

**PEDAGOGICAL PRACTICE IN MAINSTREAM UNIVERSITY LITERATURE
COURSES WITH GENERATION 1.5 AND INTERNATIONAL ESL PARTICIPANTS**

by

NATHAN KIELSTRA

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

Master of Arts in TESOL

We accept this thesis as conforming to the required standard

.....
Dr. William R. Acton, PhD; Thesis Supervisor

.....
Brian Teaman, MEd; Second Reader

.....
Dr. James Stalker, PhD; External Examiner

TRINITY WESTERN UNIVERSITY

November 2011

© Nathan Kielstra

ABSTRACT

This mixed-methods study explored the pedagogical practices of mainstream instructors in classes with NNS learners at a small university in British Columbia, Canada. English literature is a course often used in the liberal arts tradition to introduce students to the great written works of the English language and also to equip them with the critical thinking and academic writing skills necessary to be successful in their studies. The inclusion of greater numbers of NNS students in these courses, however, has presented unique challenges for instructors due to such things as lower levels of literary competence, language proficiency, and cultural knowledge as compared to their NS peers. This has necessitated changes in the teaching practices of many mainstream instructors, who often have little ESL-specific training or experience with the instruction of NNS students. Combining classroom observations, instructor interviews, and a learner survey, this research sought to describe the pedagogical choice of three instructors with different levels of experience teaching introduction to English short story and poetry courses. Participants included three instructors, 33 NS students, and 17 NNS students including 13 international ESL students of mostly Asian descent and four Generation 1.5 participants, defined as NNS learners who have lived for a number of years in an English speaking country. Results indicated that each instructor employed different types of instruction in their class, in addition to a number of practices that they implemented specifically for their NNS learners. However, the employment of NNS-specific practices appeared to be dependent on experience, either instructional or with NNS learners, or the number of NNS learners that were participating in the course. Learner perception of these practices also varied, with international ESL, Generation 1.5, and NS students exhibiting characteristics and preferences of pedagogical practices unique to their groups. Despite this variation, both NS and NNS students generally perceived the instructional practices of their teachers positively, which appears to indicate the success with which these instructors implemented different instructional types. This suggests that these mainstream literature classes differ based on the proportion and type of NNS learners in the course; and that these literature instructors are active in making adjustments to aid NNS students and creating classrooms that are inclusive of diverse students. That being said, instructors new to the teaching of NNS students would appear to benefit from ESL-specific training or greater collaboration with second language education specialists.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to thank Dr. William Acton for his advice and instruction as my mentor and thesis supervisor. Working and studying under him over the past two years has rewarded me with purpose and direction in my life that will serve me for the rest of my career. I would also like to thank the rest of the faculty in the MA TESOL Department for their invaluable instruction and subsequent interest in this research project. I would also like to express my gratitude to the participating instructors in this research project, without their approval and the sacrifice of their time this research would not have been possible. A most sincere and heartfelt thank you to both my parents in Canada and my parents-in-law in South Korea. Their patience through the years, as well as their generous and loyal support, has allowed the completion of my degree and this research project to reach this happy conclusion. My final, and most heartfelt gratitude, is reserved for my wife. Her constant encouragement and selfless actions during my studies and over the course of our marriage has allowed me to remain focused, has lifted my spirits and given me the opportunity to dream this impossible dream. I dedicate to her this thesis and my Master of Arts in TESOL.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract.....	ii
Acknowledgement.....	iii
1. Introduction & Context.....	1
1.1 Difficulties in Researching University Instructional Practices.....	2
1.2 Importance of Researching Course Types Held in Common at Universities.....	2
1.3 The Introductory English Literature Course as an Ideal Focus for Research.....	3
1.4 The Influence of the Instructor on NNS Learning.....	5
1.5 Justification and Research Questions.....	6
2. Theoretical Underpinnings.....	7
2.1 Defining Mainstreaming.....	7
2.2 Systemic Functional Linguistics, Mainstreaming, and Language Learning.....	8
2.3 Mainstreaming, SFL, and Other Practical Interpretations of Language Learning.....	9
2.4 A Language Learning Continuum?	11
2.5 Mohan’s ‘Knowledge Framework’ as a Justification for Mainstreaming.....	12
2.6 Justification for Mainstreaming from Second Language Acquisition Research (SLA)...	14
2.7 Questions about the Justification of Mainstream Education in a University Context.....	15
2.8 Mainstreaming and the Academic Discipline of English at the University Level.....	16
2.9 Issues with the Participation of NNS Students in Mainstream University Courses.....	18
2.9.1 Literary Competence.....	19
2.9.2 The Interactive Model of Reading.....	19
2.9.3 The Language Threshold, Linguistic Distance and Extensive Reading.....	20
2.9.4 Schema Theory and Background Knowledge.....	21
2.9.5 Reading Skills and Strategies.....	22
2.9.6 NNS Abilities.....	22
2.9.7 Individual Differences and Affect.....	23
2.10 Literature Courses and the Role of the Instructor.....	24
2.11 Social Constructivist Instructional Models and a Framework for Pedagogical Analysis.	25
3. Literature Review.....	28
3.1 Literature and Second Language Students in a University Language Course.....	28
3.2 NNS Learners in Lower Levels of Education.....	29
3.3 Post-Secondary NNS Learners as Generation 1.5 and International ESL.....	31
3.4 Post-Secondary NNS students in transition from IEPs to the Mainstream.....	32

3.5	A Post-Secondary University Student in the Mainstream.....	34
3.6	Mainstream Instructors in Lower Levels of Education.....	35
3.7	Additional Mainstream Classroom Issues.....	38
3.8	Literature Review Summary.....	40
4.	Methodology.....	42
4.1	Setting and Participants.....	42
4.2	Research Design.....	44
4.3	Data Analysis.....	45
4.4	Role of the Researcher.....	46
4.5	Ethical Considerations.....	47
5.	Results and Discussion.....	48
5.1	Tharp's Seven Types of Instruction.....	48
5.1.1	Modelling.....	49
5.1.2	Feeding Back or Feedback.....	50
5.1.3	Contingency Managing.....	50
5.1.4	Directing.....	52
5.1.5	Questioning.....	52
5.1.6	Explaining.....	53
5.1.7	Task Structuring.....	54
5.2	Additional Observed Practices.....	55
5.2.1	Vocabulary.....	56
5.2.2	Group Activities.....	57
5.2.3	Instructional Support and Visual Aids.....	59
5.3	NNS-Specific Pedagogical Adjustments Identified by the Instructors.....	60
5.3.1	Assessment.....	61
5.3.2	Background Information.....	62
5.3.3	Material Selection.....	63
5.3.4	Bridging the Cultural Divide.....	64
5.3.5	The Desire to Build Relationships.....	65
5.4	NS/NNS Perceptions of Pedagogical Practice.....	67
5.4.1	Characteristics and Reading Habits of the Participants.....	68

5.4.2	Perception of Reading Difficulty of Different Genres of Literature.....	70
5.4.3	Perception of Group and Pair Activities.....	71
5.4.4	Perception of Instructional Support.....	73
5.4.5	Perception of Feedback.....	75
5.4.6	Perception of Overall Classroom Operation.....	76
5.4.7	Perception of Overall Reading Difficulty.....	79
5.4.8	Perception of Instructor Approachability and Participant Use of Internet.....	80
5.5	Implications.....	81
5.5.1	Instructor Experience.....	83
5.5.2	Classroom Makeup: NS, NNS, and Generation 1.5.....	85
5.5.3	Institutional Support.....	88
6.	Conclusion	
6.1	Summary.....	91
6.2	Future Research Suggestions.....	93
6.3	Caveats.....	94
	References.....	96
	Appendix A: Teaching Practices Questionnaire.....	113
	Appendix B: Instructor Interview Questions.....	117
	Appendix C: Categorization of Codes & Tharp's (1993) Instructional Types.....	118
	Appendix D: Coding Sample from Observation Field Notes.....	119
	Appendix E: Observed Instructional Types Raw Count Chart.....	121

CHAPTER 1

1. Introduction & Context

A number of factors, including an increase in immigrant populations (Watts-Taffe & Truscott, 2000; Arkoudis, 2005; Gunderson, 2008) and the current cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1973; Pennycook, 2001) that a degree from an English medium university holds, have led to increases in the numbers of NNS (NNS) students attending universities in English speaking countries. To accommodate this demand and still serve native speaking (NS) student populations¹, universities often set minimum levels of English proficiency based on internationally recognized tests such as the TOEFL and IELTS, or provide Intensive English programmes (IEP) that, once successfully completed, allow students to gain entrance to regular content courses. Despite these measures, two interwoven issues remain: that many NNS students still enter regular content courses without all of the requisite literacy, social and academic skills necessary to perform successfully (Derwing et al., 1999), and that content courses with high numbers of NNS students present unique challenges for professors (Crandall & Kaufman, 2002) in comparison with courses whose makeup consists of NS students. The participation of NNS students in content-courses at universities shows few signs of abating; therefore research is needed to determine how their participation is changing the structure and pedagogical practices employed in content courses. To date, there are only a few research studies that seeks to describe, define, and characterize how students are successfully negotiating university content courses after they have left the language classroom; or much information on what pedagogical decisions instructors are

¹ For the purposes of this study, the terms native speaker (NS), non native speaker (NNS), and English as a second language (ESL) are used, despite questions of their political correctness. Though the terms inner-circle English speaking (ICES) and outer-circle English speaking (OCES) and emergent-circle English speaking (ECES) would be preferred (Kachru, 1985), they do not accurately distinguish between immigrant and international ESL speaking populations, which factor into the results of this study.

making in the face of growing numbers of ESL participants in their classes. Therefore it is important to explore how these issues are currently being approached at this level of education.

1.1 Difficulties in Researching University Instructional Practices

Gathering research in this field is no simple task, however, because of the divisions that occur within tertiary education. These differences can be related to wide-ranging factors involving the institution, the field of study, and student ability. For instance, Gunderson (1991) comments on how the reading requirements for students in mathematics, which rely heavily on graphs, diagrams, and internationally recognized symbols, are quite different from reading the descriptive writing found in courses such as history, sociology and psychology. As such, certain courses probably pose greater challenges on second language students than others. Second language learners may also be affected by their choice of institution. As Mohan et al (2001) argue, “linguistic, cultural and educational practices are shaped to a great extent by the sociocultural and political context” (p215). Student success, therefore, may be affected by institutional recognition and support of second language needs. The variability in NNS student abilities based on a combination of factors including culture (Hinkel, 1999), linguistic distance (Koda, 2005), and academic language proficiency (Cummins, 1981) also plays a role in the divisions that exist amongst second language learners in the university.

