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ABSTRACT

This project presents an in-service program for teachers that demonstrates how to teach writing through the Building Written Language program. The in-service program provides teachers with the support they require to address the writing needs of their students. The Building Written Language program integrates writing instruction for second language learners at all levels of language acquisition. This project justifies the Building Written Language program through a review of the history of second language acquisition theory and instruction. This review emphasizes the increasing importance of writing to second language instruction, both as a result of new understandings in the field of linguistics and changes in societal needs.

Public education provides access for non-native English speakers to the English language. Students who can write well in English have more opportunities for academic success. Teachers who deliver English instruction are in need of support and advice as to how to best teach a second language.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Background of the Project

Language is a preeminent trait of the human species. Language allows humans to work with others, to share ideas, to think and influence the very thoughts of others. Language binds people into communities and societies. Language has created peace among people, but also has provided the fuel to feed war. Knowing the English language is important to obtaining full access to opportunities within the United States. Moreover, it is fast becoming the language of choice for managing political and business affairs throughout the world.

Growing Numbers of Second Language Speakers

The number of students in the United States needing instruction in English as a second language is growing. According to Freeman and Freeman (1994) between the 1985-86 school year and the 1989-90 school year this growth was from 1.5 million to 2.1 million and it is continuing. These students represent many cultures and many languages. They need English in order to obtain equal access to opportunities in the United States. In the past, jobs that did not require skilled labor were more readily available. Today, the technological and information age requires a highly skilled labor force, with higher education and facility with the English language. Participation in the political process also requires citizens with sufficient education and English
skills to be able to read and understand complicated political and economic issues. To be a success in the United States today requires more than conversational proficiency in English; it requires full literacy.

The Role of Public Education and Teachers

Learners of English as a second language need access to good second language acquisition programs, programs that provide the kind of English they need for equal access to opportunities.

Public education in the United States is available to all and it can be a bridge to success. It is through the public schools that non-native-English speakers can learn English, gain a good education and, therefore, access more opportunities. This presents a great challenge to public schools. How is a second language successfully taught in a classroom setting? How can issues of cultural diversity be addressed? How can bilingualism or even trilingualism be maintained? How can community opinions and even prejudices be discussed without creating division? The challenges to public schools are many and the needs of the children cannot wait. Thoughtful solutions are required.

The education of teachers in successful methods of instructing English language learners is an important part of meeting this challenge. Teachers who deliver English instruction are in need of support and advice as to how to best teach a second language. Often, they have not had
classes that address the practicalities of day-to-day second language teaching, classes that offer methodology and lesson ideas based on sound practices for English Language Development (ELD). Other teachers may have had training long ago which did not include current theories of second language acquisition. Equipped with knowledge on how to instruct learners of English as a second language, teachers gain confidence that the decisions they make for students in their classrooms are beneficial. This confidence is important in today’s challenging educational climate.

Purpose of the Project

The purpose of this project is to provide an instructional program for students learning English as a second language that will meet their academic needs and facilitate full literacy. A second purpose is to design a unit for a teacher in-service program that introduces and makes accessible instructional theory and practices.

The distinction between conversational and academic language proficiency is important to an instructional program that has as a goal full literacy for second language English learners. Cummins (1994) describes this as a contrast between Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS) and Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP). Although oral language can be both conversational and academic, it is written language that falls more readily into the category of academic language, and it is written language that is the
focus of this project. Written language is what allows communication to bridge gaps of time, space, and acquaintance (Pinker, 1994). Putting thoughts into writing is a process that can enhance thinking, a process important to the development of full literacy in English.

Appropriate in-service instruction for teachers is a key factor in the implementation of an English Language Development program. It is teachers who must administer programs in the classroom and adapt them to their students. Not only do they need to learn instructional methods, but they need to understand the philosophy that supports these methods. Understanding the philosophy provides security for teachers, so they can defend their use of certain instructional methods.

Content of the Project

The content of this project is directed toward the goal of promoting literacy in English as a second language through writing. This project introduces a writing program called Building Written Language and furnishes lesson plans for introducing the program to teachers.

The literature review in this project provides the theoretical support for the Building Written Language program and the background information necessary to introduce the program to teachers. The review includes an examination of the empirical and rationalist approaches to second language learning. This examination traces the increase in the
importance of writing as a part of instruction. It also provides information that allows teachers to determine how their philosophy and approaches to language instruction compare to current and past theory. They can ask themselves, "Am I using strategies that reflect a sound theoretical base, or am I using outdated methods?"

A review of the Monitor Model by Krashen presents practical strategies and approaches to second language acquisition. Although this model is often challenged, it provides important information about comprehensible input, the affective needs of students, and the developmental stages of language acquisition.

An examination of writing discourse and writing instruction furnishes information explicit to the task of second language writing and literacy development including the following: current research in writing; the importance of writing to academic success and language learning; the place of writing in all stages of language development; and strategies and writing approaches to develop successful second language writers.

A model and three tables explain and promote understanding of the Building Written Language program. The model demonstrates how three different writing approaches work together to facilitate second language instruction in writing. The three tables facilitate a deeper understanding of the model and the theoretical foundations that support it.
An instructional unit provides lessons to practicing teachers in the use of this writing program. The unit introduces teachers to the three writing approaches that utilize the model and the three tables.

Significance of the Project

The Building Written English program, which is the focus of this project, provides the writing that is critical to helping non-native students become fully literate in English. Applied in the classroom, the Building Written Language program will facilitate second language writing by providing instruction that builds written language toward a goal of full academic literacy. The program can meet the writing needs of second language students at their particular level of language acquisition. It provides a thoughtful instructional plan based on current theory and on strategies that are clear and practical.
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Second language instruction has evolved under the continuing influence of prevailing linguistic and learning theories. The study of the history of methods of instruction and their theoretical background is important to an understanding of second language instruction today. This understanding provides the basis for current development of effective second language instructional theories.

The first two sections of this paper will cover the empiricist and rationalist approaches to second language instruction and their relation to contemporary linguistic and learning theories. The third section will examine Krashen’s Monitor Model of second language acquisition which has had a great influence on current practices of second language instruction. The fourth section is a discussion of pedagogy in written discourse, including a history of instructional approaches and research in second language writing. In the last section, writing instruction will be investigated, including several writing methods and the influence of the whole language approach, which represents integrated language learning and includes a place for writing through all stages of language acquisition.

The Empiricist Approach to Second Language Acquisition

Before the Empiricist Approach

From the end of the 1800’s to the middle 1900’s, instruction in a second language was founded on a
prescriptive model of grammar. Within this model, Latin was considered the exemplary language as it had been since the Middle Ages. The study of English consisted of forcing English to conform to Latin grammar. Little attention was paid to language as it was actually being used; rather, the focus was on proscribing how language should be used according to the rules of classical grammar (Diaz-Rico & Weed, 1995).

Prescriptive grammar gave rise to the grammar-translation method for teaching second languages, which was popular in both Europe and America. Instruction followed an orderly pattern and usually included a short reading, often concerned with the target language culture or literature, and including appropriate vocabulary lists, worksheets for practice, and grammar discussions (Freeman & Freeman, 1994). Students memorized the word lists and translated from their native language to the target language and vice versa. Original constructions of language were not encouraged. The goal was to expand the intellect by doing exercises and to translate and read works of literature from the foreign language (Larsen-Freeman, 1986).

Foundations for the Empiricist Approach

The need for a new approach to teaching a second language arose during World War Two (Freeman & Freeman, 1994). At that time, there was a demand for espionage agents in the military. It had become obvious that the grammar-
translation method did not produce effective speakers of a second language. An approach was needed that focused on the reality of language as it is actually used and not on archaic theories of how language ought to be. An approach was established that combined the linguistic theories of the time with behaviorist theories from psychology.

Linguists began to examine languages in a new way. They began to study languages as they actually were (Freeman & Freeman, 1994), studying the structural patterns of languages and promoting a descriptive linguistics. Linguists studied older forms of languages and examined change over time. They studied how words originated, examined the sounds of languages, and wrote dictionaries and established grammars for the languages they studied. This intensive study of languages led to the organizing of languages into the subsystems of phonology, morphology, syntax, and semantics. These distinctions are important today in discussions of language learning.

During this time, behaviorist theory was popular in psychology and was influencing ideas about learning in many fields (Diaz-Rico & Weed, 1995). As with descriptive linguistics, the behaviorists were concerned with what could be observed. Learning was seen as the mastery of habits and the student as needing appropriate rewards that reinforce correct behaviors. Practice and repetition were important because learning takes place by operant conditioning. B. F.
Skinner's behaviorist theory of language, learning, and the mind as stated in his book, *Verbal Behavior* (1957), had great influence in establishing the premise that language is learned through verbal input.

The behaviorist position influenced thinking not only about the acquisition of the first language, but the acquisition of second languages as well (Freeman & Freeman, 1994). First is the assumption that language is speech, but it is not writing. According to Bloomfield (1933), this is supported by the fact that in all societies there is speaking, but not always writing, and there are no societies that have just writing. Writing is not the essential component of language. Also, children as normally speak first and then learn to write. The skills of listening/speaking, reading, and writing should not be integrated, but rather taught step by step each building on the other.

Second, the behaviorists took the position that speech is mimicry (Gass & Selinker, 1994), that speaking is a matter of imitating the language to which one is exposed. According to behaviorism, language is a set of habits learned as a child. This language grows through analogizing from what is already known using the speech of those in the environment as a model. A child’s speech is perfected as the results are, or are not, supported by the language-proficient adults in the environment. Language is therefore habit and learned through stimulus and response (Bloomfield, 1933).
Third is the behaviorist notion of transfer. Transfer is the psychological process whereby learning in one situation is applied to another situation. What is important is that learning can be carried over to a new task. Transfer can be positive or negative depending upon whether it facilitates or interferes with learning. If it facilitates, it is called positive transfer. If it interferes, it is called negative transfer. When looking at transfer, it is important to note that the act of transferring is a process while the result of the transfer (negative or positive) is based on what can be seen, the output (Gass & Selinker, 1994).

The concept of transfer creates problems for second language acquisition because when learning a second language, the first language must be considered. It may facilitate or interfere in the learning process. Because of this, learning a second language is different from learning a first language; learning a second language requires learning a new set of language habits. According to Fries' introduction to Lado's book, *Linguistics Across Cultures* (1957),

Learning a second language, therefore, constitutes a very different task from learning the first language. The basic problems arise not out of any essential difficulty in the features of the new language themselves but primarily out of the special "set" created by the first language habits.

According to Lado (1957), "individuals tend to transfer the forms and meanings, and the distribution of forms and meanings of their native language and culture to the foreign
language and culture” (p. 2) This concept of transfer applied to second language acquisition contributed to the development of contrastive analysis (Gass & Selinker, 1994).

With contrastive analysis, according to Lado, languages are compared structure by structure using the subsystems of morphology, phonology, and syntax that had been established by linguists. The purpose of such study is to determine the similarities and differences between languages and thus be able to predict where the second language learner should find ease or difficulty in learning. If the languages were similar, the learning would be easier and if they were more disparate, the learning more difficult.

From this contrastive analysis of languages came instructional materials designed to meet student needs specifically according to their native language and the target language. Adapted from Gass & Selinker (1994, p. 60), the following are the assumptions about contrastive analysis upon which these materials were based: (a) contrastive analysis is based on a theory of language that claims that language is habit and that language learning involves the establishment of a new set of habits; (b) the major source of error in the production and/or reception of a second language is the native language; (c) one can account for errors by considering differences between the L1 and L2; (d) the greater the differences between L1 and L2, the more errors that will occur; (e) what one has to do in learning a second
language is learn the differences and ignore similarities as new learning is involved; and (f) difficulty and ease in learning are determined respectively by differences and similarities between the two languages in contrast.

There were two differing views of contrastive analysis, one the a priori version or strong version and the other the a posteriori version or weak version (Gass & Selinker, 1994). In the strong view, analysis was used to make predictions about learning and what kinds of instructional materials would create the most success for second language learners. In the weak view, analysis focused on recurrent student errors. Those errors were accounted for on the basis of the differences between the native language and the target language. Eventually, this second view gave rise to error analysis, which will be discussed later.

**Empirical Instruction**

The structural or descriptive approach to linguistics and the behaviorist approach to learning combined to create an empirical approach to second language instruction (Freeman & Freeman, 1994). The linguists introduced two major concepts: the study of the observable features of language as presented in real situations, and the organization of language into subsystems used for describing language. The behaviorists contributed the view that learning is the establishment of habits through stimulus and response, that
the mind is a blank slate, and that learning can transfer from one situation to another.

According to the empiricist perspective, a language is taught using the behavioral strategies of drill and practice to form the habits of a language as described by structural linguists. The premises of the empiricist approach include the following (from, Diller, 1978): (a) Language is speech, not writing; (b) a language is a set of habits; (c) teach the language, not about the language; (d) a language is what native speakers say, not what someone thinks they ought to say; and (e) languages are different.

The Audiolingual Method (ALM) is probably the most popular empiricist method of teaching second language (Freeman & Freeman, 1994). This method stresses oral language, the memorizing of planned dialogues, and drills on the language patterns determined appropriate by contrastive analysis. Grammar, in contrast to the grammar translation method, is not emphasized. The learner is a passive recipient of language. It is assumed that because the student does not know the language, he or she has nothing of importance to contribute to the learning. Mastery is the goal and students are drilled until successful. Learning is teacher centered and accomplished through a series of planned exercises. The teacher is in control of the "one best way" to learn. This empirical form of instruction was based upon the best that was known about pedagogy at that time, but it
was not highly effective. Despite this, the influence of this approach is still evident today in the instructional materials and practices used to teach second language (Freeman & Freeman, 1994).

Research and the Empiricist Approach

Research did not support contrastive analysis and its theoretical base, the behaviorist approach to language learning (Gass & Selinker, 1994). Predictions of the kinds of problems students should have according to contrastive analysis were not borne out. Errors that were predicted did not always occur and errors occurred that were not predicted.

Zobl (1980) studied speakers of English learning French and speakers of French learning English, focusing on word order of the object pronoun and the verb. In French the order is pronoun-verb (I them see) and in English verb-pronoun (I see them). French learners used correct word order when producing English despite the fact that this contradicted French grammar. The English speakers produced incorrect word order. The question is why in one instance the learner has no difficulty in producing a form not a part of their language and in another instance they have difficulty. According to Gass & Selinker (1994) this does not mean that there is no role for native language, but rather suggests that there are other factors to be considered that affect second language acquisition. The role of native language in learning a second language is much more complicated than previously thought.
During the 1960's, the behaviorist theories were further challenged (Gass & Selinker, 1994). Research did not support the idea that language was learned by imitation. Imitation could not explain the behavior of children who were seen as actively trying to make sense of the language around them. One study done by Cazden (1972) is an example of how children do not learn simply by imitation. In this study, conversations such as the following are sited as evidence:

Child: My teacher held the baby rabbits and we patted them.
Adult: Did you say your teacher held the baby rabbits? Child: Yes.
Adult: What did you say she did? Child: She held the baby rabbits and we patted them.
Adult: Did you say she held them tightly? Child: No, she held them loosely.

The appropriate form for the past tense of hold (held) was repeated several times by the adult, but the child did not attempt to alter the form from holded to held. The child did not attempt to imitate adult speech. Studies such as these eventually led to new concepts about the acquisition of second language.

Implications of the Empiricist Approach for Writing

In the past, writing in a second language has not been an important aspect of second language instruction. Before the empirical approach to language learning, the grammar-translation method was in vogue, focusing on translating previously written works. Second language learners focused
on the writing of others and did not create original pieces of writing.

With the rise of the empiricist approach, speaking became the focus. Language was speech and a sequential progression was recommended from listening and speaking, to reading, and finally writing. Writing was not considered important to second language learning and was the last skill to be learned. As research contradicted behaviorism and contrastive analysis, the theoretical base of the empiricist approach was challenged, creating new linguistic theories and the possibilities of new perspectives on writing.

Rationalist Approach to Second Language Acquisition

During the 1950's and 1960's, interesting changes began to take place in the fields of both linguistics and psychology. Linguists were examining older theories closely and developing new concepts about how language is acquired, concepts that reflected a more active involvement on the part of language learners. Psychology about this time was also leaving empiricist theories behind and moving toward a developmentalist view of learning, a cognitive approach which also reflects a more active role for learners.

These changes reveal a new rationalism. There emerged a reliance on reason, on the principle that learners are not a blank slate, but are thinking, thoughtful beings who bring much to the learning process. These changes have influenced second language instruction and have helped propel the study
of second language acquisition into a field of study on its own that draws from other fields such as psychology, cultural sociology, and neuropsychology (Gass & Selinker, 1994).

The Contributions of Noam Chomsky

Noam Chomsky introduced significant concepts into the field of linguistics. In an interview (Gliedman, 1983), Chomsky recalls a breakthrough came when he became convinced that there are unconscious mechanisms that allow for speech to happen, and that language is not learned through habit and memorizing. Transformational or generative grammar resulted from this breakthrough. This grammar theory maintains that the brain transforms sentences by applying phrase and structure rules. Grammar is unconscious and language is considered to be innate. This means that the mind has the potential to internalize grammar rules and use these rules to both create and understand novel sentences the hearer has not experienced before.

Generative-transformational grammar makes a distinction between the observable surface level of language and the deep structure of language, the hidden level of meaning from which the surface language comes (Brown, 1980). According to Pinker (1994), every sentence has two phrase structures, deep and surface. The deep structure takes the meaning to be conveyed and applies the proper rules (such as verbs require an object). When the sentence is spoken (surface structure) the words can be rearranged to reflect many possible ways of
speaking and the syntactic relationship of verb to object may change. Deep structure is transformed to surface structure. This allows for a variety of constructions.

According to Richard-Amato (1996), of more significance than transformational/generative grammar is Chomsky's development of the theories of a Language Acquisition Device (LAD) and Universal Grammar (UG). These new concepts asked linguists to see learners as capable of generating their own learning, as opposed to the predominate theory of the learner as a blank slate.

Chomsky (Gliedman, 1983), defines the LAD as a "language organ," an innate language processor that evolves over time and grows like other body structures. Language learning is a part of the human body's preprogrammed pattern of growth and is activated through natural exposure the surrounding language. Chomsky compares the process to a computer. The brain is preprogrammed in systems such as meaning, syntax, morphology, and phonology. It has a kind of language menu from which to choose and what is selected from this menu depends upon individual experiences and exposure to language forms. The LAD encodes early language experiences in the environment and this encoding in the brain modifies the structure of the language organ. Chomsky gives the example of a cat that is raised in a cage with vertical lines. That cat will encode a better sensitivity to such lines when it is an adult cat. He states that children are not trained to go
through puberty and neither are they trained to learn language. Language learning is an innate, genetic phenomenon processed subconsciously by the LAD.

This definition of the LAD introduces Chomsky's universal grammar (UG). According to Chomsky (Gliedman, 1988, p. 287) universal grammar is "The sum total of all the immutable principles that heredity builds into the language organ." These principles include grammar, speech sounds, and meaning. UG represents the menu or parameters from which spoken language is chosen and the same menu is shared by all languages. What is chosen from the menu of grammatical possibilities affects the other possible choices that can be made. A slight change in just one UG parameter can greatly alter a language, sometimes producing an entirely different language. According to Chomsky, a future goal of research would be to define every language by its choices from the UG menu. Chomsky foresees a linguistic table similar to the periodic table of the elements where all possible combinations for human language are represented.

Interestingly, the LAD and UG not only provide a great variety of languages, but also limit the options for speech. Language can be learned only within the parameters of the UG. It is not possible to learn a language beyond the inherited structures. According to Chomsky (Gliedman, 1983) languages may exist beyond that which humans can perceive. Just as
rays and ultraviolet radiation are invisible, some other languages may be "invisible" to us.


[First is] the creativity of language: children do not learn and reproduce a large set of sentences, but they routinely create new sentences that they have never learnt before. This is only possible because they internalize rules rather than strings of words... [Second,] given the complexity and abstractness of linguistic rules, it is amazing that children are able to master them so quickly and efficiently, especially given the limited input they receive.

According to Chomsky, "We humans have explicit and highly articulate linguistic knowledge that simply has no basis in linguistic experience" (Gliedman, 1988, p. 286).

Chomsky's review of Skinner and his concepts of the LAD and UG began a transformation in linguistics from an empirical to a rationalist perspective. Bruner (1978, p. 245) credits Chomsky for "freeing us from the paralyzing dogma of the association-imitation-reinforcement paradigm." Chomsky does not deny that the mind is capable of behaviorism, but in his view, language is much too complicated to be explained by a behaviorist theory alone. The environment is the source of the language to be learned and is intrinsic to developing...
language, but it is not everything. Chomsky's work stimulated research investigations in language acquisition designed to determine how much of language is innate and how much is learned through experience.

