearing and seeing words, lectures, stories, reading, writing, discussing, and memorizing.

2) **Logical-mathematical intelligence**
These learners calculate well, think abstractly and rationally, manipulate abstract symbols, enjoy experiments and puzzles, and ask cosmic questions.

3) **Visual-spatial intelligence**
These learners think in pictures, understand images, visualize in the abstract, are good at jigsaw puzzles, and read maps well. They learn best from using colors, visualizing, using mind maps, and drawings.

4) **Musical intelligence**
These learners are sensitive to patterns, rhythms, sounds, pitch, and tone. They like music, play instruments, and learn best from rhythm, melody, and songs.

5) **Bodily-kinesthetic intelligence**
These learners have keen body awareness, use their bodies effectively, and handle things skillfully. They learn best from touching and moving.

6) **Intrapersonal intelligence**
These learners are self-aware, sensitive to feelings, values, and beliefs, and tend to be shy. They learn best from working alone, reflecting, and doing self-paced projects.

7) **Interpersonal intelligence**
These learners are social and mix well with others. They respond to moods, have a lot of friends, and like group work and conversation. They learn best from sharing, interviewing, cooperating, and participating in pair work.

8) **Naturalistic**
These learners are good at recognizing and categorizing plants, animals, and other things connected to nature, and these learners care about the environment.
### TABLE 1. Summary of Gardener’s Multiple Intelligences (2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbal-linguistic (Word Smart)</td>
<td>words, spoken or written</td>
<td>The ability to use words effectively</td>
<td>talking, listening, reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical-mathematical (Number Smart)</td>
<td>logic, abstractions, reasoning, and numbers</td>
<td>the ability to work well with numbers and/or to be adept at logic or reasoning</td>
<td>balancing checkbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual-spatial (Picture/Reasoning Smart)</td>
<td>spatial judgment and the ability to visualize with the mind’s eye</td>
<td>The ability to visualize pictures or objects in one’s mind</td>
<td>decorating a house, landscaping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical (Music Smart)</td>
<td>sensitivity to sounds, rhythms, tones, and music</td>
<td>The ability to have a good sense of rhythm, enjoy and appreciate music</td>
<td>playing a musical instrument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodily-kinesthetic (Body Smart)</td>
<td>one’s bodily motions and the capacity to handle objects skillfully</td>
<td>The ability to use mental abilities to coordinate bodily movements</td>
<td>playing sports, dancing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrapersonal (Self Smart)</td>
<td>self-reflective capacities</td>
<td>The ability to understand self or self-knowledge</td>
<td>reflecting on one’s goals and beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal (People Smart)</td>
<td>interaction with others</td>
<td>The ability to understand and work with people</td>
<td>encouraging or understanding others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturalistic (Nature Smart)</td>
<td>nature, nurturing and relating information to one’s natural surroundings</td>
<td>The ability to identify and/or a sensitivity to natural forms</td>
<td>gardening, camping</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Multiple Intelligences in Foreign Language Learning

In a foreign language class, ESL/EFL teachers strongly believe that language learning should be taught meaningfully, and there are three key factors to be considered to make this simple idea successful: comprehensible input, comprehensible output, and negotiation of meaning (Omaggio-Hadley, 2001).

### Comprehensible Input

The ‘comprehensible input’ hypothesis, first proposed by Krashen (1985), argues that foreign language learners acquire language by hearing and understanding messages which are just a step beyond their
current knowledge level and are complemented by a variety of inputs: auditory, kinesthetic, visual, and so on. As occurs with learning of the first language, learners attach meaning to words when the words are supported by such input. For instance, young learners start to recognize what the term, ‘car’ means by hearing the word and seeing the object of a real car, and they come to understand what ‘painting’ means by seeing a painted picture or by painting a picture. However, each child processes input differently depending on his/her style, so it is important for classroom teachers to introduce new vocabulary with a variety of stimuli to engage their multiple intelligences.

**Comprehensible Output**

The second important factor that foreign language teachers should consider is the ‘output hypothesis.’ The concept of comprehensible output was first introduced by Swain (1985), who claimed that there are four functions of output: 1) fluency, 2) noticing/triggering, 3) hypothesis testing, 4) metalinguistic (reflective). First, the claim of the fluency function is that it provides language learners with opportunities for developing automaticity in language use. In order to have fluent productive performance, learners must have opportunities to use their knowledge in meaningful contexts. The noticing/triggering function is activated when language learners notice that they do not know how to say or write precisely the meaning they wish to deliver as they are working to produce the target language. Next, the hypothesis testing function explains the importance of interaction with teacher and peers within the classroom in assisting language learners to improve their grammar. By receiving feedback, learners are likely to modify their output and produce the target linguistic items correctly. Finally, the metalinguistic (reflective) function of output is to use a language in order to reflect on the language produced by others or the self. When language learners reflect upon the language they learned, they are able to control their output and internalize their linguistic knowledge.