1.2 Importance of Researching Course Types Held in Common at Universities

A critical place to begin research, therefore, would be in the types of courses held in common by many universities, modelled in the liberal art tradition, that serve as prerequisites for further study and/or gate-keeping courses for the conferment of degrees. There are several compelling reasons to place the spotlight on these courses. They are often taken in the first, or freshman, year of university education, which for many international English as second language

(ESL) students might serve as their introduction to a foreign education system. Because they are often a requirement for graduation, these courses can represent a tremendous obstacle for NNS students wishing to obtain an undergraduate degree; therefore illuminating the structure of pedagogical practice in these courses and their perceived usefulness might indirectly aid the success of future second language learners in these courses. Another practical issue is that many universities use these courses as academic “primers” to prepare not only NNS learners, but all university students for further study in the academic streams they have chosen, equipping students with necessary literacy skills in critical analysis and close reading that will ensure their success (Eckert, 2008). The success of second language learners in these courses could potentially be a predictor of future academic success. More important, it is the purpose of these courses and the importance placed on them by universities that make it crucial to better understand the NNS student’s role within them. As Schall (2003) conjectures, the purpose of liberal arts courses is to imbue learners with knowing “what it is to be free enough to know the truth of things and to find pleasure in this truth” (p.18). In this light, the accessibility and comprehensibility of these courses to ESL students becomes a pivotal aspect of a liberal arts university relative to its humanistic purpose of existence.

1.3 The Introductory English Literature Course as an Ideal Focus for Research

Though there are a variety of these types of liberal arts courses, one common offering is lower level, or introductory, English literature. The purpose of this course is not only to introduce students to some of the finer works of narrative in the English language but also, and perhaps more importantly, to enhance the literacy and academic skills of undergraduate students in a way that will serve them well for the remainder of their academic and professional pursuits. Put succinctly by Schwarz (2008), the general purpose of these classes is “teaching them to

reason, to read critically, to write lucidly and deftly, and to speak articulately so they can participate as citizens...and develop into community leaders” (p.112). More practically, this course is viewed by many university professors as a necessary step for students because many have not fully acquired the necessary processing, interpretive, and critical thinking skills necessary for post-secondary academic studies (Eckert 2008, Maloney, 2003). As such, many lower-level English courses offer up a steady diet of activities that foster the development of abilities in close reading (Scholes, 1998) and critical thinking (Clark, 2009) as well as opportunities to improve academic writing. Used for such purposes, literature serves as ideal reading for beginning university students because it tends to be written with non-technical or “ordinary” language (Hall, 2005), it “appeals to readers’ shared knowledge of the world” (Koda, 2005, p.155) and therefore perhaps more comprehensible, and it deals with life experiences which are more open to interpretation and critical thought than other types of expository texts (Hamner, 2003). As such, literature has the potential to work effectively as a medium to nurture the critical thinking skills necessary for future academic success that stretches across the boundaries of discipline.

Despite these apparent advantages, the increasing presence of NNS learners to the English literature classroom milieu poses significant obstacles for instructors. More precisely, many of these learners are at a disadvantage in comparison to their NS peers in regards to such areas as English proficiency, academic knowledge, cultural understanding, as well as aspects of their sociocultural identity in the classroom. Though the language of narratives is not specialised in the same sense as medical or law texts (Lazar, 1993), it may remain a challenge linguistically if it is antiquated (Short & Candlin, 1986; Vodicková, 2006) or employs complex grammar or esoteric vocabulary beyond NNS linguistic capacity that interferes with comprehension (Grabe,

2009). Using literature for academic purposes also requires what Brumfit and Carter (1986) refer to as “literary competence”, which involves a sensitivity to the “kinds of styles, forms, conventions, [and] symbolization” that are assumed to be known by learners in the Western educational tradition, but which may be quite foreign to the international ESL learner. These students may also suffer from a lack of cultural understanding, such as a full knowledge of certain cultural imbued words (Valdes, 1986), which would be taken for granted by NS professors and students alike. Another factor to consider is that many international ESL students attending English-medium universities are adjusting to a foreign education system that may place different value on certain types of academic behaviour (Davison and Williams, 2001) which could greatly influence the students’ motivation, anxiety, and participation in the classroom.

1.4 The Influence of the Instructor on NNS Learning

In such circumstances, the instructor plays a pivotal role in determining the success of ESL learners in their courses. In the literature, areas as diverse as teacher attitude towards second language students, teachers instructional training, and teachers instructional decisions have all been cited as having influence over the success of NNS students in a course. Scarcella (1990) suggests that many instructors have “prejudiced” opinions towards ESL students that influence their opinions about their academic abilities and act as impediments towards these students’ success. Though teachers appear to benefit from additional training, it is often the case that they have few opportunities for professional development and often feel isolated in dealing with the challenges of teaching second language students in their courses (Snow, Griffin & Burns, 2005; Leung and Franson, 2001). There is also suggestion that instructors employ discourse styles that may be unfamiliar or difficult for language learners (Schleppegrel, 2004), and underestimate the challenges that exist for second language students in their classrooms

(Duff, 2002). Perhaps most troubling from a pedagogical perspective, past research has indicated that classroom activity becomes more teacher-centred as students progress through the educational levels (Harklau, 1994; Kubota 2001), leading to a situation where teachers at the tertiary level see their role as being the transmitters of knowledge, and the students to see their role as being silent listeners (Slembrouck, 2000)—a situation that does little to improve the productive abilities of the second language learner. These issues suggest that instructors at the tertiary level may have a great deal of influence not only over NNS students' performance in the classroom but with their overall success in the course.

1.5 Justification and Research Questions

For these reasons, it is both essential to learn more about the choices instructors make to help NNS students navigate an introductory English course. It might also be important to investigate NNS student perceptions of the various aspects of this course and how these perceptions compare with NS peers. The following research questions will guide this research:

1. What pedagogical practices guide a lower level English course?
2. What adjustments do instructors use to aid, or in response to, NNS students?
3. How do NNS students perceive the usefulness of these pedagogical practices?
4. How do NNS students' perceptions of these pedagogical practices compare with the perceptions of their NS peers?

CHAPTER TWO

2. Theoretical Underpinnings

The following section will explore theory that has been used to support mainstream instruction both generally and in the more specific university context. It then explores the issues and challenges that might affect NNS learners in these contexts. Finally, it ends with a description of a model of instructional types from constructivist theories of education that will be used to analyze the pedagogical practice of the instructors participating in this study.

2.1 Defining Mainstreaming

Though the concept of mainstream classes or mainstreaming students is frequently mentioned in research and literature, it is seldom defined at any length beyond being characterized as a course consisting of NS and NNS students focused on content-area subject matter taught exclusively in English. Theoretically, the concept of mainstream appears to be a catchall for many different aspects of instruction, making a clear definition elusive. In the literature and research mainstream generally focuses on the elementary and secondary levels of education and is used to describe a multitude of different subject courses of a variety of sizes with instructors of varying experience. According to Davison (2001), the idea of mainstream courses has sociopolitical roots as a response to the large influx of non-English speaking immigrants to countries such as Canada and Australia since the 1970s. As an offshoot of the concept of multiculturalism, mainstreaming second language students was seen as the answer to creating an air of inclusivity, helping to ease language minority families into the cultural mosaic that these countries wished to adopt, and with the English language and western education ideals serving as the points of commonality. Although this ideal of the mainstream classroom was and continues to be embraced by many ESL researchers and professionals, it comes at great risk to

the development of NNS students, especially in mainstream classrooms where certain curricular changes are not implemented. In her research comparing mainstream and ESL classes, Harklau (1994) suggested that instructors of mainstream courses less often adjust their spoken register to accommodate ESL comprehensibility, less often attempt to elicit responses from ESL participants (as compared to their NS counterparts), offered few opportunities for explicit language learning, had curricular goals that presumed a unified knowledge base and were more constrained by outside influences, included reading that was more technical and academically oriented, and oversaw classrooms that were socially intimidating for NNS students. More comprehensively then, mainstream defines a situation, justified through the auspices of inclusivity, where second language learners from any education level attempt to learn content subject matter from a curriculum designed for NS students from instructors trained to teach NS learners who might not be aware, sympathetic to, or able to assist with the particular difficulties of NNS students in a challenging sociolinguistic environment. This definition, however, is still too broad to differentiate between important factors such as level and duration of instruction or ratios of NS to NNS students; leaving much to be interpreted when the term is utilized in the literature.

2.2 Systemic Functional Linguistics, Mainstreaming, and Language Learning

The elusive nature of an exact definition of mainstream may perhaps be due in part to the fact that it is dependent on a fairly recent and somewhat contested theoretical view of language as a functional rather than formal system. As this definition grows in acceptance, the ideal of mainstreaming may become clearer and ways in which to successfully employ it may become more amenable. As Davison and Williams (2001) note, definitions of language have traditionally hinged on a dual interpretation of language as being communicative competence,

and content as the meanings which are being communicated. This has resulted in a problematic tendency to view the two features dichotomously (Kramsch, 1993), which can then lead to a separation of the form from its function—fostering impressions that language learners can master language then focus on content, or that “culture” is a packaged set of traditions that can be tacked on to a language lesson for NNS students to memorize and then be considered culturally competent. But in the view of Halliday (1978), language cannot be separated from its meanings and social implications. In his systemic functional linguistics (SFL), language is “a system for making meanings” (Halliday, 1994, xvii) where focus should lie not only on its grammatical rules, or form, but also on its functions, or how it is used. In this interpretation, then, learners do not learn language or content or culture separately, but rather all three simultaneously. This has a dramatic effect on the notion of language and content integration. As Davison and Williams comment further, “this issue of language and content integration is seen as a different set of relationships, sociocultural rather than psycholinguistic, socially constructed and ideological rather than universal or autonomous” (p.56). Language learning is not only about “mastering” grammar and vocabulary, then, but about exercising linguistic choice in dynamic interaction with others in social contexts. English language learners, therefore, are accountable for the social contexts that they hope to participate in as well as for the language. As a result of this shift in accountability, the theoretical and research basis in language education regarding the integration of language and content remains incomplete.

2.3 Mainstreaming, SFL, and Other Practical Interpretations of Language Learning

This incompleteness is due largely in part to the different approaches that theorists and practitioners have taken in applying the insights offered to it through Halliday’s work. Systemic functional linguistics offers a more plausible definition for language and the way it is used. For

instance the distinction that Cummins (1980) makes between basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS) and cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP)², as well as the estimated time (5-10 yrs) it takes to achieve academic proficiency (Collier, 1989) are more theoretically sound through the understanding that English tertiary education within its social context is the pinnacle of 12 or more years of preparatory educational work, as well as the cultural product of hundreds of years of development in western education. But it has also opened the door for a variety of interpretations and justifications for the way it should be practically applied.