**Research Investigation: Error Analysis**

Research findings did not support the predictions based on contrastive analysis. In 1967, Corder published an article entitled "The Significance of Learner Errors" that cast errors in a new light. According to Corder, errors are important in and of themselves. They give information as to how the learner is attempting to learn a new language by showing the systems they use in order to impose regularity. These errors are indicative of an underlying rule-governed system that the language learner is applying. According to Gass and Selinker (1994) Corder's input marked the emergence of second language acquisition as a field of interest.

Corder (1967) distinguished between mistakes and errors. Mistakes are one-time happenings like "slips of the tongue." The speaker recognizes the error and is able to correct it. Errors are systematic and reoccur. The learner does not recognize the error because it is a part of how he/she perceives the language system that is being learned. An error can exist only in reference to some norm or rule of grammar, and, if no rule is violated in the grammar system, than no error has occurred. Whether or not an error exists is therefore dependent upon perspective. While an instructor may
perceive a grammatical error, learners may not perceive any such error according to their grammar.

From Corder’s concept of errors came error analysis. Research began to center on the language produced by the learner rather than the comparison between the errors made in the target language and the native language as recommended in contrastive analysis. The language of the learner was being seen as a linguistic system of its own and worthy of description. In 1972, the term “interlanguage” was coined by Selinker. Interlanguage is made up of the systematic rules the learner applies while learning a second language. It is dynamic and changes over time as the learner acquires the language. According to Gass and Selinker (1994) the following are the steps taken to use error analysis for instruction: (a) data is collected; (b) errors are identified; (c) errors are classified; (d) the quantity of errors is determined; (e) the source of the error is analyzed; and (f) appropriate pedagogical intervention is determined. Error analysis provides a greater range of possible explanations to account for a learner’s errors.

Error analysis considers two types of errors (Gass & Selinker, 1994). **Interlingual errors** are errors that result from the influence of the native language. This type of error will vary with the learners’ native language. **Intralingual errors** are errors made due to the language being learned and are independent of the native language. It is expected that
errors of this type would occur similarly for all learners of a particular language despite what their native language might be.

Despite the contribution of error analysis to establishing the role of the learner in second language learning, Gass and Selinker (1994) recognize several problems. Among these are the following: first, error analysis relies only on errors and does not consider what the learner does correctly; second, there is difficulty in determining what is an error; third, a discrepancy may exist between the learners language goal and the goal perceived by the researcher; and fourth, it can be difficult to determine the type of error. According to Gass and Selinker "[error analysis] falls short in the analysis of second language data in that it sees a partial picture of what a learner produces of the second language. One cannot hope to appreciate the complexity of the learning situation by studying one biased part of it" (p. 74).

Research Investigation: Morpheme Studies

During the late 60's and early 70's, research was stimulated by Chomsky's theory of the LAD and UG. Studies were conducted by several researchers, but the study most referred to is that of Roger Brown (1973). Brown was looking for similarities in the ways children learn their primary language across different languages. He wanted to determine
whether or not the stages of development would be the same despite the fact that the language forms would be different.

Brown examined the development of 14 morphemes in a longitudinal study of three children. He discovered that while the rate at which the morphemes were learned varied, the order in which they were learned was similar. This study went a long way in supporting Chomsky’s theories and providing evidence that children do have innate language ability that guides them as they learn their primary language.

The question now was, would developmental stages also be found for children learning a second language? Such a finding would have profound ramifications for second language acquisition theory. First, it would support Chomsky’s theory for the LAD and the concept of universal mechanisms for second language acquisition. Second, if a similarity is found, then the native language is not the influencing factory for second language acquisition. If the native language is no longer the influencing factor, then contrastive analysis is no longer viable along with the concepts that support it including transfer of learning and behaviorism (Gass & Selinker, 1994).

Dulay and Burt (1974) were the first to study second language learners in what have been called the "morpheme studies." They began with the hypothesis that there are similarities between first language learning and second
language learning in the acquisition of morphemes. They studied 60 Spanish and 55 Chinese children using the Bilingual Syntax Measure (BSM) to elicit the appropriate grammatical constructions on 9 English morphemes. The results of their study showed a similar acquisition order with a clear hierarchy no matter what the primary language. The role of the native language appears to not be the influencing element, but rather universal developmental factors.

Dulay and Burt (1974) developed what they termed "creative construction" and defined it this way: "the process in which children gradually reconstruct rules for speech they hear, guided by universal innate mechanisms which cause them to formulate certain types of hypotheses about the language system being acquired, until the mismatch between what they are exposed to and what they produce is resolved" (p. 37). This is also referred to as the "mentalist view."

The studies so far were only of children, and in 1974 Bailey, Madden, and Krashen repeated Dulay and Burt's study with adults. They used the same 8 morphemes with 79 adult learners from 12 different languages. Their results were consistent with those of Dulay and Burt.

There were challenges to the morpheme studies. The primary challenge, according to Mitchell and Myles (1998), related to the elicitation technique used. It was believed that the BSM biased the results. Other challenges included
the following: first, the results may differ depending upon whether the study is cross-sectional or longitudinal; second, using a correct form does not necessarily indicate a correct underlying rule structure; third, group data from a mix of languages may obscure individual differences (Gass & Selinker, 1994). Despite these criticisms, the morpheme studies did have a significant impact. The basic arguments held, that children and adults develop accuracy in producing morphemes in a predictable developmental order no matter what the instructional context might be. It did not matter that the order was different than the studies conducted by Brown; second language learners are guided by an internal set of principles independent of their native language (Mitchell & Myles, 1998). This was a strong challenge to contrastive analysis, transfer, and behaviorism. This research supported a new perspective of second language acquisition.

Later studies have found further evidence of stages of language development across languages. One such study is by Ellis (1994) who studied the acquisition of negative markers and learned that children begin by putting the marker outside the sentence structure and later move it into its appropriate place.

After the morpheme studies, the place of transfer in second language acquisition was in debate. To say the native language is not significant to second language acquisition was the way to privilege the cognitive over the behavioral
perspective. Gass and Selinker (1994) propose that maybe one should consider the possibility that transfer is not a result of habit, but may indeed be a cognitive process. This has led to a new perspective on the influence of native language, a view in which the language learners are selective about what they transfer, a view that is more qualitative than quantitative. What is important is how a second language learner uses the native language. This would make transfer compatible with the creative construction view of Dulay and Burt.

In 1976, Sjoholm did a study that supported the concept that learners' judgment does play a part in the influence of native language on second language learning. He compared Finnish-Swedish bilinguals (with Finnish as the primary language) and Swedish-Finnish bilinguals (with Swedish as the primary language). He found that both groups made transfer-induced errors that traced back to Swedish. The primary language was not the determining factor; both groups relied more on the Swedish language and were using learner judgment as to what might work in the second language.

Three factors mentioned by Gass and Selinker (1994) interact together to determine language transfer. First is a learner's psychotypology, or how the native language is organized by the learner. Second is the learner's perception of the distance between the native language and the target language. Does the learner perceive a close relationship or
not? Third is the actual knowledge the learner has of the target language. A prediction is not possible because of the influence of cognition in the process of transfer. What is important is that it is only possible to think in probabilities as to whether or not a learner will be influenced by the native language.

**Cognitive Influences on Rationalist Approaches**

Cognitive theories of learning from the field of psychology contribute to the rationalist approach to language acquisition. They replace the older concept of behaviorism that supported the empirical approach. Cognitive theories of learning had lost favor and were disregarded when behaviorism became popular and investigations in the cognitive approach to learning ended (Gass & Selinker, 1994). Studies in cognitive affects on behavior returned about the same time as the development of transformational/generative grammar and Chomsky’s critique of Skinner. Both psychologists and linguists were becoming dissatisfied with behaviorism and moving toward a rationalist/cognitive approach (Freeman & Freeman, 1994).

Cognitive theories value the mind as an active participant in learning. According to Wittrock (1978), learners search out information in order to solve problems, take what they already know and reorganize it to facilitate new learning, and participate actively in choosing what they will pay attention to as they pursue their goals. This
ability of the mind to participate in learning and transform information is reflected in Chomsky’s model for language acquisition and the research that has followed.

According to cognitive theory, learning is process and not just product. The importance of process is reflected in language acquisition research where the focus is on the internal processes that are taking place when language is learned. In the cognitive approach it is also understood that learning is affected by outside influences such as culture and social interaction. The study of language acquisition now incorporates other fields of study such as psychology and cultural sociology.

Challenges to Chomsky’s Theories of Language Acquisition

Those who criticize Chomsky’s theories emphasize that Chomsky promotes a too-narrow focus and fails to include societal aspects of language learning. While agreeing with Chomsky’s distinction between language competence and language performance, Hymes (1970) felt that a definition of competence as primarily grammar was insufficient and should also include psychological and social factors. He directed attention toward the idea of communicative competence (Diaz-Rico & Weed, 1995). In 1979, Breen and Candlin introduced a communicative competence approach that emphasized negotiation of meaning and suggested a process of socialization.

According to Seidenberg (1997) research into cognition and language learning now encompasses several new fields of
study including neurobiology and cognitive neuroscience. This research is yielding new evidence about brain functions and language learning. It is providing more specific evidence about how the human brain is structured and how it functions, therefore providing new perspectives on second language acquisition.

The Rationalist Approach and Language Instruction

According to Diaz-Rico and Weed (1995), changes in how language learning is perceived began in the late 1950's and are influenced by cognitive theories and Noam Chomsky's transformational grammar. Diaz-Rico and Weed list three major ideas that influence language instruction today.

First, the shift toward a cognitive paradigm means that learning has taken precedence over teaching. What the student learns is the important outcome of the teaching/learning process, not what the teacher does. Second, teaching/learning is maximized when it is compatible with the processes that take place naturally within the brain. Brain-compatible methods of language instruction have been an important outcome of the cognitive revolution. Third, integration of knowledge is an important contemporary theme uniting teaching objectives across content areas (thematic integration), and unifying reading, writing, speaking, listening, thinking, and acting is an overarching principle in today's thinking about language learning. (p. 8)

Diller (1978) contributes a new set of premises on which second language instruction is based. These premises differ radically from those he associates with the empirical approach in which language is learned through stimulus and response. Diller's premises include the following: (a) a living
language is characterized by rule-governed creativity; (b) the rules of grammar are psychologically real; (c) people are specially equipped to learn languages; and (d) a living language is a language in which thinking takes place.

With the new approaches to second language instruction, writing takes on a new role. In the empirical perspective, skills had to be taught in order beginning with listening and speaking and ending with reading and writing. In contrast, in the rational perspective, integration of skills is the goal rather than separation of skills. The focus of instruction is no longer primarily on listening and speaking, but also includes reading and writing.

The Monitor Model for Second Language Acquisition

In the 1970's, Stephen Krashen developed the Monitor Model for second language acquisition. This model consists of five interrelated hypotheses that are based on cognitive psychology and the first language acquisition theories of Chomsky. Krashen's Monitor Model has had a profound affect on second language instruction. According to Richard-Amato (1996) his hypotheses are the most known and most controversial for second language acquisition. They are flawed, but contribute an important emphasis on informal language instruction as opposed to formal instruction with an emphasis on grammatical sequencing. Freeman and Freeman (1994) emphasize the importance of his hypotheses as the basis for many English Language Development (ELD)
instructiohal methods. Diaz-Rico and Weed (1995) describe the importance of his focus on the natural processes in language learning and on authentic communication rather than grammar rules. He has contributed a change in perspective from learning by rules to learning through an environment rich in language, from learning in a conscious manner to learning in a subconscious manner.

What follows is a description and critique of Krashen’s five hypotheses from the Monitor Model. Krashen and Terrell (1983) have applied this model to second language instruction in a method called "The Natural Approach." This method will be discussed with an emphasis on the place of writing in this approach.

Krashen’s Five Hypotheses

The following description of Krashen’s Monitor Model is taken from the book The Natural Approach by Krashen and Terrell (1983). In this book, Krashen’s hypotheses are described as guesses that are well supported by current empirical data, although it was recognized that further research may change them or cause some to be completely rejected. The hypotheses are interrelated and work together to form one coherent theory of how a second language is acquired. According to Krashen and Terrell, "The central hypothesis of the theory is that language acquisition occurs in only one way: by understanding messages. We acquire
language when we obtain comprehensible input, when we understand what we hear or read in another language” (p. 1).

The acquisition-learning hypothesis. Krashen makes a distinction between acquisition and learning. Learning is formal knowing about a language. It is conscious and involves explicit knowledge of the rules of language. Acquisition, on the other hand, involves the use of language for real communication. It is more natural and the awareness of language is implicit. The learner is learning subconsciously and is unaware of learning the rules of language. They are gaining what Krashen calls a “feel” for correctness.

Language learning is supported by grammar-based approaches that emphasize the rules of language and focus on error correction. Conscious knowledge of the rules is the goal and thought to be the best way to learn a second language. According to Krashen and Terrell, “Research in child language acquisition suggests quite strongly that teaching language [in this manner] does not facilitate acquisition. Error correction in particular does not seem to help” (p. 27). This idea is supported with research including that by Brown (1973). Brown’s study showed that parents do not often correct a child’s errors, but rather pay more attention to the substance and meaning of what is being said.

Krashen recommends language acquisition is distinct from language learning. He explains that this concept of distinguishing between implicit and explicit learning is not
new. According to Ellis (1986) this distinction between language acquisition and language learning is the heart of Krashen's theory as it refers to the process of internalizing a second language.

Krashen's hypothesis does not distinguish between the parts of language that are learned and those that are acquired; nor does it specify how acquisition and learning are distinguished in language performance. What he does say is that the processes are different and that both exist in an adult learner of a second language.

The natural order hypothesis. According to Krashen, the grammar structures of a second language are acquired in a predictable order. He does not say that every learner will acquire in exactly the same order, but he does say that there are tendencies for particular structures to be acquired early and others to be acquired later. Variance in the acquisition order can be seen in structures that are usually acquired near to the same time. This natural order, according to Krashen, appears only when the focus is on communication. It is not the order of a learned language as it appears on a grammar test.

Krashen sites several empirical studies to support his hypothesis. These studies include the Brown (1973) morphology studies of children learning their first language, similar studies by Dulay and Burt (1974) of children learning a second language, and the studies of adult second language
acquisition by Bailey, Madden, and Krashen (1974). All of these studies showed an order for the acquisition of morphemes with the order for first and second language acquisition being similar, but not exactly the same.

The monitor hypothesis. The monitor is the result of what is consciously learned. The monitor uses the consciously learned rules of grammar to edit the discourse, written or spoken, of the language learner. The monitor functions only after the acquired system has generated language and this can be either before or after the actual production. If it occurs after, it is called “self-repair.” According to Krashen, there is a distinction between what is acquired and what is learned. What is acquired can both initiate production and self-correction. What is consciously learned can only serve as a monitor or editor.

The monitor has limitations. First is the limitation of time. The performer must have enough time in order to utilize the monitor. Second, the language performer must be focused on form and being correct. Krashen suggests that focusing on form and correctness takes more time and this extra time disrupts conversation. Third, the performer has to know the rule in order to apply it.

According to Krashen, when the monitor is used, the natural order is disrupted. An unnatural order can be observed when the language learner is demonstrating their language knowledge in a structured way, such as on a grammar.
test. When communication is the focus, the conscious learning of the monitor is not used and the errors reflect a natural pattern.

According to Krashen, the monitor is most effective in instances where the learner is making a prepared speech or in writing. In these instances, the limitations are less likely to restrict monitor use. Krashen considers the monitor effective with simple rules of grammar such as the adding of the "s" in the English third person singular and less effective with more difficult rules that may involve semantics or require complex changes in word order.

The input hypothesis. The input hypothesis attempts to explain how language is acquired. It states that language is acquired through input that is both comprehensible and a little beyond our level of comprehension. Krashen calls this \( i+1 \) where "\( i \)" is the learner’s current acquisition level and "\( 1 \)" is the next level in the natural order of acquisition. The focus is on comprehensible input through listening and reading. Speaking and writing, according to Krashen, will emerge later, provided there is enough comprehensible input.

Krashen distinguishes between finely tuned input and roughly tuned input. He explains that finely tuned input that focuses on the "\( 1 \)" of \( i+1 \) is not necessary and that roughly tuned, less focused input will insure \( i+1 \). Krashen refers to this roughly tuned input as the "net." When someone speaks to a language learner using roughly tuned input and the learner
comprehends, the speaker is said to be casting a net around the learner, a net of structures that comprise examples of \( i+1 \). Enough input in this net assures that \( i+1 \) is covered and that language will be constantly reviewed and recycled. Because instruction is a net of structures and examples, the needs of learners at various levels can be met, each taking from instruction (the net) what is appropriate for them. Also, instruction that is not finely tuned can focus on any interesting topics that involve the learners without concern for contriving to provide particular language structures.

Krashen uses caretaker speech as one example of support for his theory of the net and the input hypothesis. Caretaker speech is the speech used by mothers, fathers, and other caretakers when addressing children and has the following qualities: it is motivated by a desire to be understood, not to teach (Newport, Gleitman, & Gleitman, 1977); it is simple structurally and tuned to the level of the child changing as the child grows in ability; it is appropriate to the child's concept of the here and now which gives extralingual support and context to the discourse (Cross, 1977; Newport et al., 1977) and, according to Krashen, therefore provides \( i+1 \). It is caretaker speech that provides the comprehensible input that facilitates the acquisition of language.

Krashen states that second language learners are also exposed to forms of caretaker speech that facilitate comprehensible input. Among these are foreigner talk, teacher
talk, and interlanguage talk. Foreigner talk refers to the changes a native speaker makes in order to be understood by a non-native speaker. These changes include slower speech, repeating, and using yes/no questions, all aimed at the level of the non-native speaker. Teacher talk is foreigner talk in the classroom. It includes all the input needed for classroom management. Interlanguage talk is the speech between non-native speakers. This kind of speech provides some advantages, but it is a question as to whether the disadvantages outweigh the advantages. These forms of speaking aimed at communicating rather than instruction, adjusted to learner level, and offering \( i+1 \) provide the comprehensible input necessary for language acquisition. They aid the speaker in "casting the net" of structure around the learner.

The affective filter hypothesis. The affective filter refers to those attitudinal variables that affect second language acquisition. Krashen refers to Dulay and Burt (1977) who describe the manner in which second language learning is affected by attitudinal factors. They state that learners with optimal attitudes have a lower affective filter and that a lower filter is beneficial to language learning in two ways. First, a low affective filter provides the learner with more input. The more confident the learner, the more likely they are to interact and more interaction means more input. Second, a low affective filter makes the learner more
receptive and open to the input they receive. It is this last benefit that Krashen stresses for its implications in the classroom. To instruct students successfully and help them receive the input, the classroom must promote situations that encourage a low affective filter.

**Other Factors Influencing Second Language Acquisition**

Krashen describes other factors that influence language acquisition. These include aptitude, the role of the first language, routines and patterns, individual variation, and age.

Krashen distinguishes between aptitude and attitude. According to him, aptitude leads to language learning and is demonstrated in success on tests of language skills. Attitude leads to acquired language and communicative success. From this, Krashen makes the inference that attitude is more important to acquiring language than aptitude.

Krashen explains that interference from the primary language has both advantages and disadvantages. As an advantage, it allows the language learner to "outperform competence." This means that when the learner does not know how to form a particular utterance, structures and rules from the primary language can be applied to help. This allows him/her to continue with the conversation gaining more input to help with acquiring the language. As a disadvantage, the use of primary language rules can lead to language errors. These errors can necessitate monitor use and, according to
Krasnen, monitor use does not lead to acquisition. Krasnen recommends that interference from the primary language be kept to a minimum by not requiring learners to speak too early, but rather allowing them to gain competence through input. Then, when they do speak, they will have acquired the necessary language and not need to rely on the monitor or the primary language.

Routines and patterns refer to those phrases and sentences that are memorized and often used in the early stages of language learning. The learner may not understand how the parts interact, but memorization does allow him/her to communicate before they have competence and this communication creates more input. According to Krasnen, this is neither acquisition nor learning. These routines and patterns, while helpful, can also create difficulties; for example, the learner may get into a conversation that is beyond his/her ability to communicate.

According to Krasnen, any variation in learning comes from the influence of the affective filter and the amount of input. Krasnen describes differences in language acquisition that are a result of age. Children are better ultimately in language attainment and adults are faster in the short run. According to Krasnen, children attain more because of a lower affective filter. This filter goes up as children reach puberty and they then become more self-conscious. Adults, however, have the advantage of being better at managing
conversations and controlling the input to make it more comprehensible. They are good at using the primary language to outperform competence and therefore gain more input. They also have more world knowledge and background to be able to make input comprehensible.