**Negotiation of Meaning**

Negotiation of meaning is the process that language learners go through to reach a mutual understanding of each other’s meaning. Pica (1994) emphasized that joint effort is necessary between speakers in a conversation. As they talk, they negotiate and co-construct meaning together. They work linguistically to achieve the needed comprehensibility, whether repeating a message, changing its words, or modifying its form and meaning. This negotiated meaning is both personal and cultural. According to Omaggio-Hadley (2001), once language learners have reached the point of mastering these skills, they should be given relevant activities that emphasize the use of the language for purposeful communication.

**Multiple Intelligences and Language Learning**

The use of Multiple Intelligences theory provides an important vehicle for helping students learn languages, and it provides a way to work across cultural, educational, and ability differences. Each learner has a profile of abilities across all of the eight different intelligences. When teachers are aware
of the learning styles of their own learners, they can better facilitate the process of learning in their classes. Table 2 below gives a helpful listing of specific learning activities teachers can use to provide a learning environment that activates multiple intelligences. This table was adapted from one in Teacher Vision (2013).

TABLE 2. Multiple Intelligences Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbal-Linguistic</th>
<th>Logical-Mathematical</th>
<th>Visual-Spatial</th>
<th>Bodily-Kinesthetic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>choral speaking</td>
<td>problem solving</td>
<td>graphing</td>
<td>hands on experiments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>declaiming</td>
<td>measuring</td>
<td>photographing</td>
<td>activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>storytelling</td>
<td>coding</td>
<td>making visual metaphors</td>
<td>changing room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>retelling</td>
<td>sequencing</td>
<td>making visual analogies</td>
<td>creative movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speaking</td>
<td>critical thinking</td>
<td>mapping stories</td>
<td>going on field trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>debating</td>
<td>predicting</td>
<td>making 3D projects</td>
<td>physical education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>presenting</td>
<td>playing logic games</td>
<td>painting</td>
<td>activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reading aloud</td>
<td>collecting data</td>
<td>illustrating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dramatizing</td>
<td>experimenting</td>
<td>using charts</td>
<td>crafts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>book making</td>
<td>solving puzzles</td>
<td>using organizers</td>
<td>dramatizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nonfiction reading</td>
<td>classifying</td>
<td>visualizing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>researching</td>
<td>using manipulatives</td>
<td>sketching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>listening</td>
<td>learning the scientific</td>
<td>patternning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>process writing</td>
<td>model</td>
<td>visual puzzles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writing journals</td>
<td>using money</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>using geometry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Musical</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>humming</td>
<td>classroom parties</td>
<td>personal response</td>
<td>reading outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rapping</td>
<td>cooperative learning</td>
<td>individual study</td>
<td>cloud watching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>playing background music</td>
<td>sharing</td>
<td>personal goal setting</td>
<td>identifying insects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patterns</td>
<td>group work</td>
<td>individual projects</td>
<td>building habitats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>form</td>
<td>forming clubs</td>
<td>journal log keeping</td>
<td>identifying plants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>playing instruments</td>
<td>peer teaching</td>
<td>personal choice in projects</td>
<td>using a microscope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tapping out poetic rhythms</td>
<td>social awareness</td>
<td>independent reading</td>
<td>dissecting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rhyming</td>
<td>conflict mediation</td>
<td></td>
<td>going on a nature walk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>singing</td>
<td>discussing</td>
<td></td>
<td>planting a garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cross age tutoring</td>
<td></td>
<td>studying the stars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>study group</td>
<td></td>
<td>bird watching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>brainstorming</td>
<td></td>
<td>collecting rocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>making bird feeders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>going to the zoo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Methods

Research Questions

The purpose of this quantitative case study was to investigate the relationship between the measured multiple intelligences of Korean elementary students in an EFL class and the types of learning activities they were being provided in this class. As shown as below, this study sought to discover the most dominant intelligence students had and what kinds of class activities students were given frequently in the class.

• What is the most dominant multiple intelligence area of all eight categories for Korean EFL elementary school students?
• How does each of the multiple intelligences relate to other areas of intelligences?
• What kinds of class activities are students mainly given in the class and what intelligence area is the most related to the activities assigned?