This might be more easily understood when considering the question of how NNS learners should be prepared to be successful at English-medium universities. Some have suggested teaching a set of general skills determined necessary for success in formal education under the banner of English for academic purposes (EAP) (Jordan, 1997), while others have touted studying language specific to certain educational fields with high participation levels of English language learners, such as business and medicine, through English for specific purposes (ESP) (Dudley-Evans & St. John, 1998). There are also recommendations for various forms of content and language integration such as content-based instruction (CBI)³, where language instructors spearhead a dual curriculum that satisfies language and content goals (Grabe & Stoller, 1997), sheltered language instruction, where content instructors teach a segregated group of language learners (Echevarria and Graves, 2003), and adjunct language instruction, where students are concurrently enrolled in both a content and language course that are interlinked (Brinton, Snow, & Wesche, 2003). Each of these approaches has produced an offshoot of research and theoretical justification, as well as its own following of supporters and detractors.

² Discussed later in this paper, Cummins has since amended the BICS/CALP distinction to be represented as intersecting axes between contextual support and cognitive demands (Cummins, 1992), though the terms remain ubiquitous in the literature.

³ The term CBI is sometimes used as an umbrella term to speak of all these forms of English language learning.

However, practical issues such as time and resource constraints as well as the growing number of NNS participants in the education system have ensured that the mainstream classroom, where NNS students receive little additional aid in dealing with content, is the most prominent and popular choice for the integration of content and language learning (Clair, 1995; Wang, Many & Krumenaker, 2008).

2.4 A Language Learning Continuum?

One framework that has been adopted among theorists to aid discussion and bring order to the variety of approaches available for language and content integration has been to place them on a continuum demonstrating their shifting emphasis on language or content (Stoller, 2004). Regarding curriculum development, Met (1998) suggests a spectrum with the focal point of content that ranges from “total immersion” in content driven courses to language driven courses that make use of content for language practice. However, Davison and Williams (2001) point out that this cline fails to include certain types of CBI curriculums organized according to theme or topic. In another variation, Howatt’s (1985) classification of “strong” and “weak” forms of language teaching is adapted for CBI with strong curriculums emphasizing content mastery and weak forms emphasizing linguistic goals (Wesche & Skehan, 2002). While these continuums address matters of curriculum, they fail to encompass other elements relative to a descriptive framework for language and content integration. A comprehensive framework expounded by Davison, “clearly distinguishes between curriculum focus, theoretical model or approach, teaching materials, likely organisational arrangements and teacher roles” (Davison & Williams, 2001, p.57), on a continuum that ranges from “contextualized” language teaching to “language-conscious” language teaching (p.58-59). Though this goes far in explaining additional factors in content and language integration such as the role of the teacher and the type

of program, Davison and Williams themselves point out that it does not address the theoretical problem of “what constitutes “curriculum focus” or “the process of curriculum design” (p.63). In addition, Arkoudis (2005) comments that the framework is unable to comment on pedagogical concerns such as the instructor’s own beliefs of the role of language in content teaching. These frameworks also fail to address curricular and pedagogic issues that might greatly influence the effectiveness of content delivery such as duration of instruction or ratio of NS/NNS students in mainstream courses. As such, much information and description about content and language integration, especially related to mainstream courses which fall on the far end of these continuums, has yet to be adequately drawn into any of these continuums.

2.5 Mohan’s (1986) ‘Knowledge Framework’ as a Justification for Mainstreaming

Though much pedagogical and curricular information remains to be enfolded, there is a framework that allows for the analysis of discourse and social practice in content and language integration. Following Halliday’s functional interpretation of language, Mohan (2001) urges that as education systems become more multicultural and multilingual it is important to focus not just on second language acquisition but on “language as a medium of learning” (p.107), which raises the question of the “relation between language learning and the learning of content and culture” (p.108). Mohan’s (1986) ‘Knowledge Framework’ is a theory that aides this focus by seeing education “as the initiation of the learner into social practices or activities” (Mohan, 2001, p.110). A social practice is a combination of knowledge (theory), which can include certain ‘knowledge structures’ such as classification, principles or evaluation, and action (practice), which can include certain ‘knowledge structures’ such as description, sequencing, or choice.

Using the example of a news broadcast on Canadian politics, Mohan demonstrates how the Knowledge Framework moves beyond the solely linguistic concerns of second language

acquisition to include more functional concerns—not only does the learner studying the broadcast acquire knowledge of English but they also learn information about Canadian political culture. At different points, this will require the learner to incorporate such knowledge structures as classifying (the contrasting viewpoints of different political parties), or bringing to the fore certain aspects of practice such as choice (voting one way or the other on the political issue). In much the same way, the Knowledge Framework can be applied to more pedagogical matters such as classroom tasks, which require learners to acquire knowledge (theory) and then do something with it (practice). Identifying the knowledge structures that pertain to each activity, then, aids in determining where second language learners in the mainstream classroom may need additional aid regarding knowledge or practice in comparison to their NS peers. For instance, a task using Mohan’s example of Canadian politics may require the instructor to provide additional background knowledge for the ESL learner. Besides providing a framework for discussion of the social contexts of content and language integration in mainstream classrooms, Mohan’s work contributes to the theoretical justification for mainstreaming. Through systemic functional linguistics and Halliday’s definition of the functional approach to language, Mohan argues through the Knowledge Framework that language cannot be divorced from its social context. As he proposes, “Functionally...the text is more than a collection of grammatical forms; it has meaning; it gives a message; it has a function in a context; it has content; it is about some topic” (p.113). As such, NNS students may be best served when they are learning within the larger social educational milieu of the English speaking world they are participating in rather than being isolated in some form of language-specific class.

2.6 Justification for Mainstreaming from Second Language Acquisition Research (SLA)

There are other areas of theoretical support for the participation of ESL students in mainstream courses aside from a functional interpretation of language. This support, which comes from second language acquisition (SLA) research (Brinton, Snow & Wesche, 2003), summarizes the remaining theoretical factors providing a rationale for mainstream education in the literature. Perhaps the earliest linguistic justification came from Krashen (1985) and his ‘comprehensible input hypothesis’, in which he argued that language is largely acquired incidentally through extensive exposure to comprehensible “input” in the target language. Taking the idea of input to its extreme, the mainstream classroom is then the best source for plentiful and authentic input in English (Harklau, 1994).

A second argument from SLA regards skills transfer from the NNS learners’ first language (Graves & Echevarria, 2003). According to Cummins’ ‘linguistic interdependence hypothesis’ (Cummins 1979, 1981), cognitive-academic skills learned in a student’s first language act independently across languages, therefore NNS learners with strong educational backgrounds should be able to perform many academic tasks in English without the need to “relearn” these skills in English. The linguistic corollary of this, of course, is that what these students only lack is the linguistic proficiency that would ensure them academic success. This argument has been generally maintained through two complementary theoretical sources. The first, also from Cummins and alluded to earlier, is the BICS/CALP distinction, which has been more recently amended by Cummins as intersecting axes between contextual support and cognitive demands (Cummins, 1992). The second regards the time it takes for second language learners to gain academic language proficiency, which has been generally accepted at estimates of anywhere from 5-10 years depending on the learner (Collier, 1989; Cummins, 1996). As

Mohan (2001) makes clear, “because of the length of time it takes to master a second language for schooling, we cannot delay academic instruction until students have mastered L2 skills” (p.108).

A final argument put forth in the literature stems from social constructivist interpretations of pedagogy based on the Vygostkian concepts of Zone of Proximal Development, private speech and student appropriation of learning tasks (Grabe & Stoller, 1997). The basic premise of this argument, especially in regards to the mainstream classroom, is that second language learners have greater opportunities to negotiate knowledge, engage in private speech, and interact with more knowledgeable individuals in the target language when they are studying content useful to them than if they are isolated in language specific courses (Lantolf & Pavelenko, 1995). In sum, the theoretical arguments from second language acquisition basically posit that the long term benefits that can be gained by placing ESL students in mainstream classrooms outweigh any short-term linguistic or other deficiencies.

2.7 Questions about the Justification of Mainstream Education in a University Context

A note of caution, however, must be sounded about the above rationale put forth by second language researchers and its applicability to the university context. More specifically, it is difficult to discern whether researchers are focusing only on NNS learners participating in elementary and secondary school or if their justification is inclusive of NNS students participating at the university level. For instance, the case studies utilized in the preeminent book on mainstreaming edited by Mohan, Leung and Davison (2001) appears to indicate that they are speaking about mainstreaming as it relates to education systems at the secondary level and below. In addition, it would probably be argued that the high expectations levied at NNS students in mainstream classes at the university level would preclude any specific language

learning goals or justifications, because the focus of these classes would be restricted only to the learning of content. Other considerations, including severe time restrictions on the length of university courses, the maturity of the learners at the university level, and the nature of university education which is perceived to be teacher centred and predominantly lecture based (Harklau, 2000; Kubota, 2001), may warrant reconsiderations of the nature of mainstream education as it exists at the tertiary level and how, or even whether, it can be justified by the same criteria as the education levels below it.

2.8 Mainstreaming and the Academic Discipline of English at the University Level

Having established the theoretical justification for mainstream courses in general, it is important to focus more specifically on the particular course of interest. This is because not only are the academic demands on learners different depending on the subject of study—consider for example the different uses of English that alter the shape of instruction in ESP (Dudley-Evans & St John, 1998) or the different demands on a specific language skill such as reading in subject area courses as diverse as science and history—but also because as Arkoudis (2003) points out, “school teachers tend to debate and justify their views of teaching through the authority of their positions as subject specialists” (p.162). Because university teachers maintain their positions based on the content specialities, it would be expected that classroom activities would lean even more towards acting as a reflection of the content subject’s skills and knowledge. But as Davison (2005) points out the academic discipline of English, which would include any English literature course, has evaded the same scrutiny as other content subjects in part because of the perception that it is a language course and in part because of “the continually contested and changing nature of English as a discipline” (p.220). Though it is an oversimplification of the complicated relationship between discipline English and academics, the general content and

pedagogical focus of the course has been the study of particular texts, often referred to as the western canon, that have garnered substantial cultural value (Hall, 2005). Of course, the ideological nature of such a field of study has made it a perpetual source of debate (Christie, 1999; Foertsch 2006) perhaps most recently and profoundly witnessed as the “canon wars” of the 1980’s and 90’s (Vandrick, 1996; Gallagher, 2001). Current challenges to the content of discipline English include the justification of literature study in tertiary education given the prominence of the research institution (McCurrie 2004), the altered reading habits of learners due to technological advances and the internet (Sonstroem, 2006), as well as shifting demographics of the classroom including the increased participation of NNS students in mainstream courses (Stewart & Santiago, 2006; McElvain, 2010).