With reference to the monitor, Krashen refers to three types of adult second language acquirers. First is the over-user of the monitor. This person is constantly checking for correctness and shows speech that is hesitant, without real fluency. In this case, the learner has a high affective filter with no language acquired through comprehensible input. Second is the under-user of the monitor. This person corrects by "feel" and does not use the monitor even if conditions permit its use relying only on acquisition. Third is the optimal-user. This person uses the acquired language for natural communication and the monitor for planned speaking and writing. Learned competence is used to aid acquired competence.

Criticisms of the Monitor Model

Despite the fact that the Monitor Model is probably the most comprehensive theory of second language acquisition it is seriously flawed (Ellis, 1986). The following is a review of the criticisms for each hypothesis from Krashen’s monitor model.
Acquisition and learning. Ellis (1988) says that "The Acquisition Learning Hypothesis is not acceptable because it cannot be tested in empirical investigations" (p. 317). According to McLaughlin, Rossman, and McLeod (1984), one is unable to inspect empirically the subconscious and unconscious processes presented in the monitor model and this makes this hypothesis unreliable. They recommend that learning and acquisition fall along a continuum between what is conscious and what is subconscious. According to Af Trampe (1994) it is difficult to prove that learning and acquisition are two separate mechanisms and that the idea that they are is unrealistic.

Others question Krashen's non-interface position, that learned knowledge cannot become acquired knowledge. They argue that learning can become automatized through enough practice and that this automatized learning can, over time, become acquired learning. According to Gass and Selinker (1994) it does not make sense that learned information cannot become unconscious fluency because, if this is true, then the same information may be stored in two different places in the brain. This they consider inefficient use of the brain.

Larsen-Freeman (1983) says that this hypothesis does not explain the cognitive processes occurring in learning language and acquiring language, nor does it explain how these two processes differ. What does the learner do with the input? Ellis (1986) says that this is a "black box" theory.
**Natural order.** Criticism of the Natural Order Hypothesis focuses on the lack of evidence for a natural order. According to Gass and Selinker (1994) Krashen bases his hypotheses primarily on the morpheme studies. McLaughlin (1978) states that there is lack of evidence for a natural order, with some longitudinal studies showing variation in learner acquisition. Ellis (1994) also finds evidence that casts doubt on the acquisition of structures in a predictable order.

**Monitoring.** Gass and Selinker (1994) challenge Krashen’s application of the monitor only to language production, to the editing of one’s own utterances. They, along with Morrison and Low (1983), suggest that the “monitoring” of receptive language is not accounted for. According to them, second language learners also apply the monitor when attempting to comprehend a second language.

According to Shannon (1994), it is difficult to verify the validity of the monitor because it is not possible to determine when it is being used. McLaughlin (1978) and Rivers (1980) both criticize that the learner is unable to clearly determine whether they are editing applying the learned rules of the monitor, or editing using the “feel” of acquired language.

Morrison and Low (1983) have a problem with Krashen’s application of the monitor only to syntax. They postulate that learners also edit for pronunciation, lexis, and more
importantly, discourse. Richard-Amato (1996) refers to Krashen's lack of a clear distinction between the monitor and language learning. What is the precise distinction between performance based on rules and the learning of rules?

**Input.** According to Gass and Selinker (1994), validation of the input hypothesis requires defining the \( i+1 \). The levels of learning Krashen refers to need to be established so it is possible to know if input contains the necessary linguistic information. They also ask, "What is a sufficient quantity of input?"

Gass and Selinker (1994) also question how extralinguistic information aids in comprehension and the acquiring of language. According to Diaz-Rico and Weed (1995), caretaker speech is not a universal phenomenon. In some languages and cultures, speech is made comprehensible with extralinguistic knowledge. Perhaps simplified speech is not the most important factor for comprehensible input; maybe of more importance is the focus of the learner and the relevance of the message.

**Affective filter.** Krashen uses the affective filter to explain why success among learners varies and why there are differences between adult and child learners. Dulay, Burt, and Krashen (1982) maintain that the affective filter affects the part of language that one attends to. Gass and Selinker (1994) ask how this selectivity process works. According to Diaz-Rico and Weed (1995) the affective filter cannot be
defined operationally. Greg (1984) describes a Chinese speaker who has learned English and has acquired all the rules except one. He questions how the affective filter can explain the learning of all but one rule.

According to Larsen-Freeman and Long (1991), the affective filter hypothesis is useful only as a metaphor. She raises the following issues: What is an encouraging environment? How can the affective filter be measured? How is it raised and lowered for individual learners?

Richard-Amato (1996) states that despite its flaws, the Monitor Model has changed instruction in the classroom. Teachers are no longer confined to formal, grammatical instruction in the target language. They can now focus on providing ample comprehensible input that is both interesting and personally relevant. This input can be adapted to the needs and interests of the learners and need not be restricted by the sequencing of grammar rules.

The Natural Approach to Language Instruction

The Natural Approach is an instructional method based on the Monitor Model. This method is offered by Krashen and Terrell (1983) and is their recommended approach to encourage the acquiring of language through comprehensible input. They do not purport that it is the only effective approach and say that it has many features of older, traditional methods. They consider it simple to implement, and adaptable to different situations and learners (English as a foreign
language, second language acquisition, children, adults), and to different learning styles. This is an approach that can be an effective part of a program, and need not be the whole program.

Krashen and Terrell (1983) present four principles of the Natural Approach. First is the principle of “comprehension before production.” Listening and/or reading comprehension comes before output. This is based on the assumption the learner must first acquire language through comprehensible input and then that acquired language is what provides for production. The instructor is expected to use the target language, maintain a focus on communication concerning something of interest to the learner, and endeavor always to facilitate understanding.

The second principle states that production will occur in stages. According to Krashen and Terrell, these stages take place in the following pattern: non-verbal communication, single word responses, combinations of two or three words, phrases, sentences, and then more complex discourse. They refer to three stages in their book, *The Natural Approach*. The first is the *comprehension stage*. In this stage the language learner needs time to become familiar with the rhythm of the target language and begin to distinguish words. Learners are usually silent in this period and should not be required to speak. The length of time a learner remains in this stage is variable from a few hours to
months. The Total Physical Response developed by Asher is one good way to encourage participation and provide comprehensible input.

Next is the **early production stage**. Single word responses, two to three word combinations, and phrases are representative of this stage. In this stage the instructor gradually moves from activities with simple yes/no questions to those requiring more complex responses. The last stage is the **extending production stage**. In this stage speech becomes more complex and the learner is both participating in and initiating conversations. At this stage, learners may begin to focus on more academic pursuits if that is their goal.

The stages of second language development are presented in many different formats, from some with four stages to those with six stages. According to Diaz-Rico and Weed (1995), "Regardless of the scale, it is now recognized that, in natural situations, learners progress through stages in their acquisition of a second language. These stages are predictable, and learners advance through them at their own pace" (p. 35).

The third principle for the Natural Approach states that the course syllabus should consist of communicative goals. Classroom activities are to be organized around topics of interest to the students that promote communication and not grammatical structures. The last principle is that classroom instruction facilitate a low affective filter. This requires
that the instructor provide a relaxed and friendly atmosphere in which the potential for language acquisition is maximized. These four principles provide teachers with specific suggestions as to how to approach the teaching of second language students.

The Place of Writing in the Natural Approach

Krashen and Terrell (1983) do not consider writing a goal of language acquisition and minimize the place of writing. Writing becomes a goal only if the learner has a particular use for it. For example, the learner may have plans to get an education in the target language or need to write a business letter. Then writing becomes very important to the learner's success. Speaking, on the other hand, is an important goal because of the role it plays in increasing the amount of input. The more the learner speaks and becomes involved, the more input he or she will receive. Writing does not provide this unless it is done in some kind of exchange process.

Krashen and Terrell (1983) apply writing in the pre-speaking stage, with oral production, and in the practice of monitoring. The place of writing in the pre-speaking stage is primarily to write down vocabulary words. This may make adult learners more comfortable because this is a process they are used to. They recommend in The Natural Approach that only key words be written down so that the learner must rely upon hearing to acquire meaning.
Writing may be a part of oral production. According to Krashen and Terrell, "...writing is not an end in itself but is preliminary to the execution of an activity whose central purpose is to provide an opportunity to interact and gain comprehensible input" (p. 151). Examples given for preliminary writing in the classroom include writing an answer before giving it orally, making writing a part of games, writing a reaction, and filling out charts.

Krashen and Terrell also consider writing a way to practice monitoring. Writing allows for the three prerequisites for monitoring that are not easily met in spoken discourse: time, focus on form, and knowledge of the rule. They refer to two circumstances in which monitoring of writing may be appropriate: first, when the learner is doing grammar exercises focusing on rule learning, and second, when the learner is participating in creative writing and employs editing. Krashen and Terrell note that it is the acquired system that provides the initial creative writing product and recommend that such writing be be encouraged for this reason.

The place of writing within the Monitor Model and the Natural Approach is limited. It is not considered to be of any great help to the actual acquisition of language and its level of importance is primarily dependent upon the goals of the learner. It does, however, have a place as being a form of language that can be more easily monitored and as being an outlet in which acquired language can be demonstrated.
Written Discourse

Written discourse in the first language is a complex process of both motor skills and cognitive strategies. It involves the integration of skills and a developmental process that is unique to each individual. Writing in a second language is even more challenging (Leki, 1992).

The modern era of second language teaching began about 1945 (Silva, 1990). Since that time, the history of second language writing instruction has included a variety of approaches. Although language theory has supported many of these approaches, the theoretical foundations have usually come from first language research (Krapels, 1990). According to Krapels, “Until the 1980’s there was not much [second language] research to draw upon in building theory or planning classes” (p. 37). The following is a review of the history of written discourse in a second language and a summary of the research.

The History of Written Discourse in a Second Language

Silva (1990) views the history of second language writing instruction as a series of approaches that are current for a while and then replaced by approaches representing newer language acquisition theories. These older instructional approaches are important not only to a historical and evolutionary perspective, but also to an understanding of what practices may be in use today. According to Silva, instructional methods remain in use
despite the fact that newer theories indicate that they are ineffective. Silva states that the following approaches remain in use even though they are mentioned in literature only for "ritual condemnation" (p. 13).

**Controlled composition/guided composition.** Until the 1960's, writing was not considered an important aspect of second language acquisition. Most formal second language learning in the United States was confined to citizenship classes where there was little focus on writing (Leki, 1992). Leki explains the goal of these classes in the following way:

[The focus was] on indoctrinating the immigrants into what were perceived as the glories of freedom and opportunity in their new home by teaching enough oral language skills and reading to permit these aspirants to pass the citizenship exam and then, typically, to become fodder in the industrial cannon through low-paying, unskilled jobs, often in factories [where they] were assumed to have little need for writing skills. (p. 4)

After World War II, language theories of the time supported the minimizing of writing (Leki, 1992). When writing was addressed, controlled composition was the common method of instruction.

According to Silva (1990) the controlled composition approach to writing supports the beliefs of the empiricists that language is speech and learning is a matter of habit formation. The goal of controlled composition is accuracy and correctness in writing. To meet this goal, writing is taught as discrete skills. Sentence patterns, grammar, and
worksheets are the focus in the classroom, and students are not encouraged to create original text except as it directly supports skill learning. According to Pincas (1962, p. 186) "not until [patterns] have been learned can originality occur in the manipulation of patterns or in the choice of variables within the patterns."

**Contrastive rhetoric.** During the 1960's, "with the post-Sputnik influx of foreign students to the United States...the English teaching mission expanded to include preparing these non-native students to function in institutions of higher education" (Leki, 1992, p. 5). A need was therefore established to teach students the writing skills that would enable them to succeed in these institutions of higher learning (Kaplan, 1988).

The controlled composition approach was not effective in meeting this need. It produced non-English-sounding writing despite the fact that students had a good understanding of English grammar (Leki, 1992). Contrastive rhetoric was established to solve this problem. This approach was a form of contrastive analysis in writing (Diaz-Rico & Weed, 1995). Contrastive rhetoric assumes that, just as each language has its own particular syntax, each culture has its own manner of presenting ideas (Kaplan, 1966). According to Kaplan, writers do not use the rhetoric that is expected by native readers because the first language interferes with the second at the rhetorical level. Therefore, what is needed in instruction
is drill on rhetorical patterns rather than on syntax, as in the controlled composition approach.

Silva (1990) describes instruction using a contrastive rhetoric approach as concerned with the imitation of larger patterns in writing. Through pattern drill, students employ logic in the arrangement of paragraphs and essay organization. According to Leki (1992, p. 6) "The students imitated the patterns, assuming that by learning these basic patterns, they would then be able to transfer these skills to the writing of acceptable academic prose and pour their writing content into the carefully prepared and practiced molds." This approach to writing continues to be prevalent and found in the instructional materials for second language students. This is in spite of the fact that it is now no longer supported by the literature on second language writing (Silva, 1990).

**Current Approaches to Written Discourse**

The following are approaches to writing that are considered current today. These approaches differ from each other primarily with regard to how the purpose of writing is viewed.

**The writing process approach.** In the 1970's, based on first language research, Zamel (1976) and Raimes (1979) recommended a process approach to writing for second language learners. By the 1980's, this process approach became a focus for second language instructors and researchers.
The process approach presents a different perspective on writing and is supported by the rationalist view of language learning. Silva (1990) describes the process approach to writing as recursive with a focus on composing, content, and the creation of meaning. This description is in opposition to the emphasis on patterns and formulaic writing that was so important in previous approaches. The writing process is about discovery; what is important is that which occurs within writers during the writing process.

Research in second language writing supports the process approach to writing. Among these studies are one by Diaz (1985) and one by Urzua (1987). Through observation of a classroom, Diaz found benefits from process-oriented composition teaching. Diaz concluded "that not only are process strategies and techniques strongly indicated and recommended for ESL students, but also when used in secure, student-centered contexts, the benefits to those students can go beyond their development as writers" (1986, p. 41). Urzua came to similar conclusions about the benefits of process writing through a study of two fourth graders and two sixth graders over a period of six months. Her study revealed that the process approach to writing helped facilitate a sense of audience, voice, and the power of language. The studies of both Diaz and Ursua provided evidence that the writing process approach effective in first language classrooms was also effective in second language classrooms.
The interactive approach. As described by Johns (1990), the interactive approach focuses on the relationship between the writer and the audience. The writer is considered to be in dialogue with the audience. Important to this approach are the cultural differences in how this dialogue between writer and audience is perceived. For example, according to Hinds (1987), in English, the writer is responsible for making sure communication is effective. In contrast, in Japan and possibly other countries, it is the reader who is responsible for understanding what the writer has intended to say. Therefore, to become a successful English writer, it is necessary that students understand the importance of being clear when writing, and to organize carefully, using transitions and arguments that are understandable to the reader.

The social constructivist approach. According to Johns (1990) the social constructivist approach focuses on the discourse community. The form of the writing and the text are dependent upon the particular community for which something is written. Bruffee (1986, p. 777) states, “social constructivism assumes that the matrix of thought is not the individual self but some community of knowledgeable peers and the vernacular knowledge of that community.” Second language learners need to learn the discourse of the community for which they are writing.
An emphasis of this approach is learning the discourse of academia. There are two different approaches for the accomplishment of this goal. First is the perspective that the academic community should change to accommodate other cultures. Second is the perspective that students need to learn the appropriate discourse. This second perspective is addressed by English for Academic Purposes (EAP). According to Horowitz (1986) the process approach does little to prepare students for the academic writing situations they will encounter at the university level. He recommends EAP with a focus on the kinds of conditions students will experience at the university, including researching, organizing, and presenting in the appropriate form. Academia is the goal and the academician is the judge of the final product.

Writing English for special purposes. According to Leki (1992), the concept behind writing English for special purposes is that second language speakers are likely to return to their own country. What they need, therefore, is academic writing skills related to their own specific field of study. All cultures do not value the introspective writing of English, and she considers it an ethnocentric position to assume all students need to learn to relate in this way. What is important is that students learn the writing they need for success in their field of interest.
The goal of writing differs in each approach. According to Leki (1992) it is important that the goal of instruction be clearly understood by the institution, the teacher, and the student. Learning is facilitated when there is agreement on goals or at least an understanding of the differences.

Contributions of First Language Writing Research

Research in first language writing became established in the 1900's, but it was not until the 1980's that research was established focusing on second language learners (Leki, 1992). The following is a brief review of a critical first language study done by Emig (1971) that influenced the future of writing research. According to Krapels (1990), Emig was one of the first researchers to look at the writing process as opposed to the writing product, and she established the primary research design for conducting research into the writing process.

Emig used a case study approach with eight above-average, successful high school seniors. She used many sources of information, including analyzing their written products and extensive interviews. The following are the findings she considers important to supporting a process approach to writing: first, the students found school writing assignments unengaging as opposed to the poetry and stories they wrote outside of class; second, they spent little time planning and revising school assignments, but spent considerable time composing, planning, and revising their
out-of-class writing; and third, school writing was routine and mechanical, with little emphasis on communicating or grappling with ideas.

In her interview process, Emig (1971) used a research design called "think-aloud protocols." "Think-aloud protocols" allow researchers to study the thought processes of writers as they compose by asking them to share what they are thinking as they are writing. It is this research design and her pioneering research into the writing process that make Emig's work important to both first and second language writing researchers.

Summary of Findings of Second Language Writing Research.

The following is a review of research concerned with second language writing, including consideration of what contributes to writing success, the similarities and differences among native and non-native writers, the transfer of first language writing skills, and the influence of topic on second language writing.

Factors contributing to writing success. Composing competence is one of the factors found to be important to determining the degree of success a second language writer will have. Jones (1982) studied both a poor writer and a proficient writer. He found that the more important difference between the two was that the poor writer had not ever learned to compose. Less important to the difference between them was a lack of second language competence. Zamel
(1982) supports Jones' findings and recommends that the writing process be taught to improve writing competence.

Raimes (1985a) as well found that composing competence was more important than linguistic competence, but, in addition, she discovered that the compose-aloud protocol adapted from Emig's study (1971) was an effective instructional strategy. Prior to Raimes' study, in 1984, Pfingstag had come to a similar conclusion. She worked with a Spanish-speaking student with intermediate language proficiency who showed a lack of composing competence. She did a twenty minute compose-aloud session with this student modeling effective composing strategies. According to Pfingstag, subsequent compose-aloud sessions with the student showed an improvement in composing strategies.

Other factors discovered by researchers that influence second language writing success include interest, cognitive academic ability, and over-monitoring of text. Hildenbrand (1985) observed students and found that they preferred creative and personal writing and did less well with academic writing. He infers from this that interest plays a role in writing success. In 1985, a study by Brooks revealed that a lack of cognitive academic development affected the composing skills of second language learners. According to her perspective, cognitive academic development is a somewhat broader concept than the writing competence found to be important to writing success in other studies. Jones (1985)
used Krashen’s Monitor Model to analyze writing behaviors and found that monitoring did not lead to better writing, but rather it restricted the process. He supports process-directed instruction.

The relationships between native and non-native writers. Differences and similarities have been found between native and non-native writers with regard to skill as a writer, writing strategies used, and editing of text. Zamel (1983) discovered a correlation between skilled native and non-native writers and unskilled native and non-native writers. If writers were skilled, they shared similarities despite whether they were native or non-native writers. The same was true for non-skilled writers.

Arndt (1987) studied writing strategies used by six Chinese-speaking students. She found that while there was great variation in their writing strategies as a group, individually they used similar strategies in their first and second languages. The few differences she did find between first and second language strategy use tended to be related to vocabulary. Raimes (1985b, 1987), found differences when she compared her unskilled non-native writers with the native writers in other studies. She discovered that non-native writers “did not appear inhibited by attempts to edit and correct their work” (p. 458). She concluded that while there are similarities between native and non-native writers, there
are also differences that indicate writing instruction should be adapted for second language writers.

**The transfer of first language writing skills.** First-language knowledge of writing has been found to transfer to second language writing. In a longitudinal study, Edelsky (1982) studied 26 first and second grade students and discovered that knowledge of writing in the first language transfers to the second, supporting it rather than interfering. Hall (1987) found that when revising their writing, advanced non-native writers use what they know and have experienced in both the first and second language. He concluded that second language writers use one system to revise in any language.

The amount of first language use varies. Martin-Betancourt (1986) found that the amount of first language used by her subjects was inconsistent. Some used it very infrequently and others went so far as to incorporate translation into the writing process. Chelala (1981) performed one of the first studies of second language writing and her study showed that more effective writers did not go back and forth from primary to secondary language. This finding contradicts the following findings by Lay (1982) and Cumming (1987). Lay found that the more "native language switches" the better the quality of the composition. Cumming found differences between expert and inexpert writers with regard to first language use. Inexpert writers tended to
use the first language to explore ideas; in contrast, expert writers tended to use the first language to explore ideas and check on style. In general expert writers did more thinking in the first language.