Research Subjects

The participants for this study were 95 EFL students from a public elementary school in Kyungin Province, Korea. At the time of the research in 2011, these students were all in the 6th grade, studying English as a foreign language. They were divided into three class sections, and each section met for 40 minutes a week for ten weeks. These students had begun to study English in 3rd grade and were, at the time of the study, at basic and intermediate levels in English. Since the class was offered as an after-school opportunity, student participation was not mandatory. Of the 95 students in this research study, all participated consistently from the beginning of the research to the end.

Research Instruments

In order to gain a better understanding of how Multiple Intelligences theory applies to classroom teaching, the teacher designed special lesson plans, which were primarily based on the regular reading-writing activities. Those activities were created to specifically cause students to learn with all of the multiple intelligences with reference to the work of Puthikanon (2007). As shown as below, the activities in these lessons involved each of the eight intelligences.

• Flow 1: Ask students to find the title of the book and the pictures in the cover and back page. (linguistic/spatial)
• Flow 2: Ask students to read only the opening part and work in small groups to write down their guesses about the story in the book. Then, have students read their predictions out loud to the class. (linguistic/ interpersonal/ logical-mathematical)
• Flow 3: Distribute ten randomized cards with descriptions of the events of the story. Ask students to work together with other group members to arrange the cards in appropriate order according to the plot of the story. (logical-mathematical/linguistic/interpersonal)

• Flow 4: Have students do a role-play of the story. As preparation, ask students to choose music, which matches the plot to play during the performance of their little drama. (musical/bodily-kinesthetic)

• Flow 5: Ask students to write a letter to the author of the story including their questions about the story and offering their responses to it. (intrapersonal/linguistic)

Also, as a part of this research study, a survey questionnaire titled ‘Multiple Intelligence (MI) Inventory Check Sheet’ (see Appendix) was given to each student to assess his/her multiple intelligences. This questionnaire was adapted and modified from information on McKenzie (2013)’s website, http://surfaquarium.com/MI/criteria.htm. The check sheet was organized by the eight MI categories (verbal-linguistic/logical-mathematical/visual-spatial/bodily-kinesthetic/musical/interpersonal/intrapersonal/naturalistic), with eight statements for each intelligence, a total of 64 items. Students responded to each statement using a 5-point Likert scale.

Data Collection & Analysis

Before doing the Multiple Intelligences (MI) Inventory check sheet, the participants were informed of the purpose of this study and were instructed on what the terminology in the questions meant. After the participants finished, the results of the surveys were analyzed using frequency analysis and then were computed and tabled to gauge the agreement between the students’ dominant MIs and the teacher-provided activities. The quantitative data collected were analyzed using the SPSS (12.0 for Windows) statistical package. First of all, the reliability of the items of the questionnaires was analyzed by Cronbach \( \alpha \). Then, a correlation analysis, a paired-sample t-test, and a GLM-repeated-measure ANOVA were conducted to see the relationship between the MI Inventory results and the teacher-provided activities.

Results and Discussion

From each student’s MI Inventory, the following responses were collected: scores on the verbal-linguistic (VL), logical-mathematical (LM), visual-spatial (VS), bodily kinesthetic (BK), musical (M), interpersonal (INTER), intrapersonal (INTRA), and naturalistic (NA). In order to examine the internal consistency among items in the MI Inventory, Cronbach \( \alpha \) was used. The results reported the total reliability of Cronbach \( \alpha \) was .85 among each of the MI categories. For the related activities/tasks, the reliability (Cronbach \( \alpha \)) was .88. Both of the analyses were thus considered highly reliable because they were greater than .70. The kurtosis and skewness of both the MI and MI-coded activities were in the range of ±2, which proved that each category was homogeneous.
What is the most dominant multiple intelligence area of all 8 categories for Korean EFL elementary school students?

The dominant intelligence was determined based on the raw data obtained from the MI check sheet and the students’ responses to the statements that best described how they acquire knowledge in English. As Table 3 indicates, descriptive statistics of the intelligences suggests that, overall, students tended to score high on visual-spatial, musical, and interpersonal intelligences. Of the high-scoring intelligences, interpersonal was the highest at the mean score of 2.75. The second highest intelligence was musical (M=2.73). The lowest of all eight categories was in logical-mathematical intelligences (M=2.26). To see the significance of the differences, an ANOVA test was conducted. The analysis of multi-variance revealed that verbal-linguistic and intrapersonal intelligences were significantly different at the level of p<.001, logical-mathematic and bodily-kinesthetic intelligences showed the significance of .01, and overall significance was .002.