With the cultural value of texts from the canon in question, many have called for the discipline of English at the tertiary level to focus more on what is created with students in the classroom than on the texts that are the focus of study. As McCurrie makes clear, this focus hinges on the idea of pedagogy in that it “is opposed to the epistemology that assumes knowledge is already made and that the teacher’s task is its transmission” (p.44). Rather than making contentious cultural artefacts the justification of instruction, the focus should instead be on the learners and how the class and the texts endow them with academic skills and modes of thinking that are beneficial in their academic pursuits and beyond. As Paulson (2001) concurs, “now that the printed word has lost its communicative hegemony, ...we have to teach literature in ways that make it attractive and engaging vis-a-vis other cultural forms and practices” (p.159). As such, theory regarding university English literature courses has begun to focus more on the skills that it provides learners in academic literacy (Slevin, 2007), close reading (Schwarz, 2008), and critical thinking (Hamner, 2003) as the justification for its legitimacy as a required course in

many universities. There can be little doubt that this approach to the content of English courses would be welcomed by international ESL learners, who might fail to recognize or understand the historical and cultural significance of many English texts highly esteemed by western society.

2.9 Issues with the Participation of NNS Students in Mainstream University Courses

Despite an approach in English literature more pedagogically focused on learners, which concomitantly would be more beneficial for NNS students; there are a number of factors that might still be problematic for second language learners in the literature classroom. Most of these are either directly or indirectly related to reading, which despite the shift mentioned in the paragraph above would still constitute a substantial and foundational aspect of an English literature course. The most particular of these challenges is what is referred to as ‘literary competence’.

Prior to this, however, it must be made clear that an exact definition of what a literary text is, and how it might be differentiated from a non-literary text, is an extremely difficult task. As mentioned previously, literature does not utilize any particular or specialized form of language (Brumfit & Carter, 1986; Lazar, 1993; Paulson 2001), leading Thaler (2008) to argue that literature can be defined in a broad sense as all form of written communication in a language and in a narrow sense according to certain criteria, “very often referring to the poetic and imaginative quality of texts” (p16). What seems to set “quality” literature apart, then, is in how the writer has creatively exploited language. As Hamner (2003) explains, “In order to fulfill the basic requirements of all the arts, to instruct and entertain, the creative writer has license to exploit every rich ambivalence, connotation, equivocation, figure of speech, and nuance of linguistic trickery”. Depending on the author or age of the text, this creative use of language can

be linguistically difficult and even inaccessible for second language learners (Short & Candlin, 1986).

2.9.1 Literary Competence

In addition, second language learners might struggle with the ways these texts are interpreted at the academic level, which strikes to the heart of what ‘literary competence’ is about. As Brumfit (1986) makes clear, although there is no single correct way of reading meaning from a text, it is possible for incorrect responses based on misunderstandings “of the codes being operated” because these codes are not solely linguistic but also dependent on the interplay of events, “relationships between characters, exploitation of ideas and value systems, formal structure in terms of a genre or literature convention, and relationships between any of these and the world outside literature itself” (p.185). Moreover, these interpretations are historically and culturally imbedded constructs that are ideological in nature (Culler, 1975; Birch, 1989; Kramsch, 1993), culminating at the tertiary level in different forms of reader response criticism that, as Hall (2005) explains, “stresses the importance of the reader in constructing meanings derived from reading ‘transactions’ or interactions” (p.84-85).

Understandably, a NNS student who has had limited exposure to these more formalized ways of responding to literature are at a deficit in comparison with their NS peers. For this reason literary competence is a significant issue for second language learners in a literature course.

2.9.2 The Interactive Model of Reading

Another factor affecting NNS learners in literature classes is related to the skill of reading and comprehension, which Lems et al (2010) define as “the ability to construct meaning from a given written text” (p.170). Though many of these theoretical ideas have produced differing results in empirical research, they are still widely accepted due to the fact that reading is now

accepted as an intricate and complex process that is highly variable amongst learners and still open for debate amongst theoreticians (Grabe, 2009). Though it was long a source of debate, general consensus now accepts that the reading process is best understood in an interactive, or balanced, model that views the reader employing ‘bottom up’ and ‘top down’ approaches to the task of reading (Eskey, 1988; Rumelhart, 2004; Birch, 2007). Essentially what this means is that a reader employs a “mechanical process” of working through a text’s linguistic structure (bottom-up), but also approaches any piece of reading with certain goals and expectations of the text and its larger meaning (top-down) (Hedgcock & Ferris, 2009). Regarding second language learners, Koda (2005) indicates that the three ‘bottom up’ constructs of L1 reading, L2 proficiency, and L2 decoding all have significant influence on L2 reading comprehension. L2 decoding generally refers to speed and ability with which a reader is able to recognize the writing units they are working with (Nation, 2009). L2 proficiency regards the reader’s knowledge of vocabulary and grammar. L1 reading, meanwhile, is related to reading through specific aspects of Cummins (1979) developmental interdependence hypothesis, discussed earlier in this paper, which suggest that good readers in their L1 will also be good readers in their L2.

2.9.3 The Language Threshold, Linguistic Distance and Extensive Reading

There are additionally three interwoven factors that are important to consider when describing the students performance in a literature class, which stems from Alderson’s (1984) famous question “Is second language reading a language problem or a reading problem?” The first is that based on Clarke’s (1988) short-circuit hypothesis, it is widely accepted that there is a linguistic threshold that language learners must reach before they are able to read successfully; a threshold that would of necessity be higher for academic reading. The second is the idea of linguistic distance, in which it has been suggested that certain second language learners have a

more difficult time reading due to variance in writing systems and rhetorical structure from their L1 to the target language (Aebersold & Field, 1997). Finally, and perhaps most importantly, is the commonly held belief that the only way to improve bottom-up strategies and increase reading fluency and comprehension is through extensive practice reading in the foreign language (Eskey & Grabe, 1988; Nuttall, 1996; Carrell & Carson, 1997; Day & Bamford, 1998; Krashen, 2009).

2.9.4 Schema Theory and Background Knowledge

At the tertiary level, top-down approaches, which are the flipside of the interactive model theory, perhaps play a more significant role in the reading approach of second language learners. As Carrell (1988) describes, “In the top-down view of second language reading, not only is the reader an active participant in the reading process, making predictions and processing information, but everything in the reader’s prior experience or background knowledge plays a significant role in the process” (p.4). Theoretically, top-down approaches have been used to describe several aspects of reading that might have bearing on a literature course. Two of these are the related ideas of schema theory and background knowledge. According to Carrell and Esiterhold (1988), background knowledge includes any previous acquired knowledge that a learner brings to a reading, and schemata are any previous acquired knowledge structures. Hedgecock and Ferris (2009) have outlined three classifications of schemata including linguistic, which is related to the written code of the text, formal, which is related to the way various text types are organized, and content, which is related to prior knowledge of the ideas within the text. It is generally accepted that background knowledge and schemata, when activated, positively influence comprehension by contributing to “the efficiency of attentional allocation to input during reading” (Pulido, 2009, p.60) which in turn leads to richer, more memorable interpretations of the text. But it is also widely believed that background knowledge and schema

are often culturally specific (Reid, 1993; Grabe, 2009), which may influence their impact for second language learners. Aebersold and Field mention six categories of cultural orientation that as a top-down approach might influence reading, including attitudes towards the text and purpose for reading, types of reading skills and strategies used in the L1 and the L2, beliefs about the reading process, knowledge of L1 text types, as well as content cultural knowledge. As mentioned earlier the reliance on cultural knowledge endemic in literature makes the last category a particularly taxing one for the second language learner (Lazar, 1993; Hall, 2005). Even more discouraging may be the suggestion that even culturally aware NNS learners still continue to struggle with the cultural aspects of text interpretation (Tucker, 1995).

2.9.5 Reading Skills and Strategies

A final top-down approach that influences reading at the tertiary level involves the skills and strategies that the learner brings to the reading task. As Jordan (1997) makes clear, reading at the university is largely determined by the purpose the learner has invoked for reading. This will influence how readers approach the text and what actions they pursue in pre-, during, and post- reading activities to aid text comprehension. Skills and strategies also refer to metacognition, or the ways in which a reader decides to read a text, which Grabe states “involves awareness and control of planning, monitoring, repairing, revising, summarizing and evaluating” (p.223). In sum, top-down strategies including background knowledge and schematas, cultural orientation, and skills and strategies deployment might all influence to some extent the reading comprehension of NNS learners.

2.9.6 NNS Abilities

Though issues related to reading generally and reading literature specifically presents the most dominant factors in an English literature course, they are not the only ones that might affect

NNS learning and comprehension in mainstream literature classrooms. In fact, there are a number of issues related to the individual differences and abilities of the learners themselves that bear consideration when investigating the instructor's approach to teaching a diverse classroom of learners. For instance, the current emphasis in foreign language classrooms on the productive elements of language such as oral practice and proficiency might serve to mask student's receptive proficiency in listening and reading (Haley & Austin, 2004). Heavy reliance on these receptive elements in university classrooms (Harklau, 1994; Kubota, 2001) might therefore expose these weaknesses in NNS learners.

2.9.7 Individual Differences and Affect

There are also elements related to affect, which Arnold and Brown (1999) define as having "to do with aspects of our emotional being" (p.1). Second language learning research has been particularly concerned with how learners' emotional well-being affects their learning (Teemant et al, 1997; Echevarria & Graves, 2003). In the mainstream university classroom, there are two crucial elements to consider. The first is motivation, which has been suggested to play a role in aspects of reading comprehension such as strategy use and the amount of reading students are willing and able to accomplish (Cox & Guthrie, 2001), but also in more classroom oriented procedures such as willingness to communicate and ability to accomplish tasks (Dörnyei, 2003). The second is anxiety, which has been indicated to most clearly affect classroom performance (Scarcella, 1990; Pappamihiel, 2002). Though the extent to which each of these factors influences learner behaviour is variable and difficult to determine, they must be considered as having the potential to influence an instructor's pedagogical decisions.

2.10 Literature Courses and the Role of the Instructor

Though all of these factors to some degree affect the performance of learners and the compositional makeup of any classroom, it cannot be forgotten that the most influential figure in any course is the instructor. As Johnson states, “Teachers are generally characterized as controlling most of what is said and done in classrooms” (Johnson, 1995, p.16), and this generalization appears to be even more dominant at the tertiary level (Harklau, 1994; Kubota, 2001). Though it may seem contradictory, the movement away from knowledge transmission models of education may have placed even more importance on the decision-making of the instructor (Irujo, 2000; Van den Branden, 2009), both because it is through these choices that learning is now fomented in a wider array of activities and assessments, and because the role of the instructor is viewed as more than just the dispenser of wisdom (Nuttall, 1996; Schwarz, 2008). For this reason, almost all aspects of teacher behaviour are brought within the discussion of pedagogy and are required for a thorough description of instructional choices.