Some studies note that first language use frequently involves vocabulary. Jones and Tetroe (1987) studied the planning procedures of six Spanish-speaking second language writers. In this study, they found that a lack of second language vocabulary created the need for first language use when composing. The problem of inadequate vocabulary is also mentioned in the research by Raimes (1985a); however, her study considered both first and second language learners. She found that inadequate vocabulary was a problem for first language writers as well as second language writers.

The influence of topic on second language writing. Studies by Lay (1982), Johnson (1985), and Burtoff (1983) all suggest that the writing topic influences second language writing. Lay found that certain topics created more native language switches. Both Johnson and Burtoff relate the influence of culture-bound topics (topics related to culture). Johnson reported that with culture-bound topics, her subjects relied more on the first language to generate topic ideas. Burtoff considered ninety compositions and discovered that the culture-bound topics affected the organization of the text. The more culture-bound the topic,
the more differences students exhibited in discourse structures.

Krapels (1990) has the following recommendations for future second language writing research: first, that it include research on beginning second language writers; second, that it look at explaining or resolving contradictions in current research; third, that it include focus on the differences between native and non-native writing; fourth, that it examine more closely the influence of rhetorical preferences and the role of cultural background, and fifth, that it include a comparison of the learners' writing in the primary language and the second language.

The Future of Written Discourse

According to Silva (1990, p. 20), "There simply are no comprehensive theories of [second language] writing and it does not seem prudent to assume that theories of first language writing alone will suffice." He states that the information derived from second language research is growing, and while there is value in these studies, more are needed. Approaches to second language writing must be derived from theories that are realistic and based on solid research. Future studies need to be done on a larger scale, be of better quality, be conducted so that they can be compared to other studies and replicated, and include a focus on the
effectiveness of specific approaches to second language writing in the classroom.

As writing became valued by both the rationalists and society, it began to take on a greater role in instruction. Research and practical experience in the teaching of writing can enhance this role.

Writing Instruction

A major goal of second language instruction today is to help students be academically successful and gain grade level proficiency as soon as possible (Chamot & O’Malley, 1994b). According to Farnan, Flood, & Lapp (1994), “ESL children are expected to learn more than English in their classrooms; they are expected to follow a curriculum, learn content, and use literacy processes to construct meanings” (p. 135).

If students are to be academically successful, follow a curriculum, and learn content, they need instruction in language that requires them to use both receptive and productive language to think and reason (Chamot & O’Malley, 1994b). To be fully literate, students need instruction in all language skills including reading and writing. According to Chamot and O’Malley (1994a), “Listening and reading give us access to the ideas of others and speaking and writing provide us with the means of transforming ideas through our own individual experiences and outlooks” (p. 19).
The productive skill of writing as a part of an integrated approach to language instruction is important to academic success and full literacy. Writing, according to Raimes (1983), serves students in many ways. It is used to communicate, explore a subject, record an experience, and become familiar with the conventions of English. Instruction in writing is the means by which students can test hypotheses and construct new understandings (Farnan, et al., 1994).

The following is a discussion of writing instruction as supported by current theories of language acquisition. This discussion includes an examination of the significance of writing to language learning; the challenges and principles important to literacy development; the conditions needed for developing effective writers; the influence of whole language philosophy on writing instruction; the importance of viewing writing as a process; the place of error correction and guidance in writing instruction, and a review of three specific methods of instruction.

**Writing Facilitates Language Learning**

According to Swain (1985) output (such as writing) is important to the testing of hypotheses about the target language. She studied English-speaking children in an immersion program and came to the following conclusion:

Comprehensible output...is a necessary mechanism of acquisition independent of the role of comprehensible input. Its role is, at a minimum, to provide opportunities for contextualized, meaningful use, to
test out hypotheses about the target language, and to move the learner from a purely semantic analysis of language to a syntactic analysis of it. (p. 252)

Raimes (1983) discusses ways in which writing goes beyond the important role of communicating to aid in language learning and facilitate thinking. According to Raimes, writing reinforces grammatical structures, idioms, and vocabulary. Writing offers the opportunity to practice and take risks with language. Through writing the learner can become involved with the target language and learn to express ideas, coordinating hand, eye, and brain to reinforce learning. Writing permits discovery of new ways to express oneself, meeting the needs for the right word or right sentence.

Second Language Literacy Development

Literacy, of which writing is a part, is developmental for all language learners. According to Farnan et al., (1994) children move along a literacy continuum. Where a child resides on this continuum is not considered to be a positive or negative characteristic, just indicative of what they are capable at the time. Ferreiro (1990) suggests that children construct literacy rather than learn it. She explains,

As we have repeatedly tried to demonstrate, these children's theories are not a pale mirror image of what they have been told. The theories are real constructions that, more often than not, seem very strange to our adult way of thinking. (p. 14)
Children build their own systems to interpret the nature and function of language.

**Challenges to literacy development.** Although there are similarities in literacy development for first and second language students, second language students have unique challenges. There are individual difference variables that can affect motivation and comprehension for second language learners. According to Diaz-Rico and Weed (1995), these factors include the students' nation of origin, the age they arrived in this country, why they immigrated, and their literacy background. For example, is the country they are from technologically as advanced as the U.S.? Did they arrive as a young child or an adult? Are they here by choice? How is motivation viewed by the primary culture? Is the student from a family where literacy is practiced? Another factor Diaz-Rico and Weed consider is how the students' ethnic group is accepted by mainstream society in the United States. If well accepted, they will have fewer feelings of inferiority that can inhibit learning.

Chamot & O'Malley (1994a) discuss how cultural background affects the degree to which text can be comprehended. Second language learners often have the extra burden of learning the discourse structures unique to the target language. For example, how a story is organized (story grammar) reflects the particular culture of origin of the story, including values and belief systems. Stories
originating in Western European culture often feature the leading character’s attempting to overcome obstacles in order to obtain a goal that is usually materialistic in nature. In Japanese culture, the leading character’s adventures are usually the result of fate and rewards are measured in the amount of respect gained. The conflicts in discourse style that students experience can make understanding English discourse difficult and create situations in which students write narrative and expository text that is difficult for English speakers to understand.

A lack of an extensive vocabulary can also create problems for second language writers, affecting their ability to express their ideas as fully as they desire (Chamot & O’Malley, 1994a). Gibbons (1993) discusses the need of second language writers to learn the symbols of the target language writing system and the relationship between sounds and symbols. Students need practice with the spelling system of the target language and the manner in which punctuation reflects the intonation patterns and pauses of the spoken language.

Principles important to literacy development. When instructing students with the goal of enhancing literacy, it is important to build on their previous knowledge and experience, and provide a rich, integrated learning environment. Four principles are important to designing second language literacy instruction.
First is the principle that literacy develops just as it does in a primary language. It develops globally and not linearly and it develops in a variety of rich contexts (Rigg & Allen, 1989). Second, language learning is more successful in a risk-free environment that validates the experiences and contributions of students (Law & Eckes, 1990). Third, language is learned best when it is used in real and meaningful contexts, and when it is taught as an integration of listening, speaking, reading, and writing (Edelsky, Altwerger, & Flores, 1991). Fourth, children construct meaning through the literacy processes of reading and writing. They use a variety of strategies and prior knowledge to promote and regulate comprehension (Peregoy & Boyle, 1993).

These four principles provide a basis for establishing instructional programs that meet the literacy needs of second language learners. They support literacy as a developmental process and assist language learners in meeting the challenges they face.

**Developing Effective Second Language Writers.**

Developing effective second language writers requires understanding of what students need to learn and strategies to provide that learning. Both are important to successful instruction.

**What students need to understand about writing.**

Understanding the differences between speaking and writing
can provide information as to what second language students need to learn about writing. It can help in making the transition from speaking to putting ideas in written form. According to Raimes (1983), writing is not a natural extension of speaking, but rather speaking and writing are two very different tasks. The following is her discussion of the differences between these two language skills.

Speech is a universal phenomenon, but reading and writing are not. There are dialect variations within spoken language, but this is not usually the case with writing. When one speaks, voice change and gestures can give clues to meaning, but writers must depend only upon words. Speakers use pauses and intonations, but writers use punctuation. Speakers pronounce and writers spell. Usually speech is spontaneous, but writing takes time, allowing for planning, drafting and then revising what has been communicated. Speakers get an immediate response, but the response to writing is usually delayed or nonexistent. Speech is often informal and repetitive whereas writing is more formal and compact. Speakers use simpler sentences and many "ands"; in contrast, in writing, the sentences are often more complex, requiring more connecting words.

Examining the differences between speaking and writing can facilitate second language writing instruction. For example, when teaching writing it is important to know that students may need assistance with understanding the use of
connecting words, knowledge that is not as necessary when speaking.

**Strategies for developing effective writers.** The following are strategies suggested by Gibbons (1983) that help develop effective second language writers. She stresses the overall importance of context by prefacing these strategies with the statement, “The teaching of language through context is almost always more successful than teaching it in isolation” (p. 107).

Gibbons (1983) recommends that both the process and the product of writing be demonstrated. Teachers can model the process of writing using “thinking aloud” as they write in front of the class. This will let students know what the teacher is considering as the writing progresses. “Think aloud” modeling can also include joint writings with the class and discussions about language. According to Gibbons, instruction must also include models of the products of writing. She recommends that teachers provide students with models that demonstrate the range of writing purposes, genres, and styles, and that teachers read aloud to students from a variety of texts and not just narratives.

Gibbons (1983) explains the need for conferences when working with children on their written text. These conferences should focus on helping students express what they want to say and not focus on surface errors. They need to be adjusted to the specific needs of the student, with the
instructor acting as a guide rather than taking control of the students’ work. In order to foster independent writers, Gibbons recommends access to the tools of writing including dictionaries, word banks, proofreading checklists, ideas for the writing process, and so on.

According to Gibbons (1983), students should experience both set topics for writing and free choice of topic. Set topics should include models. She proposes writing tasks be provided for pairs and groups as well as individuals. In this manner, the less competent writers can work with more competent students who can act as models for writing. She suggests that games and focused activities be used to develop language in specific areas and that students be allowed use of the primary language in the beginning stages.

The Influence of Whole Language Philosophy

According to Daniels, Zemelman, and Bizar (1999), "Whole language is a philosophy of teaching and learning, an approach to curriculum, and a family of distinctive and related activities ... [and] far from being a recent innovation is a venerable, comprehensive pedagogy" (p. 33). Chamot & O’Malley (1994a) explain that in a whole language approach, language is not fragmented, but rather learned as a whole system of listening, speaking, reading, and writing with many opportunities to interact with language. Skills such as phonics, decoding, handwriting, spelling, reading for
comprehension, guided and composition writing are not treated as separate skills.

Goodman (1982) relates the importance of looking at language as a whole system to the ease of learning language.

If you understand and respect language, if you understand that language is rule governed, that the most remarkable thing about human beings is that they learn a finite set of rules that nobody can teach, making it possible for them to say an infinite number of things, then it is also necessary to understand that you cannot chop language up into little bits and pieces and think that you can spoon feed it as you would feed pellets to a pigeon or a rat...Language doesn’t work that way...We have learned a lot of things. One of those things is that language is learned from whole to part...It is when you take the language away from its use, when you chop it up and break it into pieces, that it becomes abstract and hard to learn. (p. 238)

Whole language instruction does not mean that processing discrete skills does not take place, it just means that this is not the focus of instruction to the exclusion of meaning in literacy. The "parts" of language are learned within a meaningful context (Richard-Amato, 1996). Edelsky, Altwerger, and Flores (1991) suggest, "Whole language teachers do teach children how to spell, do teach appropriate punctuation for letters children are writing, do teach strategies for sounding out particular combinations of letters under particular circumstances" (p. 38). What is taught, however, is individualized to the needs of the student and the task.
The shift to a whole language approach. According to Freeman and Freeman (1994) whole language approaches have influenced second language instruction and created changes in The Natural Approach proposed by Krashen and Terrell (1983). The Natural Approach to second language instruction originally encouraged some methods that did not support a whole language approach. The Natural Approach supported teacher-rather than student-generated topics, the use of content to talk and learn vocabulary rather than for exploration, and an emphasis on oral language and skill sequencing (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) rather than an integrated approach.

The shift to a whole language approach for second language learners was based on research findings. These findings demonstrated the benefits to second language learners from authentic reading and writing activities even before they are proficient English speakers (Freeman & Freeman, 1994). According to Freeman and Freeman, "Early on in their exposure to English, bilingual students write English for a variety of purposes and may, when encouraged, even write before they speak or read" (p. 570). Rigg (1981) and Urzua (1987) discovered that students learning English had the ability to write material they could not yet control orally. This was particularly true when the writing was based on experiences that came from the children.
Diaz-Rico and Weed (1995) recommend that teachers not postpone writing until some optimal time when students have mastered oral English. Their review of the research indicates that “children are able to write using whatever knowledge of English they possess” (p. 108). Raimes (1983) asks, “Just how much language acquisition does a student need in order to be able to write a few sentences?”

We let students speak their new language as much as possible...in writing, too, they need the same opportunity to get words down on paper as soon as possible and to try out the written language. Only then will they acquire enough familiarity with writing to be able to approach more challenging tasks with confidence. (p. 95)

These research findings confirm that instruction no longer needs to follow a prescribed path from listening to writing, but that reading and writing can be integrated into instruction from the beginning for second language learners.

The relationship between reading and writing.

Integration of language is particularly apparent in the relationship between reading and writing. As in a first language, writing in a second language interacts with reading and enhances language processes (Edelsky & Jilbert, 1985). In a review of the research on the relationship between reading and writing, Stotsky (1983) came to the following conclusions: (a) good writers tend to be better readers; (b) good writers usually read both more often and more widely; (c) writing alone does not increase reading comprehension,
but, when the writing purpose is to enhance reading, gains are made both in comprehension and information retention; and (d) writing is influenced by reading as greatly as it is influenced by direct instruction in mechanics and grammar. According to Eckhoff (1983), the style and syntax of texts children read in class are reflected in their writing. Carson (1990) reported reading experiences improving writing of second language learners more than grammar instruction or added writing practice.

The whole language approach helped to change the place of writing in second language instruction. It challenged previous theories that recommended teaching language skills sequentially and provided support for teaching writing in the beginning stages of language acquisition.

**The Writing Process Approach**

The principles of whole language are embodied in the process approach to writing. According to Daniels, Semelman, and Bizar (1999, p. 33), "Whole language teachers embrace the process model of composition: teaching writing as a staged, recursive process; encouraging young writers' developmental spelling; sparing red ink in favor of coaching and modeling; and teaching correctness in students actual writings rather than in separate drills." It is this process approach to writing as opposed to a product approach that is becoming increasingly accepted for second language instruction (Diaz-Rico & Weed, 1995).
A definition of writing process. The writing process approach, as its name implies, represents a shift in focus from product to process. This shift to a focus on process is, according to Kroll (1991, p. 247), "the most significant single transformation in the teaching of writing." With the emphasis on the act of writing rather than the result, the way in which students compose changes and situations occur where language can be used in more meaningful ways (Diaz-Rico & Weed, 1995). Raimes (1983) describes the writing process approach in this way, "...the writing process becomes a process of discovery for the students: discovery of new ideas and new language forms to express those ideas" (p. 11).

Chamot and O’Malley (1994a) refer to three major principles of the writing process approach: the writing is recursive, the focus is communication, and the writing is shared. What is important is that the communication is meaningful with concern for correct form taking place in the final stages of editing. This focus on meaning and communicating, according to Chamot and O’Malley, leads to fluent, abundant writing while a focus on skills guarantees lack of success.

The recursive stages of the writing process. Law and Eckes (1990) explain that the writing process is not linear. Writers do not begin at the beginning and work straight through to the end without the need to revise and correct along the way. Writing instead can be seen as a series of
recursive stages that the writer cycles through, returning as necessary to a stage while reviewing and revising. The manner in which these stages are visited varies with each individual learner. Some prefer to begin with an outline; others prefer to jump in and discover as they go. Most writers, however, plan, compose, review, revise what they have written, and then continue to write, review and revise again as necessary. When students use such a writing process, they learn to write through real writing for real purposes, and they practice their writing skills within a framework of communication.

The stages of the writing process are described in a variety of ways depending upon how detailed the description. As a minimum they usually include a planning/pre-writing stage, a writing stage, and an editing stage. Within these stages the four skills of listening, speaking, reading, and writing occur at different times and to varying degrees: the focus is writing, but the process integrates skills.

The following are the recursive stages of the writing process as described by Law and Eckes (1990). First is the "pre-writing stage." During this stage, students gather ideas. They may brainstorm, pooling knowledge with others and acquiring necessary vocabulary and grammar structures. It is in this stage that students determine what they want to say and how they might say it. The second stage is the "organizing stage." In this stage, students organize their
thoughts and make decisions about such things as point of view, characters, and the information that will be included. Third is the “drafting stage” when thoughts are put on paper. This is a stage of exploration and articulating and can be the most difficult. Fourth is the “evaluating stage.” In this stage the work is reviewed and critiqued. This review is done by the student, but may also include input from others, usually the teacher and/or peers. The fifth stage is the “revising stage.” The focus of the revisions is on meaning; support from the teacher is important at this stage. The teacher should take care to act as a guide offering suggestions and helping the student to clarify. This stage can be difficult for students who are unfamiliar with how writers write. Many students write, edit for grammar and spelling errors, and then consider themselves done. They are unaware that a writer may rewrite a piece many times before it communicates well. The writing process asks students to be more involved with what they write. The sixth and last stage is the “editing stage”; this is when students add the final touches. This is when grammar, spelling, punctuation, and the mechanics of language are addressed. This stage comes after meaning has been achieved. If done sooner, students have the tendency not to revise for meaning.

**Error Correction and Guidance**

Writing errors are not random (Law & Eckes, 1990). They are strategies that second language learners use when they
have not yet mastered a new form or concept. Errors indicate what students know and what they have not yet learned. According to Raimes (1983) errors demonstrate the learning process at work. Understanding this can help instructors plan for what students need. She explains that errors should be expected to occur at certain stages of a student’s development. When a student is making errors, it can be an indication that the student is being a successful learner.

The balance between meaning and mechanics. Law and Eckes (1990) emphasize that instruction must provide a balance between meaning and mechanics. Students need feedback on how well they are communicating along with ideas for improving, as well as assistance with the mechanics of writing like spelling, punctuation, and grammar. Essentially there are two stages of instruction, one that centers on meaning that occurs during the revising stage, and one that focuses on mechanics and grammar and occurs during the editing stage. Exactly how error correction proceeds depends upon the students acquisition level and the purpose of the assignment.

According to Diaz-Rico and Weed (1995), fluency in the early stages of writing is more important than accuracy. They suggest that it is important to first develop a level of proficiency and then make decisions about error correction. Law and Eckes (1990) recommend that with new and beginning writers, an instructor accept most anything and focus
discussion on ideas and clarifying what the student wants to say. Raimes (1983) recommends that only mechanical errors that interfere with communication should be addressed. This does not mean that mechanical errors should not be considered, but what is wanted is quality writing that is understandable, not writing that is mechanically correct, but not understandable. The time to correct mechanical errors is after the paper is clear and well organized. The number of errors focused on for correction should be adjusted to the level of the student.

**Research in error correction.** Research demonstrates differences in student response to corrections that focus on meaning versus those that focus on mechanics. Kepner (1991), in a study of students learning Spanish, found that those who received meaning-focused feedback did not forfeit accuracy for content. He also learned that the those who received surface-error correction produced work of lesser quality than those who received meaning focused feedback. Another study by Zamel (1985) revealed that when students received mixed feedback (both meaning focused and error focused) they tended to focus on correcting errors and to ignore content. Richard-Amato (1996) recommends, "...as a general rule, when error-focused feedback is given, it should come near the end of the writing process unless the student specifically requests it earlier."
Successful second language writing instruction provides an appropriate balance between error correction and guidance. With guidance, writers learn to create meaning; and with error correction, they learn to manage the mechanics of writing. Combining these, they are able to meet the goal of writing: communication.

Writing Methods

The writing process can take many forms depending upon the needs, age, and proficiency level of the student (Richard-Amato, 1996). Beginning writers will need more support and scaffolding, whereas more advanced writers will need the opportunity to experiment and apply their skills to more academic pursuits. Three writing methods will be discussed that are complementary to whole language and the writing process: The Language Experience Approach (LEA), Writing Workshop, and the writing component of the Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA).