TABLE 3. Descriptive Statistics of MI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MI</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Skew</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VL</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.56</td>
<td>29.92***</td>
<td>&lt;.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>10.65**</td>
<td>&lt;.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.62</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>&lt;.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>&lt;.284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BK</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>14.26**</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTER</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>&lt;.540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTRA</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>29.92***</td>
<td>&lt;.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>25.50***</td>
<td>&lt;.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note 1: N=95, *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001
*Note 2: VL=Verbal-Linguistic Intelligence, LM=Logical-Mathematical Intelligence, VS=Visual-Spatial Intelligence, M=Musical Intelligence, BK=Bodily-Kinesthetic Intelligence, INTER=Interpersonal Intelligence, INTRA=Intrapersonal Intelligence, NA=Naturalistic Intelligence

How does each of multiple intelligences relate to other areas of intelligences?

It is apparent that there were some positive and negative relationships between intelligences. A Pearson correlation analysis was conducted to examine the relationships between each of the intelligences. Analysis revealed the following positive associations between the intelligences.
TABLE 4. Positive Relationships between Intelligences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>verbal-linguistic</td>
<td>logical-mathematical</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verbal-linguistic</td>
<td>intrapersonal</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logical-mathematic</td>
<td>bodily-kinesthetic</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logical-mathematic</td>
<td>intrapersonal</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>visual-spatial</td>
<td>bodily-kinesthetic</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>visual-spatial</td>
<td>interpersonal</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bodily-kinesthetic</td>
<td>interpersonal</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Negative associations were found as follows, but these results were not statistically significant.

TABLE 5. Negative Relationships between Intelligences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>logical-mathematic</td>
<td>musical</td>
<td>&lt;0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>musical</td>
<td>intrapersonal</td>
<td>&lt;0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interpersonal</td>
<td>intrapersonal</td>
<td>&lt;0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What kinds of class activities are students mainly given in the class and what intelligence area is the most related to the activities assigned?**

In order to reflect the intelligence areas involved in the class activities, a total number of 6 handouts and 8 worksheets given in the class were gathered and analyzed. Those tasks were created on the basis of the reading-writing activities that the teacher regularly prepared and used. Descriptive statistics of activities (Table 6) showed that verbal-linguistic related activities (the mean score of 2.52) were the most frequently provided at the significance level of .001. Next, logical-mathematical and musical related activities were frequently provided but were not statistically significant. Then, interpersonal, bodily-kinesthetic, intrapersonal activities were provided in order. Overall significance differences between activities were found in the ANOVA test at the level of p<.001.

TABLE 6. Descriptive Statistics of Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Skew</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VL-activities</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>126.31***</td>
<td>&lt;.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM-activities</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.88</td>
<td>10.03**</td>
<td>&lt;.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS-activities</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>28.74***</td>
<td>&lt;.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-activities</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>&lt;.334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BK-activities</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>&lt;.980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTER-activities</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>25.90***</td>
<td>&lt;.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTRA-activities</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>126.31***</td>
<td>&lt;.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA-activities</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>&lt;.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order to examine a match between the intelligences and class activities, a paired samples t-test was used, shown below in Table 7. The results showed that for all except logical-mathematical intelligences (.290), and verbal-linguistic intelligences (p<.01), all of the other six intelligences and their pertinent activities were significantly correlated at the significance level of p<.001.

**TABLE 7. Paired Samples t-test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pair 1 VL act-mean &amp; VL-mean</td>
<td>.344</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.007**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pair 2 LM act-mean &amp; LM-mean</td>
<td>.354</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pair 3 VS act-mean &amp; VS-mean</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.704</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pair 4 M act-mean &amp; M-mean</td>
<td>-.098</td>
<td>.582</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pair 5 BK act-mean &amp; BK-mean</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pair 6 INTER act-mean &amp; INTER-mean</td>
<td>-.399</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pair 7 INTRA act-mean &amp; INTRA-mean</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pair 8 NA act-mean &amp; NA-mean</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note 1: N=95, *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001
*Note 2: N=95, VL=Verbal-Linguistic Intelligence, LM=Logical-Mathematical Intelligence, VS=Visual-Spatial Intelligence, M=Musical Intelligence, BK=Bodily-Kinesthetic Intelligence, INTER=Interpersonal Intelligence, INTRA=Intrapersonal Intelligence, NA=Naturalistic Intelligence

Conclusions and Suggestions

**The Major Conclusions of the Present Research**

First, the MI Inventory revealed that, for the students in the study, the most dominant intelligence was interpersonal, and the second most dominant was musical. It also revealed that the least dominant areas were logical-mathematical and verbal-linguistic.