Within mainstream and content-based courses, a number of factors have been the subject of theoretical exploration. At the individual level, factors related to the instructor’s themselves have included their attitudes and beliefs about second language students (Youngs & Youngs, 2001) and their knowledge of and preparedness for the instruction of ESL students (Claire, 1995; Peterson, 1997). At the curricular level, it has involved discussions concerning making adjustments for diverse student needs (Dong, 2004) as well as the selection of materials, the organization of content, and the development of realistic goals and objectives (Brinton et al, 2003; Haley & Austin, 2004). At the instructional level, it has involved discussions of discourse adjustment (Williams, 2001; Echevarria & Graves, 2003), teacher-student interaction (Scarcella, 1990; Johnson, 1995), activities (Mohan, 2001) and assessment (Turner, 1997).

As the above list suggests, there are few pedagogical aspects that have not been discussed at some point in the literature. That being said, the majority of this information is perhaps theoretically insufficient because it generally falls into the categories of problematizing the mainstream classroom situation (Wang et al, 2008) or offering practical advice on what is believed to work most effectively for NNS students (Arkoudis, 2003). For instance, there has yet to be a model suggested that is inclusive of the pedagogical choices that are being made to make classrooms and course material accessible to these students. Given the influence of the instructors over classroom decision-making, they are perhaps the most immediate catalyst of change. As Barwell (2005) notes, “Teacher agency, by which [is meant] the situated, intentional practice of individual teachers and practitioners, emerges as a recurring link between policy and curriculum, institutional organisation and classroom interaction” (p.148). If, as predicted, mainstreaming of NNS students becomes more the norm than the exception, it becomes increasingly important to describe categories of methods and techniques that are being employed to bring second language learners into the mainstream.

2.11 Social Constructivist Instructional Models and a Framework for Pedagogical Analysis

According to Daniels (2001), within social constructivist theories there are several models of education that lean heavily on Vygotskian notions of pedagogy, especially his concept of the zone of proximal development (ZPD). As Daniels explains, “the concept of ZPD was created by Vygotsky as a metaphor to assist in explaining the way in which social and participatory learning takes place. The general genetic law of cultural development asserts the primacy of the social in development” (p.56). More practically, the ZPD has been used to describe the educational situation where an instructor “provides the amount of assistance the

students need until they are able to function independently” (Echevarria & Graves, 2003, p164).

Ideally then, pedagogical decisions seek to promote the creation of ZPDs in the classroom.

In their work on instruction conversations, Tharp & Gallimore (1991) offer the following as a general definition of teaching: “Teaching consists of assisting performance through a child’s ZPD. Teaching must be redefined as assisted performance; teaching occurs when performance is achieved with assistance” (np). As an extension of this, Tharp (1993) provides the following educational model summarized by seven types of instruction that provide assistance to help learners moved through the ZPD to independent capacity:

1. Modeling: offering behaviour for imitation. Modeling assists by giving the learner information and a remembered image that can serve as a performance standard.
2. Feeding back: providing information on a performance as it compares to a standard. This allows the learners to compare their performance to the standard, and thus allows self-correction.
3. Contingency managing: applying the principles of reinforcement and punishment. In this means of assisting performance, rewards and punishment are arranged to follow on behaviour, depending on whether or not the behaviour is desired.
4. Directing: requesting specific action. Directing assists by specifying the correct response, providing clarity and information, and promoting decision-making.
5. Questioning: producing a mental operation that the learner cannot or would not produce alone. This interaction assists further by giving the assistor information about the learner’s developing understanding.
6. Explaining: providing explanatory and belief structure. This assists learners in organizing and justifying new learning and perceptions.

7. Task structuring: chunking, segregating, sequencing, or otherwise structuring a task into or from components. This modification assists by better fitting the task itself into the zone of proximal development. (Tharp, 1993, p.271-272).

In regards to pedagogical choice, Tharp's list will serve as the preliminary theoretical framework for analyzing the ways in which instructors attempt to make mainstream content accessible to second language learners in this research. This will then provide a clearer vision of the instructional types these instructors are utilizing, which would in turn make it easier to understand both how instructors are currently reaching second language learners and perhaps how they might more effectively do so in the future.

CHAPTER THREE

3. Literature Review

The literature review will explore research on NNS learners conducted in mainstream classes at lower levels of education and in transition from IEP to mainstream university classes, along with a case study of one post-graduate NNS student. Switching perspectives, it will then explore research that has focused on the instructors of mainstream classes with NNS participants, and conclude with other issues in mainstream classes that have been explored in the research.

3.1 Literature and Second Language Students in a University Language Course

There is very little research regarding reading comprehension and literature reading in mainstream courses with NNS participants at the university level. Studies have explored the purpose and benefits of the use of literature as a language learning device in language departments (Vandrick, 1996; Onukaogu, 1999; Kim, 2004; Zulu, 2005; Alvstad & Castro, 2009; Poulshock, 2010), but these do not fit the context of this research because the purposes for using literature in mainstream English courses is not language learning specific. However, there is one study that has been undertaken that may provide some clues on what might be expected regarding reading literature at the university. Research by Fecteau (1999) measured first- and second- language reading comprehension of literary texts amongst 47 American students enrolled in an introduction to French literature course. Using English and French versions of two stories from Voltaire controlled for text-based factors, these advanced language students were asked to recall the story through a number of measures similar to what is used at the university level to assess for comprehension. Results from this study were consistent with previous findings that L1 and L2 reading skills are interrelated amongst proficient learners and that L1 reading skills contribute more to L2 comprehension than L2 proficiency (Carrell, 1991;

Bernhardt & Kamil, 1995), but the L1 and L2 reading were not similar in that participants comprehended less in recall from stories they had read in their L2 than in their L1. Furthermore the researchers posited that learners appear to perform better with texts that conform to the principles of familiar genres of literature, suggesting that these types of texts are less mentally taxing, thus aiding comprehension. The researchers cautioned, however, that these results did not indicate that L2 proficiency did not factor into comprehension because the learners proficiency in this sample was quite homogenous. Regardless, this study suggests that not only will NNS readers struggle with literature reading comprehension as compared to the NS peers, but also that text selection may factor into second language learners ability to comprehend what they are reading.

3.2 NNS Learners in Lower Levels of Education

The majority of studies focused on mainstream classes occur at the secondary level and below. Despite taking place in lower levels of education, they still provide critical insights into some of the challenges that second-language students face in the mainstream classroom. In their examination of the academic records of 556 former and current ESL high school students in the Canadian province of Alberta which included in-depth interviews with 15 former students, Derwing et al (1999) identified educational policy which placed time pressures on ESL students for completion as well as a lack of effective integration of ESL students into mainstream classes as obstacles for student success. In addition, successful students were found to be more reliant on their teachers and more motivated, determined, and willing to take initiative in their own success.

Echoing the difficulty of ESL integration in mainstream courses, Duff's (2001) 2-year ethnographic study of two Grade 10 social studies classes in British Columbia that had a high

concentration of Asian background ESL students suggested that students' successful participation in the course required cultural and current event knowledge, and abilities "to enter quick-paced, highly intertextual interactions" (p.120), as well as express a range of perspectives on social issues that were beyond the abilities of ESL learners, resulting in their "silencing" in the classroom.

Another possible source of ESL integration difficulty is learner anxiety. In a mixed-methods study of 178 middle-school Mexican immigrants attending school in the US, Pappamihel (2002) suggested that a combination of factors including communication apprehension, fears of negative evaluation and test anxiety led learners to withdraw from the learning experience as a coping mechanism.

Perhaps the most heralded of the studies at this level is Harklau's (1994) 3 ½ year ethnographic-study of 4 Chinese immigrant students as they made the transition from ESL to mainstream courses at a northern California high school. In the study, Harklau compared ESL and mainstream classes by focusing on the areas of organization of instruction and language use, the structure and goals of instruction, explicit language instruction, and the socializing functions of schooling. Among her observations were that ESL learners in mainstream classes "were often more withdrawn and non-interactive in mainstream classes" (p.252), became adept at locating factual information and using it in answers with only marginal understanding of the information they were using, relied more heavily on "somewhat faulty intuitions about language form" (p.267) due to receiving little to no explicit language instruction, and "were intimidated by the sociolinguistic environment" (p.263) resulting in an avoidance of interaction and the erection of barriers between themselves and their native-speaking peers. Though it may be debatable how many and to what extent these factors influence the university classroom given its altered

dynamics, it is still possible that any or all of these factors maintain influence over NNS students at this educational level.

3.3 Post-Secondary NNS Learners as Generation 1.5 and International ESL

Though research on NNS learner participation in mainstream classes has been ongoing for decades, there has been relatively little focused on students at the university level. However, in recent years more focus has been placed on this context due to the increasing participation of immigrant children, referred to as “Generation 1.5”, who have gone through the western education system and are now entering their university eligible years (Vásquez, 2007). The majority of studies on NNS students in universities tend to focus on their participation in intensive English programs (IEP). Though these studies may not be contextually helpful for the present research in regards to their educational level, they still provide useful insights into factors that may influence ESL learners in the mainstream classroom.

In a case study of a single Generation 1.5 student, (Vásquez, 2007) indicated that ESL students with high-oral proficiency and experience with western education might be able to use this knowledge to mask deficiencies in academic writing and reading skills that would not become apparent until they were participating in mainstream subject courses. Similar results were reported by Song (2006), whose interview research of 22 learners who had failed a college ESL course indicated a lack of academic skills hidden by high oral proficiency amongst Generation 1.5 students, along with internal factors such as lack of motivation and effort and other social factors such as job and family responsibilities across all NNS learners all contributed to learner’s struggles in post-secondary ESL courses.

Along with higher academic demands and increasing anxiety from outside social factors, other studies have provided evidence that show international ESL learners to be more reticent in

the classroom. Lincoln and Rademacher (2006) investigated the learning styles of 69 ESL students from 17 countries (34 Latin American and 14 Asian) attending ESL classes in IEP programs at colleges in the South Eastern United States. Though the results of their survey data were more focused on the Hispanic population, they did suggest that Asian males favoured note-taking and aural learning, results in line with previous research in the same area that have shown Asian learners cross-culturally to be the least kinaesthetic, and to prefer visual and auditory learning over other methods of instruction (Reid, 1987; Stebbins, 1995; Park, 2002). The image of university age NNS learners that emerges from research in IEP programs, therefore, is one of increasing anxiety from pressures outside of the classroom matched by silence and withdrawal within the classroom. It might be predicted that this pattern would be replicated or even exacerbated in the mainstream classroom.