The Language Experience Approach. The Language Experience Approach was the predecessor to Whole Language (Van Allen & Allen, 1967). When it originated, it did not have a theoretical base; however, it proved to be effective and became established as a means to teach language to primary language students (Richard-Amato, 1996). Various versions of LEA were later introduced for use with second language students (Moustfa, 1989).
In the LEA process, students dictate to the teacher, who records what the students have to say using the students own expression, vocabulary, and grammar. According to Law and Eckes (1990) the process is encompassed in the following steps: (a) an experience is shared that can be written about; (b) the experience is discussed; (c) students dictate the story to the teacher who writes it without correcting any errors in language structure; (d) the story is read aloud as it is written and the students copy the story; and (e) the story is used for student reading and other possible alternatives including reinforcement of skills.

Richard-Amato (1996) describes many advantages of LEA. The text is appropriate both cognitively and linguistically. The writing comes from the students' own vocabularies and experiences and is authentic. What is written reflects the culture of the students and their ideas are validated, both of which help increase self esteem. Independence in using language is supported and fostered. Instruction can be individualized, meeting the specific language needs of each student. Students can learn from each other by scaffolding on the contributions to the writing. In this way the less proficient can learn from the more proficient and students can create zones of proximal development for each other (Richard-Amato, p.204). According to Law and Eckes (1990), the approach is appropriate for all acquisition levels and
ages and can be used with large groups, small groups, and individual students.

Richard-Amato (1996) also describes concerns about LEA. The inclusion of student errors is considered a limitation by some; however, those who advocate the “pure approach” maintain that any disadvantages are outweighed by the advantages to beginning writers. There is some concern that students might get the impression that writing is simply speaking recorded on paper; however, through transferring their thoughts onto paper, the writing process is demonstrated. A third concern is that the teacher will simply act as a transcriber and not utilize the opportunity to play the role of facilitator by composing with students, bringing out their ideas, modeling, and providing language on which students can scaffold.

The close connection between reading and writing is apparent in LEA; in fact, LEA is commonly referred to as an approach to teach reading. Rigg (1989) reported the success of this approach with beginning second language readers of varying ages. Law and Eckes (1990) describe the approach as one that utilizes all four skills of listening, speaking, reading, and writing and particularly recommend the use of the approach for teaching writing. The assumption is that the writing experienced in LEA will help students “transition on their own when they are ready—when they have gained enough confidence to try, learned some vocabulary, or just
simply learned that writing has meaning" (p. 120). According to Richard-Amato (1996) as students instructed with LEA become more proficient and move to higher levels of acquisition, they will begin to read and write independently.

Although LEA has a place with all levels of language acquisition, it is particularly appropriate for beginning second language learners. It provides a safe learning environment in which students can build self-esteem and language skills. LEA can help students move into using a second language.

The Writing Workshop. The Writing Workshop allows for use of the writing process in an atmosphere of collaboration where students have the opportunity to facilitate their writing by conferring with other students and the teacher. According to Diaz-Rico and Weed (1995), in a writing workshop approach, second language students use prior knowledge and experiences, and take responsibility for their own learning. The teacher's role is one of facilitator, offering advice and support to the language learners. Writing Workshop also allows for flexibility. It can meet the needs of individual students at their own level of language acquisition and it can be integrated so that it relates to what students are studying in other areas of the curriculum (Richard-Amato, 1996).

The manner in which Writing Workshop is managed in the classroom can vary. In Table 2.1, Atwell (1987) describes
### Table 2.1.
**Seven Principles that Inform Teacher Instruction and Student Learning in Writing Workshop** (Atwell, p. 17-18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writers need regular chunks of time.</td>
<td>Writers need time to think, write, confer, read, change their minds, and write some more. Writers need time they can count on, so even when they aren’t writing, they’re anticipating the time they will be. Writers need time to write well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writers need their own topics.</td>
<td>Right from the first day of kindergarten students should use writing as a way to think about and give shape to their own ideas and concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writers need response.</td>
<td>Helpful response comes during—not after—the composing. It comes from the writer’s peers and from the teacher, who consistently models the kinds of restatements and questions that help writers reflect on the content of their writing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table Continues)
Table 2.1 continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writers learn mechanics in context.</td>
<td>Writers learn mechanics from teachers who address errors as they occur within individual pieces of writing, where these rules and forms will have meaning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children need to know adults who write.</td>
<td>Teachers need to write, share writing with students, and demonstrate what experienced writers do in the process of composing, letting their students see their own drafts in all their messiness and tentativeness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writers need to read.</td>
<td>Writers need access to a wide variety of texts, prose and poetry, fiction and non-fiction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing teachers need to take responsibility for their knowledge and teaching.</td>
<td>Teachers must seek out professional resources that reflect the far-reaching conclusions of recent research into children's writing. Teachers must become writers and researchers, observing and learning from their own and and their student's writing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
seven important principles that inform teacher instruction and student learning and should be a part of every writing workshop.

The writing conference is an important aspect of writers workshop. Atwell (1987) recommends that in a conference, students maintain ownership of their writing by reading it aloud themselves. Atwell also recommends that the information gained in a conference be recorded so that student learning can be followed and monitored. Diaz-Rico and Weed (1995) refer to conferences as the time when second language students receive very individual help with the writing process. They explain that in the process of conferring with the teacher and peers, the writer learns what questions they need to ask themselves as they write. Richard-Amato (1996) emphasizes that the purpose of the conference can vary with the stage of language acquisition. In the earlier stages fluency and learning to discuss and get feedback are important. Later students will become more interactive and can be asked more specific questions.

Writing Workshop can meet the writing needs of second language students who are ready for independent writing experiences. Writing Workshop can provide students with practice and experience in writing and aid them in discovering writing as a means for communication.

The Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach to Writing. The Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach
(CALLA) is presented by Chamot and O’Malley (1994a) in The CALLA Handbook and is derived from a cognitive model for learning. Learners are considered to be mentally active and conscious of their own learning process. CALLA is an instructional model intended to meet the needs of students learning English as a second language or as a foreign language, and it is meant to be used with students who have attained an intermediate or advanced level of language acquisition. The goal is to help students transition successfully to mainstream English classes.

There are three components that describe the CALLA model (Chamot & O’Malley, 1994a). First, instruction concentrates on content topics and is aligned with the academic program for English speakers. The focus is on higher order thinking skills and depth rather than breadth. Second, language is considered a tool to learn academics. Students learn the language of the content area and the necessary concepts and skills while practicing listening, speaking, reading, and writing in English. Academics are the focus and language is learned through the academic content. Third, students receive instruction in learning strategies. These strategies are the purposeful behaviors or thoughts that learners use to acquire and retain new information or skills (Pressley, 1988; Weinstein & Mayer, 1986). According to Chamot and O’Malley, research supports the fact that strategies can be successfully taught in a second language classroom.
The CALLA approach provides instruction in the learning strategies important to writing (Chamot & O’Malley, 1994a). This instruction is facilitated by using the writing process which allows for strategies to be named and modeled for students at each stage in the process. The following instructional sequence is used in CALLA for written expression. First, students are prepared by eliciting prior knowledge, providing essential information, and previewing vocabulary. Second, learning strategies for written expression are presented, explained and modeled. Third, students practice by beginning to write about the idea or theme presented in classroom discussions or the text. Fourth, students are taught how to evaluate and reflect on their work so that they learn to improve. Fifth, the students apply their learnings to new contexts.

Each of the methods presented above integrates language skills, fosters students becoming successful independent writers, and positions the teacher as a facilitator. LEA offers particular support to students at the beginning levels of language acquisition. Writing workshops foster more independence than LEA and provide for more teacher interaction with individual students through conferences. CALLA is specifically designed for the intermediate and advanced levels of acquisition, with the goal of promoting learning of academic skills and language. Each method has a place in the teaching of second language writing and the
methods can be used in combination or independently depending upon the goals of instruction.

Second Language Writing Instruction Today

Over time, writing has taken on a more significant role in second language instruction. At the time of the empirical approach the focus of instruction was on speaking; the sequencing of language skills made writing the last skill learned. When writing was taught, the emphasis was on learning the discrete parts of language, consonant with the behaviorist empirical approach. Known research did not support important aspects of the empirical approach and the rationalist approach eventually replaced it.

The rationalist approach supports a greater role for writing instruction than the empirical approach. In the rationalist approach, writing, as part of the integration of language skills, has a place at all levels of language acquisition and is recognized to have an important role in the learning of language. The cognitive view of the learner as an active participant in learning is important to the rationalist process oriented approach to instruction. The Monitor Model by Krashen and the Natural Approach by Terrell and Krashen both originated from rationalist theories.

Language theories continue to change with new research findings and new perspectives from many related fields of study. Current research supports whole language and the writing process as approaches to writing instruction;
however, as research into second language learning continues, theories may change and precipitate new instructional methods.
CHAPTER THREE: A PROGRAM PLAN FOR SECOND LANGUAGE WRITING INSTRUCTION

The purpose of this project is to develop both an instructional program for writing in a second language and a plan for providing in-service training in the use of this program. The literature review has provided the basis for developing a program that can facilitate writing instruction for all students at all stages of language acquisition. It has also provided the rationale for procedures to introduce such a program to teachers and promote its use.

The following model and three tables address the above two issues. First, the model represents the instructional program for writing that is recommended here. Second, the three tables provide the opportunity for teachers to compare and evaluate approaches to writing instruction.

A Description of the Model

The program for writing instruction is represented in the model Building Written Language (see Figure 3.1). This model shows three instructional approaches which work together to facilitate full literacy for second language students. Collectively, these three instructional approaches address all stages of language acquisition. Instruction begins with the Language Experience Approach (LEA), then, as students are ready, proceeds to Writing Workshop and finally ends with the Cognitive Academic Learning Approach (CALLA). Each of these approaches to writing builds on the other in
Figure 3.1. Model for Developing Written Language
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order to produce successful writers who can achieve full academic literacy.

**Components of the Model**

The approaches to writing instruction presented here represent current research findings—primarily rationalist views of second language instruction. They are consistent with whole language philosophy and the writing process approach.

LEA is the means to get second language students into writing. Through shared writing, LEA provides the affective support that students need to build confidence in the beginning stages of writing and become independent writers. Because the writing comes from the students, it also provides comprehensible input and comprehensible output.

Writing Workshop provides the writing experience necessary to help students through writing. Writing Workshop provides opportunities for independent writing based on student choice and experience. Conferences allow for the addressing of individual student needs. In these conferences, meaning comes before mechanics. Through this approach, students build their writing skills.

Designed for intermediate and advanced levels of language acquisition, CALLA challenges students to go beyond and apply their writing skills to academic content. Learning strategies and higher order thinking skills are taught. The focus is on academic content and language skills. CALLA
builds on the students' writing experience and offers instruction that can provide students with full academic literacy.

**Application of the Model**

The Building Written Language model represents a program to be applied in the classroom. A second function of the model is to provide a clear picture for teachers as to how this program meets the writing needs of their students.

Use of this program in the classroom begins with an assessment to determine the developmental level of the students. Are they at the beginning stages of writing and, therefore, require a great deal of assistance? Are they ready for independent writing? Or are they independent writers ready to apply their skills to academic content?

Once they are assessed, students can then be grouped by level and the appropriate instruction can be employed, whether LEA, Writing Workshop, or CALLA. It is important to note that there is flexibility and integration of instruction between proficiency levels: LEA can be appropriate for all levels of language acquisition and Writing Workshop can be applied in CALLA. For example, a CALLA science lesson may involve writing using LEA. This might be done to include students who are not yet independent writers. Or, it might be done to provide support for proficient writers when teaching difficult content. As students build proficiency, they must be periodically reevaluated so that instruction keeps pace as
they move into, through, and beyond written language instruction.

The model itself is an important element for presenting the Building Written Language program to teachers. Augmenting a purely verbal presentation, it provides a picture that aids teachers in seeing the relationship between the three writing approaches. It presents writing as a process to be learned and provides practical strategies for that learning.

A Description of the Tables

Four tables provide comparisons among second language writing approaches (Table 3.1, Table 3.2, Table 3.3, and Table 3.4). The descriptors for the first column of the tables are based upon the factors that define the difference between empirical and rationalist approaches to language. The descriptors provide a means to analyze second language approaches to writing and determine the theoretical position—empiricist or rationalist—they support. These comparisons allow teachers to better understand the implications of the instructional approaches they select.

The Descriptors for Comparing Writing Approaches

The following explanation presents each descriptor as a continuum of possibilities for language instruction. The two extremes of the continuum are the empirical approach supported by behaviorist psychology and the rationalist approach supported by cognitive psychology. An individual
Table 3.1.

Comparing Empirical and Rationalist Approaches to Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Empirical Approach</th>
<th>Rational Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The mind of the learner</td>
<td>Passive learner</td>
<td>Active problem solver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal of instruction</td>
<td>Product</td>
<td>Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View of language learning</td>
<td>Language is the mastery of habits</td>
<td>Language is innate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of the teacher</td>
<td>Teacher plans and sets goals</td>
<td>Teacher &amp; students plan &amp; set goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Features of instructional program</td>
<td>All children learn in the same way/ The curriculum determines instruction needs</td>
<td>Learning is a process unique to each individual/ Instruction is based on student needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill instruction</td>
<td>Sequential &amp; out of context</td>
<td>Integrated &amp; in context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing content</td>
<td>Teacher determined</td>
<td>Student determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>All Levels/ Individual</td>
<td>All levels/ Individual/ Small group/ Large group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective support</td>
<td>Sociocultural aspects are not important to learning</td>
<td>Sociocultural aspects are important to learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3.2.

Comparing Your Approach to Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Empirical Approach</th>
<th>Rational Approach</th>
<th>Self/Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The mind of the learner</td>
<td>Passive learner</td>
<td>Active problem solver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal of instruction</td>
<td>Product</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View of language learning</td>
<td>Language is the mastery of habits</td>
<td>Language is innate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of the teacher</td>
<td>Teacher plans and sets goals</td>
<td>Teacher &amp; students plan &amp; set goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Features of instructional program</td>
<td>All children learn in the same way/ The curriculum determines instruction needs</td>
<td>Learning is a process unique to each individual/ Instruction is based on student needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill instruction</td>
<td>Sequential &amp; out of context</td>
<td>Integrated &amp; in context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing content</td>
<td>Teacher determined</td>
<td>Student determined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>All Levels/ Individual</td>
<td>All levels/ Individual/ Small group/ Large group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective support</td>
<td>Sociocultural aspects are not important to learning</td>
<td>Sociocultural aspects are important to learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3.3.

A Comparison of Three Approaches to Second Language Writing Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>LEA</th>
<th>Writing Workshop</th>
<th>CALLA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The mind of the learner</td>
<td>Active problem solver</td>
<td>Active problem solver</td>
<td>Active problem solver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal of instruction</td>
<td>Build the affective/</td>
<td>Build writing competence</td>
<td>Build academic competence/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent writing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Apply knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View of language learning</td>
<td>Language is innate</td>
<td>Language is innate</td>
<td>Language is innate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of the teacher</td>
<td>Facilitator/ Scribe</td>
<td>Facilitator/ Guide</td>
<td>Facilitator/ Expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Features of instructional program</td>
<td>Experience/ Discuss/</td>
<td>Independent writing/</td>
<td>Model and name learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dictate/Read/</td>
<td>Conferences/</td>
<td>strategies/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scaffold/</td>
<td>Focus on meaning first,</td>
<td>Higher order thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus on meaning/</td>
<td>then</td>
<td>skills/ Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modeling/ Based on student</td>
<td>mechanics/</td>
<td>on academic content/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>needs</td>
<td>Modeling/</td>
<td>Based on student needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill instruction</td>
<td>Integrated &amp; in context</td>
<td>Integrated &amp; in context</td>
<td>Integrated &amp; in context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing content</td>
<td>Shared experience</td>
<td>Student chosen topics</td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>All ages/All levels/</td>
<td>Intermediate &amp; advanced</td>
<td>Intermediate &amp; advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual/</td>
<td>levels/</td>
<td>levels/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small groups/</td>
<td>Individual/</td>
<td>Individuals/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large groups</td>
<td>Small groups</td>
<td>small groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective support</td>
<td>Writing validates student</td>
<td>Individual student needs</td>
<td>Independent success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>culture/skills</td>
<td>met through conferences</td>
<td>through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>strategies/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>instruction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.4.
Comparison of LEA, Writing Workshop, and CALLA to Empirical and Rationalist Approaches to Second Language Acquisition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Writing Approaches</th>
<th>Empirical Approach</th>
<th>Rational Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The mind of the learner</td>
<td>LEA</td>
<td>Writing Workshop</td>
<td>CALLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal of instruction</td>
<td>LEA</td>
<td>Writing Workshop</td>
<td>CALLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View of language learning</td>
<td>LEA</td>
<td>Writing Workshop</td>
<td>CALLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of the teacher</td>
<td>LEA</td>
<td>Writing Workshop</td>
<td>CALLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Features of Instructional program</td>
<td>LEA</td>
<td>Writing Workshop</td>
<td>CALLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill instruction</td>
<td>LEA</td>
<td>Writing Workshop</td>
<td>CALLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing content</td>
<td>LEA</td>
<td>Writing Workshop</td>
<td>CALLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility:</td>
<td>LEA</td>
<td>Writing Workshop</td>
<td>CALLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective support</td>
<td>LEA</td>
<td>Writing Workshop</td>
<td>CALLA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
program will fall somewhere on this continuum for each descriptor. A program may, therefore, represent aspects of both the empiricist and rationalist approaches to varying degrees.

**Mind of the reader.** The first descriptor refers to how the learner is perceived. At one end of the continuum is the empirical approach, in which the learner is passive. At the other end of the continuum is the rationalist approach in which the learner is active. A passive learner is a receiver of information and does not actively transform that information into something new and unique. The active learner takes in information and actively transforms it using previously learned information to create something new and unique.

**Goal of instruction.** The goal of instruction may be oriented toward product or process. If the goal is product oriented as maintained by the empiricists, it is the “what” of instruction that is important, the end result. If the goal is process oriented, as maintained by the rationalists, it is not just the “what” that is important, but also the “how,” the procedure for learning. In the rationalist view, the goal of instruction supports metacognition, thinking about the learning process experience.

**View of language learning.** “View of language learning,” refers to beliefs about how language is learned. For the empiricist, language is learned through stimulus and response
and the establishment of habits. At the other end of the continuum is the rationalist perspective that states language is innate, that languages are learned when one is given appropriate exposure and comprehensible input (Krashen & Terrell, 1983).

Role of the teacher. The role of the teacher has special importance because the teacher's role also determines the role of the learner. According to the empiricist position, it is the teacher who plans and sets the goals in the classroom. The student's role is to remain passive and to receive the instruction as dictated by the teacher. The teacher is a director of instruction. In the rationalist position, both teacher and student work together to plan and set goals. The student takes an active role in determining what will be learned. The teacher is a facilitator of instruction.

Features of the instructional program. "Features of the instructional program" refers to how the curriculum is administered. For the empiricist, the curriculum determines the instructional needs of the students. All children are considered to learn in the same way and therefore it is not important to consider individual needs and differences. Learning skills through drill and practice and a focus on mechanics are important features of this approach. For the rationalist, learning is unique to each individual and instruction should be based on the individual student's
needs. Conferences, shared experience activities, and a focus on meaning are important features of the instructional program.

**Skill instruction.** Skill instruction can be sequential or integrated and can take place in or out of context. The empiricists recommend sequential skill instruction beginning with listening and speaking, and then moving to reading, and finally writing. Skills are taught out of context following the curriculum schedule which determines when they should be taught. The rationalists recommend skill instruction that is integrated and taught according to student need. Skill instruction, for the rationalist position, is done in the context of student writing.

**Writing content.** Writing content is on a continuum from content that is teacher determined to content that is student determined. The empiricists support teacher-determined content and the rationalists student-determined content. Consonant with the rationalists’ position, the teacher may facilitate the generation of ideas, but it is the student who makes the final determination.

**Flexibility.** Flexibility involves several aspects of the writing program. Does the program meet the needs of students at all levels of language acquisition? Does it work well for individual students, small groups, and large groups? Both the empiricist approach and the rationalist approach provide instruction for all levels of language acquisition. The
Empiricists focus on instruction of the individual and the rationalists support instruction for individuals as well as recommending cooperative group instruction.

**Affective support.** "Affective support" refers to the degree to which sociocultural aspects are considered important to learning. Does an approach to instruction consider the affective needs of students or not? The empiricists do not focus on affective needs of students and the social aspects of learning. For the rationalists, the affective and social aspects are very significant and, according to Krashen and Terrell (1983), can be a primary factor affecting the successful acquisition of a second language.