Second, a correlation analysis revealed a positive correlation between these pairings of intelligences: verbal-linguistic and logical-mathematical, verbal-linguistic and intrapersonal, logical-mathematical and bodily kinesthetic, logical-mathematical and intrapersonal, visual-spatial and bodily-kinesthetic, visual-spatial and interpersonal, and bodily-kinesthetic and interpersonal.

Third, the activities most frequently provided by the teacher during the class were verbal-linguistic and logical-mathematical, whereas the students’ dominant MIs were interpersonal and musical activities. In other words, there was a mismatch between the students’ dominant intelligences and the teacher-provided activities in the class.
Suggestions for Teaching

This case study shows that the learning activities the teacher designed and provided did not give much consideration to the learning styles of the students being taught. The young learners had difficulty trying to learn in styles they were not strong in. The mismatch in styles made their process of learning more difficult, slower, less efficient, and less effective than it might have been with activities that were more thoughtfully designed. Therefore, it is very important for teachers to pay more attention to the learning styles of the students. If the teaching activities can be designed and prepared on the basis of Multiple Intelligences theory, then that conscious effort will help students to maximize their learning and to improve their academic performance.

Implications

Although the present research has come up with some important findings, there are a few limitations. The MI survey was conducted only once, and it is difficult to assess students’ actual intelligences based on only 64 statements. Further experimental research should include classroom observation and learning portfolios. Also, the subjects were 95 Korean EFL elementary school students, so that the results may not be generally applicable to all school circumstances.
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**APPENDIX**

**Multiple Intelligences Check Sheet**

Please complete each section by placing a ‘1-5’ (Strongly Disagree – Strongly Agree) next to each statement you feel accurately describes you.

*Note: 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neutral, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree

### Section 1 – This indicates your Verbal-Linguistic strength.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>Foreign languages interest me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>I enjoy reading books, magazines and web sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>I keep a journal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>Word puzzles like crosswords or jumbles are enjoyable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>Taking notes helps me remember and understand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>I faithfully contact friends through letters and/or e-mail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>It is easy for me to explain my ideas to others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>I write for pleasure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 2 – This indicates your Logical-Mathematical strength.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>I am known for being neat and orderly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>Step-by-step directions are a big help.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>Problem solving comes easily to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>I get easily frustrated with disorganized people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>I can complete calculations quickly in my head.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>Logic puzzles are fun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>I enjoy troubleshooting something that isn't working properly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>Things have to make sense to me or I am dissatisfied.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 3 – This suggests your Visual-Spatial strength.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>I enjoy creating my own works of art.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>I remember better using graphic organizers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>I enjoy all kinds of entertainment media.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>Charts, graphs and tables help me interpret data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>A music video can make me more interested in a song.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>I can recall things as mental pictures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>I am good at reading maps and blueprints.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>I can visualize ideas in my mind.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section 4 – This suggests your Musical strength.

- I focus in on noise and sounds.
- I enjoy making music.
- I respond to the cadence of poetry.
- I remember things by putting them in a rhyme.
- Concentration is difficult for me if there is background noise.
- Listening to sounds in nature can be very relaxing.
- Musicals are more engaging to me than dramatic plays.
- Remembering song lyrics is easy for me.

### Section 5 – This tells your Bodily-Kinesthetic strength.

- I learn by doing.
- I enjoy making things with my hands.
- Sports are a part of my life.
- I use gestures and non-verbal cues when I communicate.
- I love to dance.
- I like working with tools.
- Hands-on activities are fun.
- I live an active lifestyle.

### Section 6 – This shows your Interpersonal strength.

- I learn best interacting with others.
- I enjoy informal chat and serious discussion.
- I often serve as a leader among peers and colleagues.
- I value relationships more than ideas or accomplishments.
- Study groups are very productive for me.
- Friends are important to me.
- I belong to more than three clubs or organizations.
- I dislike working alone.
Section 7 – This reflects your Intrapersonal strength.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>My attitude effects how I learn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I like to be involved in causes that help others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I am keenly aware of my moral beliefs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I learn best when I have an emotional attachment to the subject.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fairness is important to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Social justice issues interest me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Working alone can be just as productive as working in a group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>When I believe in something I give more effort towards it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 8 – This reflects your Naturalist strength.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I enjoy categorizing things by common traits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ecological issues are important to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Classification helps me make sense of new data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I enjoy working in a garden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I believe preserving our National Parks is important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Putting things in hierarchies makes sense to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I enjoy studying biology, botany and/or zoology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I pick up on subtle differences in meaning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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