3.4 Post-Secondary NNS students in transition from IEPs to the Mainstream

A number of studies have investigated learners in transition periods between IEPs and mainstream courses. In a continuation of her research on ESL students in mainstream education, Harklau (2000) conducted an ethnographic study focused on identity representations that followed one Turkish and two Asian ESL students in their transition from secondary school to college in the US. Though the results of this study were generally focused on Generation 1.5 ESL in contrast to international ESL students, and the majority of her research at the university were specific to ESL classes, Harklau did suggest that post-secondary students are required to adapt or resist representations of ESL students that may be different and potentially more negative in the tertiary as opposed to the secondary system. This suggestion found additional support in a two-year mixed-methods study conducted by Marshall (2010) at a British Columbia university using data gathered from 997 pre- and post-course surveys and 18 interviewees of an

academic literacy course. His research indicated that ESL students in their first years of university are subject to “a deficit ‘remedial ESL’ identity which positions their presence in the university as a problem to be fixed rather than an asset to be welcomed” (p.41).

As can be expected, a large part of this representation is formed by ESL learners’ specific language abilities. In a simulated recall study with 15 participants of mostly Asian-descent taking simultaneous ESL and mainstream classes at a Canadian university, Zhou (2009) reported NNS students concern with general vocabulary, academic vocabulary, and word choice to be an ongoing challenge in both IEP and mainstream courses. These research studies all suggest that ESL students remain troubled by their potential deficiencies beyond their entrance into English-medium universities, while simultaneously being confronted by potentially negative institutional and social representations of their “ESL-ness”. In the case of Asian students, Kubota’s (2001) literature review of applied linguistics proclaims this to be a revisionist discourse of a positive, idealized image of a native speaker student “Self” who is independent, autonomous, and creative as opposed to the negative Asian student “Other” who is intellectually interdependent, “inclined to preserve rather than create knowledge, reluctant to challenge authority, and engaged in memorization rather than analytical thinking” (p.14). Thus university ESL students are challenged by these representations and perhaps must choose to challenge or acquiesce to these representations at various points in their time of education.

Regardless of the validity of these representations, what remains clear is that NNS students form a significant group (or groups, in the case of Generation 1.5) of learners that are distinct from their native-speaking peers in their educational expectations (Rebenstein, 2006) and their ability to perform academic work. This has given rise to a number of case studies which have emphasized interventions such as professional development for subject instructors (Snow &

Kamhi-Stein, 2002), increased student agency in negotiated academic preparatory programs (Goldschmidt, Notzold & Miller, 2003), increased collaboration between mainstream and ESL instructors (O'Byrne, 2001) and pedagogical adjustments to increase student dialogue (Dooley, 2004) that have all reported positive results for their student populations.

3.5 A Post-Secondary University Student in the Mainstream

There is little research available that focuses specifically on NNS learners in university mainstream courses after they have completed university IEPs or have gained full acceptance into the university. As the NNS population at English-medium universities continues to grow, it becomes increasingly important to investigate how these learners fare in mainstream courses as they continue their education. One such study that is relevant to the research at hand is Bifuh-Ambe's (2009) ethnographic investigation of a Korean doctoral student in an American university. Having been accepted to an English-medium university after passing the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) as well as the Graduate Record Examination (GRE), the research participant recounted her struggles with the mainstream curriculum. Bifuh-Ambe further divided these difficulties into the following five broad categories: receptive and expressive language difficulties, difficulties in writing, difficulties in comprehending content area material, differences in teaching learning, and assessment models. To counter these difficulties, the participant employed a number of strategies which Bifuh-Ambe categorized as personal, interpersonal, and academic. Academic strategies included extensive note-taking and the use of media to improve her language skills. Interpersonal strategies included such things as utilizing an academic peer coach to check her writing, attending study groups, and seeking out the instructors during their office hours. Personal strategies included maintaining high motivation to complete work and spending more time on task than her native speaking peers.

Though the data from this ethnography would be difficult to generalize, it does suggest that ESL students, even at high levels of post-secondary education, encounter numerous obstacles for which they must summon the motivation to overcome in order to succeed in English medium universities.

3.6 Mainstream Instructors in Lower Levels of Education

Research on mainstream teachers and their interactions with ESL students has focused almost exclusively on the primary and secondary levels. This is unfortunate because it is likely that university instructors teach classes with high percentages of ESL participants, and yet relatively little is known about how these instructors interact with second language learners. Still, the research that has been completed at lower levels may help to understand the actions of the post-secondary instructors participating in this present study. One of the earliest studies to explore this topic is Clair's (1995) year-long qualitative study of three mainstream teachers in the fourth, fifth, and tenth grades at schools in the US. Focusing on the professional development needs for mainstream teachers, Clair's analysis of interview transcripts, classroom observations and journals led her to suggest that mainstream teachers are inadequately prepared for the integration of ESL students into their classrooms, "desire easy answers to complex educational problems" (p.194), lack understanding of second language acquisition, and display attitudes towards ESL students which do not facilitate ESL learner success. These conclusions painted a particularly negative image of the institutional and instructor preparedness for the education of second language learners.

Successive studies have focused in particular on the last of Clair's (1995) conclusions regarding the attitudes of instructors towards second language learners. According to these researchers, teacher attitude towards ESL students is likely to affect their learning as a "self

fulfilling prophecy” (Jussim 1986; Jussim & Eccles, 1992; Jussim, Eccles & Madon, 1996), where teachers’ preconceived attitudes and expectations of their students propel them towards the expected behaviour. Youngs and Youngs (2001) survey study of 143 junior high and middle school mainstream teachers in the US indicated “a multipredictor model of teachers’ ESL-related attitudes” (p.97) which involved teachers being more likely to have positive attitudes toward ESL students if they have taken a foreign languages or multicultural education course, work in humanist, social sciences, or natural/physical sciences as opposed to applied disciplines, have some ESL training, have lived or taught outside of the US, have interactions with diverse ESL students and are female. However, the one-shot nature of the study could not explain a time-frame for these pre-existing attitudes and was unable to explain nearly 74% of the variance in teacher attitudes, perhaps due in large part to an inability to factor personality into the survey. Still, this research suggests that teachers’ perceptions of ESL learners are formed on previous personal experiences with foreign cultures, but can also be influenced through professional development and training.

The previous study also did not record the instructor’s attitudes towards the professional and practical aspects of the inclusion of ESL learners in mainstream courses. To rectify this, a number of studies have been conducted to focus on this area. Interview research by Platt, Harper, and Mendoza (2001) with 29 district level ESL administrators in a south-eastern US state indicated a wide range of support for different forms of ESL inclusion—noting a trend towards standardization and inclusion of ESL students in mainstream classes for reasons other than what was felt best for ESL learners, further suggesting that not only is mainstream education a contentious issue but that opinions on second language acquisition and ESL inclusion are divergent or perhaps even misconceived. In another study designed to measure

teacher attitude towards English-language learner inclusion, Reeves (2006) surveyed 279 subject-area high school teachers regarding their attitudes towards the four categories of English-language learner (ELL) inclusion, coursework modification, professional development, and perceptions of language learning. Her findings indicated teachers to have a neutral or slightly positive attitude towards ELL inclusion, a somewhat positive attitude towards coursework modification that was more favourable to allowing more time for ELLs to complete work than any kind of reduction of work compared to native-speaking peers, a neutral attitude towards professional development which included perceptions that they were unprepared to teach ELLs combined with lack of desire to receive training to aid their education ability in this area, and misconceptions regarding second language acquisition including underestimation of the amount of time required for ELLs to gain academic readiness and a significant (40%) portion of the respondents questioning the learners' continued use of their L1 in school.

A final study on this issue is Walker, Shafer and Liam's (2004) survey of 442 K-12 teachers in a mid-west state in the US regarding teacher attitudes. The results of their data analysis indicated that teachers in low-incidence schools tended to have more positive and "naively" optimistic views regarding the inclusion of ELL learners in their courses. However, actual experience with ELL inclusion tended to instil in instructors more positive attitudes if they had previous positive experiences with ELLs or were devoting time to a limited number of ELLs but more negative attitudes when they were unprepared and unsupported. As with other research of this nature, a large proportion of the respondents were neutral in their responses related to professional development, knowledge of second language acquisition, and making adjustments for ELLs, which suggests that many mainstream educators have limited knowledge of the needs of ESL learners and the process of second language acquisition. In sum, the research on

instructor attitudes towards the inclusion of ESL learners in mainstream education suggests that most teachers are initially neutral or even open to the idea of ESL inclusion, but this attitude may be naively optimistic, and a lack of institutional support or professional development can turn this naive optimism to negative opinion when challenges occur.

3.7 Additional Mainstream Classroom Issues

These results draw parallels with research on other aspects of mainstream courses. Karathanos (2009) survey of 327 pre-service and experienced mainstream teachers from the elementary to secondary levels in the mid-west US regarding the incorporation of the students' L1 into instruction indicated that many instructors supported the idea of L1 inclusion in theory but were less supportive of its actual practical application. However, factors such as experience with NNS students or teacher training led to more positive perceptions. While teaching experience seemed to factor more positively towards the incorporation of NNS learners' L1, the support for its practical application was greater at the elementary level than at the secondary. The results also indicated that professional development in ESL-specific training led to greater support for the incorporation of NNS students' L1 in instruction, which lends further support to the notion that mainstream instructors lack knowledge of the second language acquisition process.

Two studies on educational identity also testify to these themes. Vollmer's (2000) ethnographic study of seven teachers at an American high school in California suggested that instructors, in their identity-construction of ESL students, tended to rely on assumptions identified as "folk theories behind a monolingual language ideology" (p.63) that international ESL learners should willingly give up ties to their home country and L1 in exchange for the benefits offered them by western education and society. She also suggested that teachers tended

to believe that the success of students was more tied to non-school related student factors such as motivation or a good academic background than the educational practices of the institution, thus absolving the institution from responsibility for the educational struggles of NNS students.

Similarly, Haworth's (2008) ethnographic study of eight mainstream primary school teachers in New Zealand regarding their own identity construction suggested that the presence of second language learners led to tensions that changed teachers' perceptions of their abilities. Difficulties with negotiating cultural and linguistic barriers led to lowered perceptions of self-efficacy, while some teachers placed a low priority on professional developments regarding NNS students because working with them did not fit with "the set of socially constructed beliefs that defined the core identity and role of a class teacher" (p.426). Mainstream teachers also experienced contextual tensions because ESL was deemed an issue of minor significance in their schools, therefore those teachers deemed to be effective with second language learners risked a loss of prestige as well as the loss of additional institutional support in teaching ESL students. Just as with the research on mainstream attitudes towards NNS learners, it appears that mainstream instructors lack knowledge of both NNS learners and the second language acquisition process. Though professional development appears to help, instructors are reluctant to attend this training, and if institutions do not place a high priority on their NNS learners in the form of support or training, they tend to be seen as having a negative impact on mainstream classes.