**A Description of the Tables and their Application**

The four tables are intended for use when instructing teachers in the Building Written Language Program. The comparisons provided in the tables allow teachers to better understand the implications of the instructional approaches they select. The tables help to summarize and provide a starting point for discussion.

Table 3.1 provides a summary of the differences between empirical and rational approaches to second language writing instruction. This is a helpful reference for teachers as they learn to define the differences between these two approaches. Table 3.2 repeats the distinctions made in Table 3.1, offering a blank column in which teachers may do their
own evaluation with regard to empiricist and rationalist approaches. Using the column entitled "Self/Approach," they can evaluate their own philosophy about second language writing instruction or the writing approaches they are currently using.

Table 3.3 is a comparison of LEA, Writing Workshop and CALLA. This comparison gives teachers a concise description of each approach and information as to how these three approaches relate to each other. This table helps to explain the rationale for the Building Written Language program. It clearly demonstrates where there are similarities between the approaches, and also where there are important differences that support the needs of students at their particular level of language acquisition.

Table 3.4 places LEA, Writing Workshop, and CALLA on a continuum ranging from the empirical approach to the rational approach. This table provides a comparison of the three recommended writing instruction approaches. This comparison shows in what areas the three approaches vary in their support of either an empiricist or rationalist point of view and the degree of this support. With this table, teachers can see how emphasis of the empirical or rationalist view in a particular area of instruction may best meet the needs of students at their particular level of language acquisition.

Together, the model and the four tables support and facilitate comprehension of the Building Written Language
program. They make the program understandable and, therefore, more likely to be adopted by teachers.
CHAPTER FOUR: CURRICULUM DESIGN

Curriculum Organization

The purpose of the curriculum presented in this project is to provide an instructional plan for the teaching of writing based upon sound theoretical principles. It is intended to be presented as an in-service program for elementary and middle school teachers who provide writing instruction for students learning English as a second language. It is designed to teach teachers in a manner that allows them to experience the writing approaches recommended for their students and to encourage teachers to apply the approaches in their own classrooms.

There are five lesson plans in the unit for the in-service program, Building Written Language. The first lesson provides an introduction to the theoretical foundations of the Building Written Language model. This lesson gives teachers the opportunity to review the strategies they now use for teaching reading and to explore their own beliefs about writing in relation to empirical and rationalist perspectives.

The next four lessons discuss the three recommended writing approaches. In the lessons, teachers experience each approach as it would be taught to students. Therefore when previewing the unit, the reader will find student lessons included as a part of the instruction. Each lesson provides time for teacher self-reflection in a Learning Journal and
the opportunity to consider how the approach might be applied to one’s own classroom.

The materials are presented in this project as they would be organized for the person giving the in-service program. Each of the five lessons is followed by the necessary support materials including the student lessons. These support materials include informational “focus sheets” and worksheets. In an in-service program, teachers would need to receive a handbook that includes all these support materials. Particularly helpful for teachers may be the student lessons that they can use as a guide to developing their own lessons.

Application of the Instructional Model to the Curriculum

The Building Written Language model presented in Chapter Three and based on the research in Chapter Two is the foundation for the curriculum presented here. The process represented by the model provides the basis for designing a successful writing program for second language learners that meets student needs at their level of language acquisition.

Three writing approaches contribute to the model and this curriculum: Language Experience Approach (LEA), Writing Workshop, and the Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA). For each approach, the manner in which it can meet the needs of students at their acquisition level is discussed and experienced by teachers through the student lessons.
LEA is presented in the model as a means into writing for second language writers. It is a way to help students begin the transition to writing in English. In the instruction for teachers, the procedure for LEA is presented along with the benefits to students. After experiencing an LEA lesson, teachers reflect and are then asked to organize and present an LEA lesson in their own classroom.

Writing Workshop is the means through language, according to the model. This means that it provides the experience students need to develop their writing process skills. Presenting the Writing Workshop component to teachers requires two lessons. The instruction provides teachers with experience in how to begin a writing workshop and information as to what is needed to provide the necessary structure that ensures success. At the end of the lesson, teachers are asked to review what implementing a writing workshop would mean in their classroom. What would they be able to keep? What would they need to give up? What would they need to add? Writing Workshop requires a greater commitment of time and effort to implement than the other two approaches and may be the one least likely to be adopted.

CALLA is the third approach and is meant to take students beyond in their writing, as they apply writing to academics. This lesson for teachers includes instruction in the importance of learning strategies and in the steps of a CALLA lesson. The CALLA lessons presented for teachers
provide a model for organization. Teachers are asked at the end of the lesson to apply this model to a content lesson they already use in their classroom.

Teachers are instructed that when these three approaches are integrated together, they provide a comprehensive writing program for English language learners. The model provides for success for all students learning to write in English.

Assumptions

This curriculum involves assumptions regarding both the teachers and the instructor. It is assumed that teachers taking this in-service program are aware of the special needs of their students learning English as a second language, and that they have learned appropriate strategies for meeting these needs. Without this, the program may fail, not because it was inadequate; but because it was administered from a point of view that created failure.

An instructor of this program should have experience with the approaches to writing instruction that are presented. Without this experience, it is difficult to provide the depth of information the teachers will need.
CHAPTER FIVE: ASSESSMENT

There are two categories of assessment in the curriculum for the Building Written Language program. The first focuses on the assessment of writing and the second on the assessment of teacher performance. There is a close relationship between these two categories of assessment. For example, teachers must implement the program appropriately before its success can be determined; therefore, program success depends upon teacher performance. The following is a review of how assessment is applied in this curriculum.

Assessment of Student Writing

Success of the Building Written Language program is determined by the success of student writers in the program. According to Reid (1990), writing assessment can be used to evaluate a writing program, determine placement in composition classes, provide information on individual diagnosis and progress, and decide exit competency and mastery of course content. Evaluation in this curriculum focuses on the day-to-day assessments that can be used by teachers to determine grades and inform their instructional practices. This daily assessment is different from a program evaluation, where the focus is only on the program, and the testing is not meant to be used to provide information on individual students. A program assessment is important and should be considered, but it is beyond the scope of this in-service curriculum. The following provides information on
direct writing tests and on the assessment design used for writing evaluation in the curriculum presented here.

A Review of Direct Tests of Writing

According to Hamp-Lyons (1990), prior to 1970, most testing was done through indirect tests of writing, such as multiple choice tests. Then, opinion began to shift. Hamp-Lyons relates that it was argued that "failure to learn and practice writing reasonable lengths of text in school was leading to declining literacy levels and to a college-entry population that could not think critically about intellectual ideas and academic material" (p. 69). Responding to this pressure to have students write, research began to focus on the establishment of reliable methods for evaluating direct writing tests. In 1986, after many reliability studies, TOEFL (Teachers of English as a Foreign Language) introduced the Test of Written English (TWE). This change on the part of TOEFL helped to establish a preference for the use of direct writing tests for students learning English as a second language (Hamp-Lyons, 1990).

Establishing a valid direct test of writing is, according to Hamp-Lyons (1990), not an easy task. A valid test should provide an equal opportunity for all students to produce their best work and have scoring procedures that reduce the amount of human error. Hamp-Lyons discusses four aspects of direct writing assessment that need to be addressed with regard to establishing a valid test: the
writing task, the writer, the scoring procedure, and the reader.

According to Hamp-Lyons (1990), validity of the writing task depends upon variables such as how the test is taken (pen and pencil, word processor, and so on), the amount of time given for the writing, and the elements of the topic or prompt. Control of these variables is important so that all students have the same opportunities for success.

Establishing the validity of the writer is also important to equal opportunity for success. Hamp-Lyons mentions that establishing this validity requires accounting for such things as language background, cultural integration, and gender, all factors that influence how the writer understands the audience, purpose, and mode of discourse. She states, "Each writer brings the whole of himself or herself to the task at hand. In interpreting a task and creating a response to it, each writer must create a "fit" between his or her world and the world of the essay test topic" (p. 77). If the writer does not understand the task, he or she will replace what they do not understand with their own ideas and therefore respond incorrectly.

Scoring procedures and the reader are the last two aspects addressed that affect test validity. The scoring procedures affect the amount of human error in test evaluation. In holistic scoring, the reader’s overall impression of the writing compared to other pieces is the
basis for judgment. The idea behind holistic scoring is that the writing taken as a whole is greater than the sum of its parts. According to Hamp-Lyons, studies show that this is not a reliable method. For more reliability, a scale needs to provide some standardization of the scoring.

The perspective of individual readers is also important to validity. There is more validity with two readers, with provision for a third to settle any disagreement between the first two. Hamp-Lyons (1990) questions whether lack of correlation between writers is a problem with scoring procedures or with differences in reader perception of writing quality. Hamp-Lyons recommends more research into test design to establish testing that provides an accurate picture of writing success.

Assessment Design for Student Writing

The following is a description of the writing assessments designed for the Building Written Language program. These assessments concern what is important to teachers in their day-to-day evaluation and monitoring of student writing using the Building Written Language program. This kind of assessment needs to be valid, but also feasible for teachers to implement. For example, having two readers is probably not possible on a daily or weekly basis, but having a rubric for scoring is possible. The following is a review of the assessments recommended to teachers for each of the approaches.
The Language Experience Approach (LEA) closely integrates the skills of listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Although this facilitates the learning of all the language skills, it is difficult to separate out writing for purposes of assessment. Therefore, some of the assessments involve writing in direct combination with other skills. The first assessment concerns the ability to recognize the meaning of the shared writing through reading. In this assessment, students need to match the written text to the appropriate pictures. As students show readiness, the extended activities from the LEA lesson provide opportunities for students to begin to write independently. A scoring rubric furnishes the means to assess this writing. Another extension of the LEA lesson gives students an opportunity to practice speaking and a speaking rubric provides the means for assessment.

Assessment in the Writing Workshop component includes the use of rubrics, the Teacher Conference Record, and teacher-student grading conferences. For each piece of writing submitted, the teacher confers with the student and records both problem areas and growth that the student has made. The Teacher Conference Record provides an assessment of each individual student's writing progress on specific items relevant just to that student. Such an evaluation is very valuable in determining student needs and in reporting progress to parents.
Rubrics can be used for teacher evaluation of students and for student evaluation of their own work. Rubrics can be designed by teachers (or teachers and students) and based on the aspects of writing relevant to each classroom. When designing these rubrics, teachers consider content, mechanics/grammar, effort, and student progress. The conference record is a source of much of the information needed for the evaluations. The writing used to evaluate students should be drafts edited only by the student. Final drafts edited by the teacher often reflect less of what a student can do on their own and more of how well the teacher edits.

Teacher-student grading conferences are also recommended for assessment. In these conferences students and teachers together use the rubrics to arrive at an assessment or grade for student work. Conferences take time, but they also help facilitate student understanding of how they are progressing; moreover students appreciate the individual attention.

Assessment of writing in the Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA) is embedded within the content lesson and, therefore, varies with each assignment. If a student is successful in the assignment, then the writing must also be successful. For example, in one of the CALLA lessons included in the in-service program as a sample, the students are to write word problems for mathematics. The focus, therefore, is mathematics, but the vehicle is writing.
Assessment will be of the mathematics, but it is also inherently of the writing because correct understandable writing is required to meet the goal. It is possible to assess just the writing in the content lesson using a writing rubric. This, however, does not meet the intended purpose of assessment in CALLA.

Assessment of writing involves the use of rubrics to provide valid scoring. Proficiency in designing rubrics is important to assessment and teachers should have the appropriate skills to produce them.

Assessment of Teacher Performance

Assessment of teacher performance is determined by the objectives for the in-service program. Teachers, the district (including school principals), and the instructor for the in-service program all have goals. Teachers may attend an in-service program because they need course credit or hours for credential renewal. They may attend because it is required or because they want to provide better learning opportunities for their students. Most school districts offer in-service programs with the goal of improving student performance, but the expectations for teachers vary. In some cases the district expects teachers to attend and listen, but there are no performance expectations. In other cases, districts expect teachers to implement what they have learned, but may or may not follow up to see if implementation has actually occurred. For an in-service
program the instructors’ criteria for success usually includes teacher participation, teacher learning, and implementation of what has been learned. In order to avoid misunderstanding, it is important that goals and criteria for success are clearly stated and understood.

The in-service program Building Written Language includes daily assessment of the objectives for teacher participation and learning. It also includes activities for teachers that can be used to assess their understanding of successful implementation of the writing program. A final assessment of teacher implementation is dependent upon actual classroom observation. In-service assessments may need to be adjusted to meet teacher and/or district objectives. For example, depending upon district goals, a follow-up to this in-service program would be to provide classroom support to teachers and in-class observations. The following is a review of the teacher assessments included in this in-service program.

Assessment Design for Teacher Participation and Learning

The primary means of evaluating teacher participation and learning is the Learning Journal that is provided for each teacher. In this journal, teachers are asked to address their understanding of the objectives presented each day. This journal is meant to be reviewed by the instructor to assess teacher understanding of the content so that instruction can be adjusted as necessary. A rubric is
provided to evaluate this journal, should that seem appropriate according to the district’s goals. It is expected that the instructor will respond in the journal and therefore begin a dialogue with each teacher.

Assessment Design for Teacher Implementation of Writing Approaches

For each writing approach, there is an activity to help teachers begin to apply what has been learned to their own classrooms. For LEA, teachers prepare a lesson plan and present it in their own classroom. Writing Workshop requires time and a commitment to establish, and cannot be done in a single lesson. Participants explore application of this approach by completing a worksheet that asks them to evaluate how it might be implemented in their classroom. CALLA requires application of writing to content. To facilitate implementation of CALLA, teachers are asked to complete a lesson plan applying CALLA to a lesson they already do in their classroom. In this way, teachers are prepared to present their first CALLA lesson.

Assessment is important to establishing successful directions for instruction and it is necessary that assessments evaluate appropriately. Debate continues regarding successful methods for assessing direct writing. Future research may provide insights into better assessment methods.
APPENDIX A

TEACHER IN-SERVICE PROGRAM: BUILDING WRITTEN LANGUAGE

Lesson One: An Introduction to Building Written Language
Lesson Two: Language Experience Approach
Lesson Three: Writing Workshop, Part I
Lesson Four: Writing Workshop, Part II
Lesson Five: Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach
Lesson 1: An Introduction to Building Written Language

Time Frame: 60 minutes

Materials:
1. The following focus sheets:
   1.1 Thinking About Writing
   1.2 The Differences Between Speaking and Writing
   1.3 Comparing Empirical and Rationalist Approaches to Instruction
   1.4 Model for Developing Written Language
   1.5 A Comparison of Three Approaches to Second Language Writing Instruction
   1.6 Empirical and Rationalist Approaches to Second Language Acquisition

2. The following worksheets:
   1.1 Writing Needs of Students Learning English as a Second Language
   1.2 Comparing Your Approach to Instruction
   1.3 T-Chart

3. Course handbook containing focus sheets and worksheets
4. Learning Journal for teachers to write in.
5. Rubric for Learning Journal if teachers are to be graded (Worksheet 1.4)

Objectives:
1. To be able to state four needs of second language English writers
2. To be able to state beliefs about writing instruction in terms of the empirical and rationalist approaches to language instruction
3. To be able to describe the Building Written Language program, and the rationale for its use

The Lesson

Overview: Participants will be introduced to the workshop and review the need for good writing instruction. They will review strategies they use now to teach writing and their beliefs about writing in terms of empirical and rationalist perspectives. The Building Written Language model will be introduced.
Step 1: Introduction to the Workshop

A. Introductions. If participants are unknown to each other, play “Uncommon Commonalities” using the following directions taken from Second Language Learning Through Cooperative Learning by Julie High in consultation with Dr. Spencer Kagen (1993, p. 3:2). Point out that this activity works well with second language learners and can be used with different topics. It allows for pictures and words and can therefore meet the needs of students at their level of language acquisition.

1. Each group of four participants folds a sheet of blank paper into fourths and then draws a rectangle in the middle.

2. They take turns around the group listing facts about themselves. They can write them or make line drawings on the fourth of the paper closest to them outside of the center rectangle.

3. When teams discover one unusual fact that all team members share, then that fact gets written in the center rectangle and in each person’s quadrant.

4. Teams continue to see how many uncommon commonalities they share.

B. Discuss workshop focus.

1. The purpose is to become familiar with your individual perspectives on writing and learn an approach called Building Written Language.

2. The workshop is hands on and experiential.


D. Review the day’s lesson.

Step 2: Review the needs of second language writers
A. Using Focus Sheet 1.1, participants discuss difficulties for students learning English as a second language and the need for writing.

B. As an aid to understanding needs of writers, participants in groups of 3-4 review the differences between speaking and writing on Focus Sheet 1.2 and then discuss with the whole group.

C. In groups of 3-4, participants complete an overhead of Worksheet 1.1. Each group shares their overhead worksheet with the whole group.

Step 3: Review language theory and determine individual perspectives on language learning.

A. Review Focus Sheet 1.3 and discuss the differences between empiricist and rationalist approaches to language learning and writing.

B. Complete Worksheet 1.2 on individual perspectives.
   1. Acknowledge that answers are very individual and identify perspectives that are held at this time.
   2. Discuss the idea that completion of the worksheet helps with knowing what areas in this program will match beliefs already held and what areas will require looking at a new paradigm.
   3. Working with a partner, participants discuss perspectives on writing, and then individually complete the worksheet.

Step 4: Explore the Building Written Language model

A. Discuss the model (Focus Sheet 1.4).
   1. Explore the parts of the model.
   2. Participants discuss their understanding of the model with a partner and then with the whole group.
B. Compare LEA, Writing Workshop, and CALLA.

1. Examine and discuss the evaluation of LEA, Writing Workshop, and CALLA on Focus Sheet 1.5.

2. Participants work with a partner and complete Worksheet 1.3. On this T-Chart they write what they notice about the relationship between these approaches to writing—where they are alike, where they differ, and how the differences facilitate language instruction?

2. Discuss findings with the whole group.

C. Review and discuss the comparison of LEA, Writing Workshop, and CALLA to empiricist and rationalist perspectives on language learning (Focus Sheet 1.6). Discuss the use of both empiricist and rationalist approaches in meeting student needs.

Step 5: Participants address the following in their Learning Journals. (Use “Rubric for Journal Responses,” Worksheet 1.4, if journals are to be evaluated.)

A. Describe four needs that students have as learners of writing in a second language.

B. Describe your current views on writing in relation to the empirical and rational approaches.

C. Pretend you are explaining the Building Written Language model to your principal or another teacher. You want to be sure that he/she understands how the model functions to meet the writing needs of students. You want your principal to know that it is based on current theories of language acquisition and that each writing approach in the model is designed to meet the needs of students at their level of language acquisition. Use your worksheets and focus sheets to help you to be clear and concise.

D. What feedback do you have about today’s workshop? What worked well? What could be different?
Focus Sheet 1.1

Thinking About Writing

1. "Of course language is integral to most of what happens in the classroom, but to a competent language user, its role is like that of a window, through which we look at the content. It is transparent, and although we may recognize that it is there, its transparency means that it is very hard to see. Focusing on content alone makes language the invisible curriculum in the school. And for children with poor English skills the language becomes a block to learning. To put it another way, their window is made of frosted glass."


2. "When we learn a second language, we learn to communicate with other people: to understand them, talk to them, read what they have written and write to them. An integral part of participating fully in a new cultural setting is learning how to communicate when the other person is not right there in front of us, listening to our words and looking at our gestures and facial expressions. But the fact that people frequently have to communicate with each other in writing is not the only reason to include writing as a part of our second language [instruction]. There is an additional and very important reason: writing helps our students learn. How? First, writing reinforces the grammatical structures, idioms, and vocabulary that we have been teaching our students. Second, when our students write, they also have a chance to be adventurous with the language, to go beyond what they have just leaned to say, to take risks. Third, when they write, they necessarily become very involved with the new language; the effort to express ideas and the constant use of eye, hand, and brain is a unique way to reinforce learning. As writers struggle with what to put down next or how to put it down on paper, they often discover something new to write or a new way of expressing their idea. They discover a real need for finding the right word and the right sentence. The close relationship between writing and thinking makes writing a valuable part of any language course."

Quoted from Ann Raimes, Techniques in Teaching Writing, 1983, p. 3.
Focus Sheet 1.2

The Differences Between Speaking and Writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaking</th>
<th>Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Speech is universal.</td>
<td>Not everyone learns to read and write.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Spoken language has dialectic variations.</td>
<td>Written language generally has standard forms of grammar, syntax, and vocabulary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Speakers use their voices and bodies to help convey ideas.</td>
<td>Writers rely on words on a page to express meaning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Speakers pronounce.</td>
<td>Writers spell.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Speaking is usually spontaneous and unplanned.</td>
<td>Most writing takes time and is planned. You can go back and change what has been written.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. A speaker speaks to a listener who is right there interacting with them.</td>
<td>For the writer, response is delayed or non-existent. The writer has one chance to convey information and hold the readers attention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Speech is usually informal and repetitive.</td>
<td>Writing is more formal and compact. It progresses logically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Speakers use simple sentences connected with “ands” and “buts.”</td>
<td>Writers use more complex sentences with connecting words.128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Worksheet 1.1

Writing Needs of Students
Learning English as a Second Language

What do you do in your writing program to meet:

Skill Needs

Academic Needs

Process Needs

Affective Needs
### Comparing Empirical and Rationalist Approaches to Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Empirical Approach</th>
<th>Rational Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The mind of the learner</td>
<td>Passive learner</td>
<td>Active problem solver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal of instruction</td>
<td>Product</td>
<td>Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View of language learning</td>
<td>Language is the mastery of habits</td>
<td>Language is innate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of the teacher</td>
<td>Teacher plans &amp; sets goals</td>
<td>Teacher &amp; students plan &amp; set goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Features of instructional program</td>
<td>All children learn in the same way/ The curriculum determines instruction needs</td>
<td>Learning is a process unique to each individual/ Instruction is based on student needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill instruction</td>
<td>Sequential &amp; out of context</td>
<td>Integrated &amp; in context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing content</td>
<td>Teacher determined</td>
<td>Student determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>All Levels/ Individual</td>
<td>All levels/ Individual/ Small group/ Large group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective support</td>
<td>Sociocultural aspects are not important to learning</td>
<td>Sociocultural aspects are important to learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Worksheet 1.2

Comparing Your Approach to Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Empirical Approach</th>
<th>Rational Approach</th>
<th>Self/Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The mind of the learner</td>
<td>Passive learner</td>
<td>Active problem solver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal of instruction</td>
<td>Product</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View of language learning</td>
<td>Language is the mastery of habits</td>
<td>Language is innate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of the teacher</td>
<td>Teacher plans and sets goals</td>
<td>Teacher &amp; students plan &amp; set goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Features of instructional program</td>
<td>All children learn in the same way/ The curriculum determines instruction needs</td>
<td>Learning is a process unique to each individual/ Instruction is based on student needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill instruction</td>
<td>Sequential &amp; out of context</td>
<td>Integrated &amp; in context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing content</td>
<td>Teacher determined</td>
<td>Student determined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>All Levels/ Individual</td>
<td>All levels/ Individual/ Small group/ Large group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective support</td>
<td>Sociocultural aspects are not important to learning</td>
<td>Sociocultural aspects are important to learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Focus Sheet 1.4.
Model for Developing Written Language

Build Academics

Beyond

CALLA

Writing

LEA

Writing Workshop

Into

Build the Affective

Through

Build Language Experience
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# Focus Sheet 1.5

## A Comparison of Three Approaches to Second Language Writing Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>LEA</th>
<th>Writing Workshop</th>
<th>CALLA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The mind of the learner</td>
<td>Active problem solver</td>
<td>Active problem solver</td>
<td>Active problem solver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal of instruction</td>
<td>Build the affective/ Independent writing</td>
<td>Build writing competence</td>
<td>Build academic competence/ Apply knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View of language learning</td>
<td>Language is innate</td>
<td>Language is innate</td>
<td>Language is innate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of the teacher</td>
<td>Facilitator/ Scribe</td>
<td>Facilitator/ Guide</td>
<td>Facilitator/ Expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Features of instructional program</td>
<td>Experience/ Discuss/ Dictate/Read/ Scaffold/ Focus on meaning/ Modeling/ Based on student needs</td>
<td>Independent writing/ Conferences/ Focus on meaning first, then mechanics/ Modeling/ Based on student needs</td>
<td>Model and name learning strategies/ Higher order thinking skills/ Focus on academic content/ Based on student needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill instruction</td>
<td>Integrated &amp; in context</td>
<td>Integrated &amp; in context</td>
<td>Integrated &amp; in context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing content</td>
<td>Shared experience</td>
<td>Student chosen topics</td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>All ages/All levels/ Individual/ Small groups/ Large groups</td>
<td>Intermediate &amp; advanced levels/ Individual/ Small groups</td>
<td>Intermediate &amp; advanced levels/ Individuals/ small groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective support</td>
<td>Writing validates student culture/skills</td>
<td>Individual student needs met through conferences</td>
<td>Independent success through strategies instruction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Worksheet 1.3

T-Chart
### Comparison of LEA, Writing Workshop, and CALLA to Empirical and Rationalist Approaches to Second Language Acquisition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Writing Approaches</th>
<th>Empirical Approach</th>
<th>Rational Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The mind of the learner</td>
<td>LEA</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CALLA</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal of instruction</td>
<td>LEA</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CALLA</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View of language learning</td>
<td>LEA</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CALLA</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of the teacher</td>
<td>LEA</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CALLA</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Features of Instructional program</td>
<td>LEA</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CALLA</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill instruction</td>
<td>LEA</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CALLA</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing content</td>
<td>LEA</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CALLA</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility:</td>
<td>LEA</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CALLA</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective support</td>
<td>LEA</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CALLA</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Worksheet 1.4

**Rubric for Journal Responses**

Directions: The following rubric is meant to help instructors determine a journal grade for a student when the journal writing is a summary of the student's learning from class activities. The content of the response you expect will vary with the classroom experience and the expected journal write. A blank on the rubric means that the requirements of that item were not met.

Definition of terms:
- **Thoughtful** - A thoughtful response is one in which the student goes beyond what is requested. They may include personal experiences, ask probing questions, add extra detail or in some other way enhance their answer.
- **Comprehensive** - A comprehensive answer is complete. It is detailed and concentrates on the entire question, leaving no part unanswered.
- **Focused** - In a focused response, the student shows awareness of the question topic in their answer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D-F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thoughtful</td>
<td>Thoughtful</td>
<td>Not thoughtful</td>
<td>Not thoughtful</td>
<td>Not thoughtful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>Complete but with no details</td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focused</td>
<td>Focused</td>
<td>May be off focus</td>
<td>Unfocused</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lesson 2: Language Experience Approach (LEA)

Time frame: 120 minutes

Materials:
1. The following focus sheets:
   2.1 The Language Experience Approach
   2.2 The Red Balloon, an LEA Lesson
   2.3 Assessment of Speaking
   2.4 Writing Rubric
2. The following worksheet:
   2.1 Planning an LEA Lesson
3. Materials for the LEA lesson (see Focus Sheet 2.2)

Objectives:
1. To experience the Language Experience Approach
2. To write a lesson plan for a Language Experience Approach lesson
3. To implement a language experience lesson

The Lesson

Overview: The participants will experience a Language Experience Approach (LEA) lesson using the video called “The Red Balloon.” They will be asked to do an LEA lesson in their own classroom and then to evaluate it.

Step 1: An introduction to LEA

A. Discuss LEA and the initial support it provides for students learning second language writing.

B. Discuss the LEA process using Focus Sheet 2.1.

Step 2: Experiencing the LEA lesson about “The Red Balloon”

A. Review and discuss Focus Sheet 2.2.

B. Experience the lesson plan for “The Red Balloon” and note the
steps in the LEA process. Advise that this lesson normally takes two to three days.

Step 3: Review of the LEA experience

A. Discuss the lesson. Note how scaffolding is experienced and how written language is facilitated in a safe, positive environment.

B. Participants discuss and then answer the following questions in their Learning Journals.

1. What were the steps taken?
2. In what way did you see scaffolding take place?
3. Was the environment safe and positive?
4. What do you see as the advantages for a beginning second language writer? For more independent writers?

Step 4: Extension of the LEA lesson and Assessment

A. Discuss the possible ways to extend an LEA lesson. (See Focus Sheet 2.2, section on Extensions).

B. Discuss assessment ideas

1. Evaluate the extension writing activities using a rubric (See Focus Sheet 2.3).
2. Use LEA to evaluate speaking using the speaking assessment (Focus Sheet 2.4).
3. Practice reading using the individual small books that students illustrate matching text to a picture.

Step 5: Participants design their own LEA lesson

A. Participants discuss their experience in groups of four and determine how they might incorporate an LEA lesson into their teaching the following week.
B. Each participant plans an LEA lesson using Worksheet 2.1.

C. At the next class meeting, discuss the experiences.
Focus Sheet 2.1

The Language Experience Approach

The Procedure for LEA:

1. Experience something together
   • This may be a book, an activity, a video, etc.

2. Discuss the event
   • Build on previous knowledge and explain pertinent vocabulary

3. Write the story
   • Students dictate and you write for the whole class (use overhead, chart paper, etc.)
   • Students write as you write or copy the story later
   • As you write the story, say the words aloud
   • Stop periodically and read what has been written moving your finger as you go
   • Students read with you
   • Encourage students and facilitate scaffolding

4. Follow up activities
   • Make a large class book - students match pictures to the words
   • Make individual small books and illustrate them
   • Have students extend the experience and write their own stories
   • Use the writing for language activities- cloze, ordering sentences/words, identifying words/letters in the writing

The Benefits of LEA:

1. The student point of view is valued
2. The content is authentic and in the student's own words
3. Self-concept is enhanced - this is their writing
4. Skills are built in a meaningful context
5. All language skills are utilized
6. Less proficient students benefit from the expertise of more proficient students
7. It can be used large with large groups, small groups, and individuals
8. It is appropriate for all grade levels and can be used at all levels of acquisition
9. It can be adapted to teach grammar and punctuation for students who are ready for such instruction
Focus Sheet 2.2

The Red Balloon, an LEA Lesson

Audience: Grades 1 and up

Level: Pre-production, Speech Emergence and up

Time Frame: Approximately 3 hours, may be extended

Materials:
2. Overheads or chart paper on which to write story
3. Writing paper for students
4. Colored pencils/crayons/markers

Objectives:
1. To attend to the video
2. To produce a group story
3. Other—depending upon extensions

Language objectives:
1. To write and sequence “The Red Balloon” story with a beginning, middle, and end
2. To learn vocabulary appropriate to the story
3. To use ordinal numbers (1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th etc.)
4. To read the class written story
5. To retell the story using details appropriate to level of acquisition

The Lesson

An overview: The students will watch the video called “The Red Balloon” and then write the story in a shared writing format. The story will be produced as a class story on chart paper with pictures made by the students. Follow up activities are listed at the end of the lesson.

Step 1: Experience something together

A. Introduce the video.
1. Share a red helium filled balloon with students.

2. Show the box for the video and discuss what the video is about. If students need something more concrete, use drawings on the board.

3. Explain that there are no spoken words in this story and that later we will write the story.

B. Show the video.

Step 2: Discuss the event

A. Discuss the story. Write important words on the board, with a picture if necessary.

B. Take advantage of an opportunity - if it is appropriate, teach ordinal numbers to sequence what happened in the story.

Step 3: Write the story

A. Get ready to write.

1. Explain to students that we will write the story of the Red Balloon together.

2. Students can write as the teacher writes or they can copy the story on their own later.

B. Begin the shared writing.

1. As students contribute sentences, discuss with them and encourage participation. Help them to build upon each other’s ideas.

2. Say the words aloud as the sentences are written.

3. Periodically stop and reread what has been written, following the text with a finger. Students who are writing can use this time to catch up and then read along.
4. When the story is completed, read it with the class several times and/or invite individual students or small groups of students to read.

Step 4: Follow up activity: Making a class story

A. Sequence the story on chart paper with the writing at the bottom and room for a picture at the top. If students are capable, they can write the story at the bottom of each page, but if it is to be read as a class story, it needs to be very legible.

B. Explain to students that they will be making a kind of picture book that we can all read together. They will need to draw a picture to go with the writing at the bottom of the piece of chart paper.

C. Divide students into groups with each group making the picture for one part of the story. (No more than four to a group; three is preferred.)

EXTENSIONS:

A. Lower acquisition levels--becoming comfortable with writing

1. Assess student speaking and understanding of the story by asking individual students to tell the story and completing the Focus Sheet 2.4 Small picture prompts of events in the video can be used to facilitate understanding.

2. Give students the story sequenced on plain writing paper with words at the bottom and a place for them to put a picture at the top. This “book” can be read by them and taken home to share with parents. You can give them points for reading it to someone at home.

3. After students are familiar with the group story, give them sentences from it to put in proper sequence. This is best as a group activity. (Not recommended by those who support a pure whole language approach.)

B. Upper acquisition levels--becoming independent writers
1. Have students write an extension to the story.
   a) Students draw a picture of a part they liked best and write about it telling what is happening and why they liked this part.
   b) Students write an adventure story about being carried away by balloons telling where they would go and what they would see. This could be made into a small book.

2. After students are familiar with the story, make up a cloze activity. Write the story, leaving out words specially selected as important to student learning. Depending upon level, put the missing words at the bottom of the page. This can be difficult, so it may be better to have students work in groups.

3. Cut up sentences into the words and have students reconstruct them. Adjust number of sentences and particular sentences to level of students.
Focus Sheet 2.3  

Assessment of Speaking  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Name</th>
<th>Conveyed Meaning</th>
<th>Used appropriate vocabulary</th>
<th>Used appropriate sentence and grammar structures</th>
<th>Pronounced clearly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Topic: 

Date: __________
Focus Sheet 2.4

Writing Rubric

Directions: Read the student’s writing and then complete the following rubric. Put a check mark next to those items that apply to the student’s writing. Total the number of checks at each level. The level with the most checks indicates the score for the student.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Non-proficient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
  - unintelligible 
  - language other than English is used 
  - does not address topic |
| 2. Very limited proficiency | 
  - barely intelligible, many errors affect meaning 
  - addresses topic inadequately with few or no supportive details 
  - lacks correct paragraphing 
  - vocabulary and syntax limited 
  - errors in punctuation, capitalization, spelling affect understanding 
  - the quality and/or quantity of writing is below grade level |
| 3. Limited Proficiency | 
  - mostly intelligible, some errors affect meaning 
  - addresses the topic generally with partially supportive details 
  - ideas may be disorganized and paragraphs poorly developed 
  - vocabulary and syntax acceptable 
  - partially correct punctuation, capitalization and spelling 
  - the quality and/or quantity is partially lacking for grade level |
| 4. Proficient | 
  - intelligible, errors do not limit meaning 
  - addresses topic clearly with supportive details 
  - logical organization of ideas and well developed paragraphs 
  - vocabulary and syntax precise and higher level 
  - almost no errors in punctuation, capitalization, spelling 
  - quality and quantity meets grade level expectations |

Step 1: Experience something together

Step 2: Discuss the event

Step 3: Write the story together

Step 4: Follow-up activities

Assessment:
Lesson 3: Writing Workshop, Part I

Time Frame: 70 minutes

Materials:
1. Writing materials, pens, pencils, paper, and so on.
2. The following focus sheets:
   3.1 Introducing Writing Workshop
   3.2 Conducting a Writing Workshop
   3.3 Lesson Plan for Day One of Writing Workshop
   3.4 Rules for Writing Workshop
   3.5 Skills List (Student Writing Folder)
   3.6 My Ideas for Writing (Student Folder)

Objectives:
1. To be able to explain what writing workshops provide for students
2. To experience the first day of Writing Workshop and relate this experience to their own teaching
3. To become familiar with a method to help students find writing topics
4. To be familiar with the rules of Writing Workshop

The Lesson

Overview: Participants will be introduced to Writing Workshop and what it can provide for students. They will learn about beginning a writing workshop by experiencing a lesson for day one. Through this lesson they will be introduced to a method for getting students started writing and to some of the rules that help structure the workshop.

Step 1: Introduction

A. Discuss and review Writing Workshop using Focus Sheet 3.1.

B. Discuss the need for a strong structure within which students have the freedom to experience the writing process.

C. Review the day’s lesson.

Step 2: Review and discuss how to conduct writing workshops using Focus Sheet 3.2
Step 3: Experience day one of Writing Workshop

A. Share and discuss Focus Sheet 3.3.

B. Experience the Writing Workshop lesson.

Step 4: Discuss the lesson

A. Discuss what the students are able to do by the end of day one of Writing Workshop (they have found a topic on which to write, they have begun writing, they have their folders, and they know to label the draft they are working on).

B. Address the following parts of the lesson specifically.

1. The lesson involves just one idea for doing a topic search and getting students started writing.

2. Listening, reflecting, and asking questions is important modeling for students.

3. Sharing has many purposes including to audition a piece, share an idea or technique, look at different ways to solve a problem, get advice, see what others are doing and get ideas.

Step 5: Participants write in their Learning Journals

A. Discuss the following journal questions briefly.

1. What do writing workshops provide for students?

2. How would you adapt day one of Writing Workshop to your classes?

3. What was advantageous about this method of getting students started writing? What other ways have you used in the past?

4. What would you add to the writing rules? What would you not use?
B. Participants answer the questions in their Learning Journal.
Introducing Writing Workshop

Writing Workshops Provide:

1. **Time:** Students need planned, regular, frequent time to write. They need time to think, confer, read, change their minds and write some more.

2. **Ownership:** Students need to feel connected to what they write. They need opportunities to choose. Right from the first day of kindergarten, students should use writing as a way to think about and give shape to their own ideas and concerns.

3. **Response:** Students need personal, meaningful responses to writing. Helpful response comes during—not after—the composing. It comes from the writer’s peers and from the teacher, who consistently models the kinds of restatements and questions that help writers reflect on the content of their writing.

A Day in Writing Workshop:

1. Begin with a mini-lesson on procedures, craft of writing, or writing skills. This is a time for direct teaching and lasts about 10 minutes. In a pure form of a writing workshop, the information is offered and students are not “tested” on it with worksheets etc.

2. Take the status of the class. Record what each student is working on this day. This lets you know how students are progressing and helps students focus on what they will be working on.

3. Writing begins. **Students** write drafts 1, 2, etc., edit, write final drafts, or conference with teacher or each other. **Teachers** conduct conferences on content or mechanics and record results of conferences.

4. **Writing is shared,** preferably each day.

5. **Teacher preparation:** edit essays, prepare conference record, plan mini-lesson.
Focus Sheet 3.2

Conducting a Writing Workshop

Materials

Paper of different sizes, weights, colors, & textures. Writing implements of various sizes, colors, & styles. Erasers, paper clips, envelopes, scissors, stamps, staplers, Post It notes, etc.

Mini-lesson

10-15 minute lesson on procedures, craft of writing, or writing skills

Status of the Class

Students report to the teacher what they will be working on that day (draft, final draft, editing, conferencing, etc.) Teacher records on the status of the class sheet. Done quickly in 2-3 minutes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Students: Experience a recursive writing process</th>
<th>Teacher:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Choose topics</td>
<td>Facilitates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Conferences on content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Conferences on mechanics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Write drafts &amp; Label “D-1, D-2, etc.”</td>
<td>Completes a conference record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluate</td>
<td>Note: Students read their own work in the conference. Mechanics are best addressed after content has been established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rewrite</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Write final drafts &amp; label “F-D”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conference with teacher and peers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Writing Workshop Cycle

Students write draft 1, 2, 3, etc. and edit. Drafts may be shared with peers

Students turn draft into the teacher and continue work on another piece

The teacher edits draft, prepares for conference, & makes notes on conference record

Student & teacher conference/ student records skills to work on

Student turns in final draft/ draft may be shared
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Focus Sheet 3.3

Lesson Plan for Writing Workshop Day One

Participants: Can be adapted for grades 2 and up.

Time Frame: 60-90 minutes

Materials:
1. Various writing materials including pens, pencils, paper.
2. Student writing folder
3. Writing Workshop rules

Objectives:
1. Students will begin writing on a topic
2. Students will be familiar with the rules of Writing Workshop and how to label their writing pieces.
3. Students will share the lead from what they have written

The Lesson

Overview: Students will experience a mini-lesson on how to choose a writing topic. They will begin writing and be introduced to the rules of Writing Workshop. They will receive their writing folders and share a part of what they have written.

Step 1: Choosing materials for writing

A. Discuss with students the importance of choosing writing materials that work well and are enjoyable to use.

B. Explain that we (instructor too) will be writing today and to select the writing instrument and paper they would like to use.

Step 2: Extended mini-lesson on choosing a writing topic

A. Discuss the importance of writing about familiar experiences.

B. Share some personal topics for writing. Elaborate and tell the stories briefly.
1. Demonstrate the importance of choosing familiar topics.

2. Demonstrate the need for keeping the focus from being too broad.

B. Students do a topic search.

1. Discuss that each student is an author with stories to tell.

2. Suggest possible topics. For example times they were laughing, crying, or scared; people they love; someone special; something they want to remember or something they want to forget; stories about pets; people they miss and so on.

3. Have students think silently for three minutes and make a list of ideas using words and/or pictures. Just ideas, no writing of stories yet.