Though most studies have portrayed the mainstream instructor as being unprepared and having a negative, or at best neutral, position towards the instruction of the NNS learners, there is one study which expresses a much different view. Wang, Many, and Krumenaker (2008) conducted a year-long ethnographic study of one social studies teacher at a secondary school in

the US in an attempt to understand mainstream teachers experiences and needs when instructing ESL learners. The results of this study indicated that unlike the past results of studies of mainstream teachers who appeared to be unwilling or unable to help their NNS students, this teacher made a number of modifications to his teaching that were “appropriate” and “consistent with what is recommended by research on language and content integration, and in line with good principles for inclusive education” (p.79), such as cooperative learning, peer teaching, and accompanying oral lectures and instructions with visual aids allowing the ESL students multiple opportunities to access information. Unfortunately, some of these modifications appeared ineffective in that they slowed the pace of instruction and lowered the standard of learning in the class, affecting the overall quality of learning. Thus the data gathered from this teacher indicated that the negativity of mainstream teachers towards NNS learners that was common to past research studies ignores the complexity and difficulty of the experiences and needs of mainstream teachers.

3.8 Literature Review Summary

The above statement is revealing of the research completed thus far on mainstream teachers and their interactions with ESL students in their classrooms. The themes that have appeared are that though teachers seem willing to teach ESL learners, they are often underprepared or naive in their beliefs about what is needed to teach them. This may be positively altered through previous experience with second language learning and learners, ESL-specific training or professional development, and institutional support, but instructors are often unwilling to take the steps that might aid their experience with these learners, and many institutions do not place a high priority on NNS students and their needs. But because the complexity and difficulty of the issues that occur on an everyday basis in the university

mainstream classroom have not been research thoroughly, the adjustments that the instructors at this level make to their instruction and course material are relatively unknown; therefore, it is crucial to research how these issues might unfold in the university classroom.

CHAPTER FOUR

4. Methodology

The following research questions will guide this research:

1. What pedagogical practices guide a lower level English course?
2. What adjustments do instructors use to aid, or in response to, NNS students?
3. How do NNS students perceive the usefulness of these pedagogical practices?
4. How do NNS students' perceptions of these pedagogical practices compare with the perceptions of their NS peers?

4.1 Setting and Participants

The study was conducted in the winter semester (January to April) at a small university in British Columbia, Canada. Participants were the instructors and learners of three different sections of the Introduction to Literature: Short Fiction and Poetry course. Along with one or two prerequisite English courses designed to aid NNS students with academic writing, this course was one of two selections (the other being a course dedicated to the study of the novel) required to be taken in the first year of studies, and as a requirement for graduation. The decision to focus in this study on the short fiction and poetry course was based on informant information that it was historically the most popular choice for NNS students. The three instructors had very different levels of experience: a female instructor with more than ten years teaching experience, a male instructor with less than ten years of experience, and a female instructor in her first year of teaching. It is important to note that the instructor with the most experience was known anecdotally in the English department as the instructor with the most experience in the education of international ESL students, due in large part to her position in charge of the university's writing centre, where all students could go to receive help with their

academic essays. Of the 50 participating students, 33 were NS students (10 male and 23 female) and 17 were NNS (7 male and 10 female). Of the 17 NNS students, 4 would be considered Generation 1.5 having lived in an English speaking country for some of their schooling before university (12, 11, 8, and 5 years living in an English speaking country)⁴. The nationalities of the NNS students included 10 Chinese, 2 Korean, 1 Indonesian, 1 South-African, 1 Brazilian, 1 Turkish, and 1 Canadian with Mandarin Chinese as a first language. The ages of the learner participants ranged from 18-33 years with an average age of 20.54 years (NNS=21.4, NS=20.1). In terms of language proficiency, acceptance to the university was based on a minimum TOEFL score of 570, a minimum IELTS score of 6.5, or the successful completion of an IE program at the university.

The three sections of the course took place on different days and at different times during the day from 1-3 times per week for a total of 150 minutes per week. The number of ESL participants in each class varied greatly. In Class A, 3 of 15 participants were ESL. In Class B, 5 of 20 participants were ESL, with 3 of the 5 being Generation 1.5 (12, 11, and 8 years living in an English speaking country). In Class C, on the other hand, 9 of 15 participants were ESL with only 1 of the 9 ESL participants being Generation 1.5 (5 years living in an English speaking country). The classes took place in different classrooms, but each had similar long, narrow table style desks that fit two students to each table that were configured with four or five rows of desks with no more than four students side by side. The desks were positioned to face the front of the classroom. Each room was equipped with an overhead projector placed on a movable cart with additional space to place a binder or notes that the teachers utilized as a “podium” while

⁴ For the purposes of this research, participants were informed that the definition of NNS was anyone whose mother tongue was not English. This allowed for the potential of Generation 1.5 candidates to be included and accounted for in the data. In one case, where a participant identified as NNS having learned Chinese as a home language but using English for all communication other than at home in an English speaking country/environment, except for one year, the participant was classed as NS.

teaching, as well as with permanent whiteboards, internet access, a video projector mounted in the ceiling, and sound-speakers capable of being used with multiple modes of output.

4.2 Research Design

This exploratory study adopted a mixed-methods approach including classroom observation, instructor interviews and a survey of the NS and NNS learners. Methodological triangulation was employed to compare observed pedagogical practices with stated practices in the interview to answer the first research question, offer specific stated pedagogical adjustments from the interview with observed adjustments to answer the second question, and perceptions of these practices from the questionnaire to answer the third and fourth research questions.

Observations occurred over a one month period towards the end of the semester in order to ensure that the observations captured were, as much as possible, representative of the general activities and procedures that characterized each class. Observations were recorded as ethnographic field notes and entailed the actions of approximately 5 hours of instruction in each course. In general, the field notes were loosely structured and did not follow any predetermined checklists or rating scales due to the variation in instruction styles, and in order to capture the pedagogical practices of each instructor as they occurred during these instructional hours from the time they entered the classroom until the time they left. However, the exception to the loose structuring of field notes occurred in that the observations were focused using Tharp's (1993) list of the seven types of instruction as a baseline for observations. As much as possible the researcher attempted to minimize his intrusion in the normal operation of the class. In instances where it was felt the researcher's presence may have influenced the actions of the participants, the researcher located himself to a predetermined area of the classroom deemed least obtrusive by both the instructor and the researcher.

At the end of the observation period, a 30-item questionnaire was issued to willing NS and NNS participants of each class (see Appendix A for complete questionnaire). Survey items were approved by the instructors of each class as well as reviewed by an experienced TESOL professional and piloted with four MA TESOL students including one NNS before distribution. All 30-items were close-ended and rated on a six-point Likert-scale which ranged from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. The survey was administered at the end of class time with the instructor absent during the time of administration.

The final measure employed in the study was a semi-structured interview with each of the instructors which lasted approximately 15 minutes. Instructors were provided with a pre-determined set of seven questions a few days in advance of the interview which were reviewed by an experienced TESOL professional and subject to the professional's and interviewees approval (see Appendix B for interview questions). These questions were supplemented with additional questions about particular pedagogical practices that were influenced by the observations or which were brought up during the interview process. The interviews occurred in the instructors offices and were audio-recorded with the instructor's approval and subsequently transcribed by the researcher.

4.3 Data Analysis

All field notes, interview transcripts, and surveys were organized with assigned capital letters and numbers. For instance, the field notes were assigned a capital letter based on class (A, B, or C) and a number coinciding with the chronological order in which the notes were taken (1-6). Field notes were initially coded using Tharp's (1993) seven types of instruction to assist learner performance. These types were further divided in order to determine if the teaching practice was oral or visual, and if the instruction was directed to the whole class, a group, or an

individual. An additional category identifying aspects of relation building was added to the seven types of instruction (see Appendix C for the categorization of codes and Appendix D for a sample of the coded field notes). The interview data was audio recorded and transcribed verbatim by the researcher. This data was analyzed for all instances that related to Tharp's (1993) list of instructional types and then used to complement the ethnographic notes from above, as well as to reveal pedagogical adjustments that the instructors were cognizant of making that could not be directly observed.

The surveys were similarly organized to identify class with each participant being issued a number. After the surveys were organized, the data was entered into a database and used to calculate means between the groups in order to identify significant results. The means were then displayed, along with number of NS or NNS participant per class, and divided between class and NS and NNS for comparison. Survey questions were grouped and compared according to the categories that were determined based on the observations and interviews.

4.4 Role of the Researcher

Having graduated with a BA in English literature, the researcher was comfortable with understanding the processes and practices that were occurring in the literature classroom. However, with more than five years separating the time from when the researcher attended similar introductory English courses, he was interested in observing how a rising percentage of NNS participation had changed pedagogical practices in these courses. With prior experience in these courses, he was knowledgeable of the ways in which English had been taught, and was therefore well-positioned to recognize adjustments that the instructors would be making for the benefit of their NNS learners.

4.5 Ethical Considerations

Several ethical considerations were taken into account over the course of this study. To begin, the study was submitted to the university's research ethics board for approval. After that, instructors were contacted via email about their willingness to participate in the study. Instructors were at all times made aware of the anonymous and voluntary nature of the study and all aspects of data collection were brought for their approval before they were initiated.

Before the administration of the survey, student participants were made aware orally and in writing of the anonymous and voluntary nature of their participation and given the option of leaving the classroom before or at any time during the administration of the survey. They were also made aware of their ability to withdraw their participation in the survey for a period of time after the administration until the time of analysis, and were given the researcher's contact information if they had any questions. Each page of the survey clearly stated that their answers on the survey indicated their willingness to participate.

All data collection including field notes, completed surveys, interview audio files, and interview transcriptions were kept on the researcher's laptop which was password protected or in a single binder which was kept in a locked cabinet. After the analysis the records were placed on a USB flash drive which was kept with the binder in a locked cabinet.

CHAPTER FIVE

5. Results and Discussion

The following results are presented in three different sections. In answer to the first research question, the first section presents the pedagogical practices that guided the literature class as they were observed, supplemented by data from the instructor interviews. These will be discussed as they compare between instructors, as they compare to Tharp's (1993) seven types of instruction, and in regards to how they align with past research and current knowledge of effective teaching techniques for second language learners. In answer to the second research question, the second section looks at the pedagogical adjustments made for ESL students as reported by the instructors and supplement by data from the observations. As in the first section, they will be discussed as they align with past research and current knowledge of second language learning. In answer to the final two research questions, the final section will report the results of the survey supplemented by the results from the first two sections.