C. Students share ideas for writing

1. In groups of two to three, have students talk for two minutes each and quickly tell the stories they are thinking about. They write down any new ideas for writing they have discovered through the discussion.

2. As a whole group, have students share an idea they or their partner had. As they do, model listening, reflecting, and asking questions. They write down any new ideas for writing they may have.

Step 3: Discuss the procedures and rules for Writing Workshop using Focus Sheet 3.4 (Rules and wording may need to be adapted for grade level)

A. Explain that in Writing Workshop, students write every day. Each person is an author and works at his or her own pace and on his or her own special piece of writing.

B. Review the rules.

Step 4: Students begin writing
A. Show students how to label their paper with “Draft 1” and the date.

B. As the instructor, begin writing. Do not look up. Give students the time to begin their own writing.

C. After students have begun writing, move about and confer with students. Go first to those who have had trouble starting writing.

**Step 5: Students share a part of what they have written (This procedure may need adapting for younger students)**

A. Have students look at what they have written for about a half minute and decide where the beginning ends. Explain that this is the place where the reader has a pretty good idea what the piece is about. Tell them to put a dot there. For older students, tell them this is called the “lead.”

B. Have students put their papers face down. (This helps them to focus on what is being read.)

C. Go very quickly around the room having each person read their lead. No comments or stopping.

**Step 6: Students receive their writing folders**

A. Instruct students to finish the sentence they are writing.

B. Pass out student writing folders and review what is in them (Focus Sheets 3.5 and 3.6). Explain that they are to keep all writing in progress in this folder

**Step 7: Summing up day one. Review what has been done today and answer any questions**

Focus Sheet 3.4

Rules for Writing Workshop

1. Do not erase. You may cross out. Thinking and writing are connected. It is important to record your thinking and how it changes. You may want to go back and use what you have crossed out.

2. Write on only one side of the paper. This will make it possible to reorganize by cutting and pasting.

3. Skip lines. This will allow you to write in what you may have forgotten and it is easier to edit. This does not need to be done for the final draft.

4. Save everything. Keep notes and doodles. You may not see the value of something today, but later you may want it.

5. Date and label all your writing. This means DRAFT 1, DRAFT 2, FINAL DRAFT and so on.

6. Use quiet voices. Writing is thinking and it is hard if thoughts are interrupted.

7. Work hard. You are never “finished” writing. When you are done with one piece, you begin the next one.
Focus Sheet 3.5
Skills List

Things that ______________________ is working on as a writer.

1. ____________________________________________
2. ____________________________________________
3. ____________________________________________
4. ____________________________________________
5. ____________________________________________
6. ____________________________________________
7. ____________________________________________
8. ____________________________________________
9. ____________________________________________
10. __________________________________________
11. __________________________________________
12. __________________________________________
13. __________________________________________
14. __________________________________________
15. __________________________________________
16. __________________________________________
17. __________________________________________
18. __________________________________________
19. __________________________________________
20. __________________________________________
Focus Sheet 3.6

My Ideas for Writing

Finished Pieces of Writing - Title and Date
Lesson 4: Writing Workshop, Part II

Time Frame: 60 minutes

Materials:
1. The following focus sheets:
   4.1 Status of the Class
   4.2 Teacher's Conference Record
2. The following worksheets:
   4.1 The First Mini-lessons: Teaching Procedures
   4.2 Writing Workshop: Teacher Responsibilities
   4.3 Establishing a Writing Workshop In Your Classroom: What to Consider

Objectives:
1. To be able to apply the model of Writing Workshop
2. Using the information presented to be able to explain what they already do that facilitates Writing Workshop, what they would need to give up, and what they would need to add.

The Lesson

Overview: Participants will review the important aspects of running a Writing Workshop including mini-lessons to cover what students need to know and a discussion of teacher responsibilities. They will evaluate implementing a Writing Workshop in their own classroom.

Step 1: Review the objectives of the day's lesson

Step 2: Discuss the use of mini-lessons to teach procedures to students

   A. Review the purposes of mini-lessons (Focus Sheet 3.1). Discuss the importance to a smooth running writing workshop of the first mini-lessons on procedures.

   B. Using Worksheet 4.1, participants discuss and take notes on the procedures students need to be taught in mini-lessons.

       1. Discuss all class rules.
2. Review the location and appropriate use of materials for the writing workshop.

3. Demonstrate how to complete the forms in the writing folders.
   
   a) On the skill sheet (Focus Sheet 3.5), students record what skills they are working on as determined in their conference with the teacher.
   
   b) Students also record their ideas for writing and their finished pieces of writing (Focus Sheet 3.6).
   
4. Discuss editing procedures.
   
   a) Editing is done independently so the writing reflects what students know.
   
   b) Students should use the Skills List in their folder to determine the focus for their editing.
   
   c) Editing should be done in a different color than the one in which the essay is written.
   
5. Establish where things go.
   
   a) Where should drafts for the teacher to edit be turned in?
   
   b) Where should final drafts go?
   
   c) Where should something to be copied or mailed be put?
   
6. Decide how to label their papers with name and draft number.

7. Schedule how and where conferencing with peers will take place.
8. Establish that students need to be ready and respond quickly for the status of the class (Focus Sheet 4.1).

Step 3: Discuss teacher responsibilities in Writing Workshop

A. Using Worksheet 4.2, discuss and take notes on teacher responsibilities in a Writing Workshop.

1. Prepare mini-lessons.

2. Take the status of the class (Focus Sheet 4.1). This should be done quickly.

3. Edit student drafts and complete the student conference record.

   a) Review Focus Sheet 4.2. Discuss the importance of using the conference record to monitor student progress.

   b) Discuss editing options: content or mechanics; one or two skills; writing on the student’s paper; having student make the corrections in the conference; skipping this step and editing during the conference.

4. Conference with students and complete student Skills List (Focus Sheet 3.5).

   a) Students read their work to the teacher.

   b) Students record the skills they should work on.

   c) Discuss the value of this part of the workshop to students and their investment in their writing.

B. Review Focus Sheet 3.2 and “The Writing Workshop Cycle.”

Step 4: Discuss assessment of students in Writing Workshop

A. Assessment can take many forms.
B. The conference record provides a record of student progress and is a valuable tool in assessment.

C. Some assessment ideas. Discuss the pros and cons of each.

1. Design a rubric and assign grades to final drafts.

2. Establish an evaluation rubric based on aspects of writing important to your students learning such as content mechanics/grammar, spelling, effort, and the progress the student is making.

3. Establish a self-evaluation rubric for students and have them participate in determination of their progress and a grade.

4. Have individual conferences with each student, review their work and arrive at a grade. The previously completed evaluation rubrics can be the focus for the conference.

5. Have students write an end of the grading period paper demonstrating their best work and use it as a part of their grade.

Step 5: Participants apply the Writing Workshop model to their classroom

A. Establishing a Writing Workshop in your classroom takes time and commitment. Allow time to organize it carefully to ensure success.

B. Participants work in groups of two or three and each completes Worksheet 4.3.
Worksheet 4.1

The First Mini Lessons: Teaching Procedures

Class rules

Materials

Using the writing folder

How to edit

Where things go

Labeling papers

Conferencing

Status of the class
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D1= First Draft  Ed Con= Editing conference  SE= Self editing
D2= Second Draft Cont Con= Content conference  Sh= Schedule for group share
DF= Final Draft  Peer Con= Conference with peers  TS= Topic selection
Worksheet 4.2

Writing Workshop:
Teacher Responsibilities

Prepare mini-lessons

Take the status of the class

Edit student drafts and complete the student conference record

Confer with students and complete the student conference record

Determine a method of evaluating student progress
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Piece and Date</th>
<th>Skills Used Correctly</th>
<th>Skills Taught (No more than two)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Worksheet 4.3**

**Establishing a Writing Workshop in Your Classroom:**

**What to Consider**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What I already do that facilitates writing workshop</th>
<th>What I will have to give up to have a writing workshop</th>
<th>What I will need to add to have a writing workshop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Lesson 5: Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA)

Time Frame 90 minutes

Materials from workshop handbook
1. The following focus sheets
   5.1 Learning Strategies in the Classroom
   5.2 CALLA Plan for Teaching Learning Strategies
   5.3 CALLA Lesson Plan: Answering Questions
   5.4 CALLA Lesson Plan: Writing Math Problems
2. The following Worksheets
   5.1 What Would a Family Bring in Their Covered Wagon?
   5.2 Thinking About Your Learning
   5.3 Practice Writing Your Own Word Problems
   5.4 Thinking About Your Learning
   5.5 Applying CALLA to Your Classroom
   5.6 Thinking About Your Learning
3. Materials for the CALLA lessons (see focus sheets 5.3 and 5.4)

Objectives:
1. To be able to explain the rationale for CALLA
2. To be able to apply CALLA to the classroom

The Lesson

Overview: The participants will be introduced to the learning strategies and steps for a CALLA lesson. They will experience two lessons and then apply what they have learned to their own classroom teaching.

Step 1: An introduction to CALLA

A. Discuss the appropriateness of this strategy for students at intermediate and advanced levels of proficiency.

B. Discuss the need for an approach that takes students “beyond” and into using writing for academic purposes.

C. Review the day’s lesson.
Step 2: A discussion of the structure and focus of CALLA lessons

A. Using Focus Sheet 5.1, discuss the importance of the teaching of learning strategies in CALLA instruction and the importance of student awareness of the use of strategies to learn.

B. Using Focus Sheet 5.2, discuss the five CALLA steps for teaching a content lesson.

Step 3: Experience CALLA Lessons

A. Share and discuss the two CALLA lesson plans (Focus Sheets 5.3 and 5.4).

B. Experience the two CALLA lessons.

Step 4: Discuss the CALLA lessons

A. Review the learning strategy instruction and the five steps in the lessons.

B. Review the rationale behind CALLA.

C. Answer any questions.

Step 5: Applying CALLA to the classroom

A. Discuss that the teaching of learning strategies and the steps of CALLA can be integrated into content lessons participants already use. The difference may be to focus on the learning strategies and the five lesson steps.

B. Using Worksheet 5.5, participants apply CALLA to a lesson they already do in the classroom.

Step 6: Ask participants to evaluate themselves using Worksheet 5.6. Remind them to include written comments to help explain their responses.

Step 7: Summarize the learning from the workshop and ask participants to respond to the following questions
A. Make a quick list of ideas for teaching writing presented in this workshop.

B. Of these ideas, which ones will you choose to use in your classroom? Please explain.

C. Of these ideas which ones do you choose not to use. Please explain.

D. How well did this workshop meet your needs? What would you change? What would you add?
   
   1. Content
   
   2. Instructional style

E. Other comments
Focus Sheet 5.1
Learning Strategies In the Classroom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Name</th>
<th>Strategy Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metacognitive Strategies:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance organization</td>
<td>Preview, skim, get the gist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational planning</td>
<td>Plan what to do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective attention</td>
<td>Listen/read selectively, scan for specifics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-management</td>
<td>Plan when, where, and how to study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring comprehension</td>
<td>Think while listening/ reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring production</td>
<td>Think while speaking/ writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-assessment</td>
<td>Check back, reflect on learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cognitive Strategies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resourcing</td>
<td>Use reference materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grouping</td>
<td>Classify, construct graphic organizers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note-taking</td>
<td>Take notes on idea lists, T-lists, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaboration of knowledge</td>
<td>Use what know, make analogies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarizing</td>
<td>Say or write the main idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deduction/induction</td>
<td>Use a rule/ make a rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagery</td>
<td>Visualize, make a picture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditory representation</td>
<td>Use mental tape recorder, hear it again</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making inferences</td>
<td>Use context clues, predict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social/ Affective Strategies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning for clarification</td>
<td>Ask questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation</td>
<td>Cooperate, work with &amp; coach each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self talk</td>
<td>Think positively</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Focus Sheet 5.2

**CALLA Plan for Teaching Learning Strategies**

The following is the organizational plan for teaching learning strategies within a content lesson using CALLA. There are five steps, but they may not fall in order. For example a lesson may include several sequences of steps one and two before moving to step three.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Teacher Responsibilities</th>
<th>Student Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparation and Presentation</td>
<td>Activate prior knowledge, explain, model</td>
<td>Attend, participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>Coach with extensive feedback</td>
<td>Practice strategies with guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate and Expand</td>
<td>Encourage transfer, assess</td>
<td>Evaluate strategies, use strategies independently</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Teacher responsibility becomes less as a lesson progresses through the steps and student responsibility and independence increases.

Focus Sheet 5.3

CALLA Lesson Plan: Answering Questions

Note: This is one lesson in what would be a whole unit on the Settling of the west. It is designed to demonstrate the organization and content of a CALLA lesson.

Audience: Elementary

Level: Intermediate and advanced fluency

Time frame: 45 minutes

Materials:
1. Listening text: “What Would Your Family Bring in Their Covered wagon” in If You Traveled West In A Covered Wagon by Ellen Levine (Scholastic, 1983, p. 20)
2. Pictures of covered wagons
3. The following worksheets
   What Would a Family Bring In Their Covered Wagon (5.1)
   Thinking About Your Learning (5.2)

Content Objectives:
Be able to answer the question “If you traveled west in a covered wagon, what would you have to bring with you?

Language Objectives:
Listen to information about traveling west in a covered wagon and answer questions with a written summary.

Learning Strategies:
1. Utilizing prior knowledge
2. Selective attention in listening
3. Note taking
4. Cooperation
5. Self-evaluation
Procedures

1. Preparation: What do you know about what the pioneers carried with them in their covered wagons?

   A. Brainstorm ideas with students

   B. Look at pictures of the wagons and imagine what might be taken. What might be left behind.

   C. Point out the strategy of "utilizing prior knowledge" to the students.

2. Presentation: Teacher instructs students in strategy of selective listening and note taking.

   A. Put the first paragraph of the listening text, "What Would Your Family Bring in Their Covered Wagon" on the board or overhead.

   B. Ask students what words could be erased or abbreviated and still retain meaning?

   C. Show how the whole text can be reconstructed - in their own words - from the notes.

   D. Explain that this is using a strategy called selective attention to take notes.

3. Practice: Students listen to the text "What Would Your Family Bring in Their Covered Wagon" and take notes.

   A. Remind students to use selective attention.

   B. Pass out Worksheet 5.1 for note taking (note: this should be adjusted to abilities of students). Point out the T-list as a strategy for note-taking.

   C. Students listen to the text the first time without writing notes. Discuss any vocabulary that may be difficult. The second time, students take notes on the T-List.
D. Students work in groups of 3-4 to compare and complete their notes. Point out to students that they are using the strategy “cooperation.”

E. Each student writes a summary from their notes in answer to the question, “What did the pioneers headed west take with them in their covered wagons and why?”

4. Evaluation: Students record in their learning logs what they have learned today, any new vocabulary, and the learning strategies they used. The teacher leads a discussion of the learning logs and what has been learned.

5. Extensions

A. In groups of 3-4, students use pictures and words to make a collage that explains what the families brought in their covered wagons.

C. Have students imagine that they are going to leave planet Earth in a small spaceship for a destination on another planet far, far away. They must bring with them everything they will need to establish a colony on this planet. What would they be sure to take with them? What would be hardest for them to leave behind? Have students write about this.

5. Self-Evaluation: Complete Worksheet 5.2.

6. Assessment

A. Evaluate the written product using a rubric (see Focus Sheet 2.4).

B. Evaluate the Learning Log
Worksheet 5.1

**What Would a Family Bring In Their Covered Wagon?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Ideas</th>
<th>Details and Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What was left behind?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What was taken?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Things for daily chores?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Things for Sleeping?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Things for cooking and eating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Worksheet 5.2  
Thinking About Your Learning

How successful do you feel about what you have learned today? Circle the place on the line that shows how you feel.

1. Knowledge about what is taken in a covered wagon

- Not very successful
- Somewhat successful
- Very successful

2. Vocabulary

- Not very successful
- Somewhat successful
- Very successful

3. Learning Strategies

- Not very successful
- Somewhat successful
- Very successful

Comments:
Focus Sheet 5.4

CALLA Lesson Plan: Writing Math Problems

Note: This is one lesson in what is a whole unit on solving addition problems. It is presented here to demonstrate the organization and content of a CALLA lesson.

Audience: Elementary

Level: Intermediate and advanced fluency

Time Frame: 45 minutes

Materials:
The following worksheets
  Practice Writing Your Own Word Problems (5.3)
  Thinking About Your Learning (5.4)

Content objectives:
Apply knowledge of addition in writing problems

Language objectives
Write word problems

Learning Strategies
1. Organizational planning
2. Cooperation
3. Self-evaluation

Procedures

1. Preparation: What do you know about word problems?

   A. Teacher leads a discussion about how word problems are structured, eliciting from students the main parts: story or situation, data, and question.

   B. Students brainstorm ideas for writing their own word problems and teacher writes them on the board.
2. Presentation: Planning a word problem

   A. Using some of the ideas from the board, the teacher models writing a word problem and the strategy of “organizational planning” before beginning writing.

   B. The teacher challenges students to write word problems that are not too difficult nor too easy for students in the class to solve.

3. Practice: Students write their own problems

   A. Using Worksheet 5.3, students work in small groups writing word problems.

   B. Students take turns reading their problems aloud. Other group members write down the information that is important to solving the problem.

4. Evaluation: Students write in their learning logs about what they have learned in the unit, any new vocabulary, and the learning strategies they used. The teacher leads a class discussion of the learning logs.

5. Expansion:

   A. Students write word problems about things at home and bring them to class to share.

   B. Students work together to write word problems related to other content areas.


7. Assessment suggestions:

   A. Worksheets with sample problems to do.

   B. Assignments for students to write their own problems.

   C. Student learning logs.

Worksheet 5.3

Practice Writing Your Own Word Problems

Now it is your turn to write your own addition word problems. Follow these steps:

1. Organize your ideas
2. Write a word problem
3. Read your problem to two friends. Solve each others problems.
4. Check answers with your friends.

A. Organize your ideas. First choose an addition equation.

**Examples:** 33 + 82 = 115   264 + 367 = 631

Then think of a story to go with the equation.

**Examples:** My brother has 33 records and my dad has 82. Maria has 264 stamps in her stamp collection. Her uncle gave her 367 more stamps.

B. Write a word problem. First write the story you thought about. Then write a question to go with the story. Remember to use words that tell what math operation to use.

**Examples:** How many records do they have altogether? How many stamps does Maria have in all?

C. Now try writing other addition word problems.

**Problem 1**

Addition equation: ________________________________________

Story: ____________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

Question: ________________________________________________________
Problem 2
Addition equation: ____________________________
Story: ______________________________________
Question: ___________________________________

Problem 3
Addition equation: ____________________________
Story: ______________________________________
Question: ___________________________________

Problem 4
Addition equation: ____________________________
Story: ______________________________________
Question: ___________________________________

D. Sit with two friends. Take turns reading your problems and solving them. Read your problems aloud. As you read, your friends will write down the important numbers. Then they will solve your problems. When it is your turn to solve their problems, remember to use the 5-Point Checklist.

E. Now check your work with your two friends. How many correct answers did you have? _______ Which problems were easy? __________ Which problems were difficult? __________ Look again at the problems that were difficult. Decide why they were difficult. Is the math too hard? Are the words too hard? Write a sentence that tells what was difficult.

Worksheet 5.4
Thinking About Your Learning

How successful do you feel about what you have learned today? Circle the place on the line that shows how you feel.

1. Knowledge about writing word problems

Not very successful  Somewhat successful  Very successful

2. Vocabulary

Not very successful  Somewhat successful  Very successful

3. Learning Strategies

Not very successful  Somewhat successful  Very successful

Comments:
Worksheet 5.5

Applying CALLA to Your Classroom

1. Choose a content area lesson that you already do and are very familiar with. Choose just one lesson and not a whole unit. Describe the lesson:

2. Review the lesson and using Focus Sheet 5.1, write down the learning strategies that you feel apply to the lesson. You may have to limit yourself to those you feel are most important to teach.

3. Working with a partner, brainstorm ways to teach those learning strategies.

4. On another piece of paper, outline your lesson using the CALLA lesson steps of preparation, presentation, practice, evaluation, and expansion. Remember that you may repeat the first three steps several times before you move to the last two.
Worksheet 5.6
Thinking About Your Learning

How successful do you feel about what you have learned today? Circle the place on the line that shows how you feel.

1. Knowledge about the rationale for CALLA

[Scale]

Not very successful  |  Somewhat successful  |  Very successful

Comments:

2. Knowledge about the use of strategies for CALLA

[Scale]

Not very successful  |  Somewhat successful  |  Very successful

Comments:

3. Knowledge about the five lesson steps for CALLA

[Scale]

Not very successful  |  Somewhat successful  |  Very successful

Comments:
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