5.1 Tharp's Seven Types of Instruction

All seven of Tharp's (1993) types of instruction were found to be present in the observed classes (see p. 29 for a discussion of Tharp's instructional types and Appendix C for a list of Tharp's instructional types), though they existed in different modes and to different extents depending on the instructor (see Appendix E for a chart outlining a raw count of instructional types). The least observed instructional types in the classroom were task structuring, feedback, contingency management, and modelling, while the most observed were questioning, explaining, and directing. Though this appears to echo past research which found post-secondary instruction to be teacher centred and consist mostly of oral lectures focused on knowledge transmission that are unhelpful to second language learners (Boyer, 1987; Applebee, 1996; Zamel, 1995; Kubota,

2001), a closer look at how each of these types functioned in the classroom reveals divergences from this portrayal.

5.1.1 Modelling

Though it did not occur frequently, “modelling” was present in each of the classes in a number of circumstances. All of the instructors performed dramatic readings of the poems they were studying which served as templates for the oral reading of poetry by the students in the class. Though no NNS students were observed to read orally in the class, at least one instructor indicated that part of the student’s assessment would involve the dramatic reading of a poem. The instructor of Class A, who made frequent use of an overhead projector, provided visual modelling of note-taking while she discussed a poem with the class, as well as utilizing a questioning technique of providing a model answer to the questions she was asking the class in order to encourage the learners into speaking. In Class C, the instructor used kinaesthetic modelling by clapping out lines of poetry in order to aid the students learning of poetic metre and also provided visual modelling when she displayed an internet writing website through the video projector and demonstrated to the students how they could use the website to improve their understanding of literary convention. Within the interviews, the instructor of Class A also reported that she had used modelling to specifically benefit her NNS students by using examples of former NNS student’s exemplary work as demonstrative models of how to write outlines. Though these examples of modelling were quite specific, they demonstrate a variety of different modes of instruction that suggest the instructor’s willingness to accommodate different learning styles and the needs of NNS students.

5.1.2 Feedback

“Feeding back”, or “feedback”, was one of the least observed occurrences in these classrooms. In all three classes, feedback generally occurred within the class as an oral correction on the part of the instructor to an incorrect answer from a solicitation question or to information that a student group leader was providing to the class after a group activity. The instructors of Class B and C both make reference to written feedback that they have given on essays that have been marked, and the instructor of Class B set aside class time to address some of the feedback from these essays, specifically some aspects of grammar, that he felt would be of benefit to the whole class. Despite the attention given to explicit language instruction, it did not appear that the observed use of feedback was given particularly for the benefit of NNS students over their NS peers, and in most cases was initiated by NS students rather than NNS students. However during the interviews, the instructor of Class A indicated her belief that arranging out of class, one-on-one appointments with students to give feedback (NS and NNS) regarding their first essays was a pedagogical device she utilized that was most beneficial for ESL students. Therefore although feedback was not observed to have any particular advantage for NNS students, it did register with at least one of the instructors as an area where they had made pedagogic adjustment.

5.1.3 Contingency Management

Similar to feeding back, “contingency management” was not observed to occur frequently within these classes. This is perhaps not surprising, due to the fact that university education falls within the realm of adult instruction, and overt punishment would in many cases be deemed inappropriate and condescending due to the maturity of the learners. In addition, the maturity of the learners regarding their internal motivation towards learning and appropriate

behaviour in class may preclude any benefit of external motivation that might be gained by offering rewards. There were, however, a few instances of contingency management worth mentioning.

In all three classes, instances arose where the behaviour of some or all of the learners was deemed inappropriate by the instructor for such things as not following an oral direction, engaging a peer in conversation while another student was presenting information to the class, or engaging in personal conversations while the instructor was lecturing. In all of these occasions the instructor would orally request the class to be respectful or observe the requested behaviour, or even more simply do something such as use a hand gesture or clear their throat as a method of contingency management. On another occasion the instructor of Class B, in preparation for an essay that was due, warned the students about the seriousness of plagiarism and its consequences. The instructor of Class C, in response to the drafts of essays that she had read, engaged the students in a contingency management activity related to plagiarism where she had the students turn to a university guidelines book and then read with them a page related to academic honesty and the punishments for infringements of the universities policies. Though it cannot be established that that this issue of academic honesty was related to the ESL students in these classes, plagiarism has been established as a known issue with ESL learners (Thompson & Williams, 1995; Evans & Youmans, 2000; Abasi, Akbari, & Graves, 2006), therefore it is possible that this issue of contingency management was undertaken by the instructors with their ESL students in mind.

5.1.4 Directing

Unlike the previous three instructional types, “directing” was a commonly observed feature of these classes. Directing was often used by the instructors in fairly predictable ways, such as to give the students information about what literature they would be studying in class, what activities they would be using, and what was expected of them to do for homework in preparation for the next class. Of interest then, is not what the instructors were directing but in the mode they were doing it. The mode of delivery for directions was predominantly oral, with a few notable exceptions. Assignments and assessments of importance were often found to be accompanied by visual instructions exemplified in these classrooms through being written on the whiteboard or given as a handout. More than this, the instructor of Class C gave out worksheets that helped to direct the activities of the majority of two of the classes that were observed. This was similar to the instructor of Class A, who relied heavily on a combination of oral and visual directions to negotiate activities such as distributing handouts with instructions and questions for the students to answer in groups. A distinction was also observed between the instructors in how they chose to address their directions, with the instructor of Class C addressing directions to individuals by name far more often than the instructors of Classes A and B. Thus though the content of directing was similar, and the method of delivery of directing was primarily oral, the differences in who the directions were delivered to and whether a visual element was included in the directions may have had a positive impact on ESL learners.

5.1.5 Questioning

“Questioning” was also frequently observed in all of the classrooms. Just as with directing, the content of the questioning across classes was quite similar, generally consisting of questions meant to solicit information from the students about the literature they were studying.

There were variations, however, regarding the mode of question delivery. Though the majority of questions were delivered orally, at times a visual element was added to supplement important questions. For instance, the instructor of Class A in several instances had questions prepared as an overhead projection or would write them on an overhead projection, and the instructor of Class C had some of her questions written as an activity handout. In somewhat similar fashion, during group activities the instructor of Class B would orally report a pre-prepared discussion question for each group to write down themselves. Also similar to directing was who the questioning was directed to. Though the majority of each instructor's questions were directed to the whole class or a group depending on the activity, the instructor of Class C also directed many of her questions towards individual students, often addressing the students by name while asking. Questioning also represented a type of instruction that varied according to the inclusion of visual elements and whether the questions were addressed to the whole class or individuals.

5.1.6 Explaining

“Explaining” was also one of the most frequently observed types used in these courses. Each of the instructors spent a great deal of time in each class explaining information about the literature, most often to the whole class, but also to groups depending on the activity and to individuals at times during and after class. The mode of delivery for explaining was most often oral, but there were notable exceptions to this. The instructor of class B included the use of the whiteboard to aid explaining, often adding key words, short notes, and occasionally drawing. Likewise the instructor of class C made use of the whiteboard for key words, short notes, and pictures, but also included the use of the internet displayed via the video projector as well as the previously mentioned kinaesthetic explanation that involved clapping out the metre of poems. The instructor of Classroom A, however, made by far the most use of supplemental modes of

delivery, complimenting almost all of her lecture with some type of visual element such as the extensive use of the overhead projector to display the literature and write notes about the literature, showing pictures to help describe difficult to explain images (such as sirens and kingfishers), and the use of other realia to help explain the literature she was describing. Explaining differentiated, then, in the use of additional support that aided oral lecture on the literature.

5.1.7 Task Structuring

“Task structuring” was observed to occur in ways unexpected based on previous literature about the characteristics of instruction in university classrooms. As mentioned previously, university classrooms were described as being teacher centred and focused on knowledge transmission through oral lecture. This did not appear to be the case with these literature classes however, as the majority of the in-class tasks were group or pair activities focused on collaborative knowledge generation with the assistance of the instructors. In general, each group or pair was given a question or series of questions to discuss with their peers for a given amount of class time or for homework. After discussions were concluded, each group would share the information they had discussed.

These activities were conducted in different ways depending on the instructor. Class A, for instance, would typically have one spokesperson who would share information on behalf of the group. Class B, on the other hand, would share responsibilities between all members of the group, each member sharing a different piece of information that had been discussed. The more elaborate activity of Class C, which spanned several classes, had pairs studying different poems and answering a series of questions which they then shared with the rest of the class. The instructor would aid these discussions by preparing the questions that the groups would discuss,

by asking questions of the group during whole class discussion that would expand on the information the groups were sharing, and also by sharing from their own knowledge of the literature.

Other methods of task structuring that were observed were that the instructor of Class C appeared to monitor her speech, often speaking quite slowly and carefully with apparent attention to her vocabulary. In addition, the instructor of Class A would use a sheet of paper to cover up information on her overhead projector that would be discussed at a later time. In the interviews, task structuring was identified by the instructors as ways in which they attempted to help their NNS students.

The instructor of Class B believed his group activities to be helpful because they showed NNS students that they had information to contribute in class, and the instructor of Class C believed that a group activity in which she had each group become an “expert” in an element of fiction positively contributed to their reading comprehension. Meanwhile, the instructor of Class A indicated that she would attempt to make groups discussion questions easier for NNS students by identifying page numbers and paragraphs as the points of focus when they searched for answers. Task structuring, therefore, was a conscious way that these instructors attempted to reach the NNS students in their classrooms.

5.2 Additional Observed Practices

In addition to Tharp’s (1993) seven types of instructions, there were a number of pedagogical practices observed that appear to either have been influenced by the ESL students present in the class, or if not influenced by them are at least supported by second language theorists and educators as “best practice” techniques. These practices are recorded here because even though they may only be an aspect of each instructor’s natural repertoire of teaching, they

represent differentiations between the instructors that might have a great deal of influence over the success of NNS students in the classroom.

5.2.1 Vocabulary

The first of these practices is the instructors' explicit attention to vocabulary. The academic vocabulary knowledge of second language students, especially at the tertiary level when more technical and esoteric language begins to factor into education, has been an area of concern in second language theory for some time. It has been argued that the amount of vocabulary expected of students at the tertiary level vastly exceeds the amount language students learn in language classes (Nation, 2001 ; Koda, 2005; Grabe, 2009), therefore language students attend university classes without the desired amount of vocabulary knowledge that would allow them to succeed with the same type of ease as NS students. Within this research it was observed that each instructor spent time providing the definitions for vocabulary. This was to be expected, because as mentioned earlier literature classes employ a level of technical vocabulary requiring explanation for even NS students. For example, the study of poetry at this level typically needs to define more difficult words such as iambic, trochaic, and couplet as well as the specialized usage of more common words such as imagery, metre and feet.

There was, however, a noticeable distinction between the ways each instructor dealt with vocabulary items in their classes. The instructor of Class B, aside from vocabulary that NS students might reasonably struggle with, was not observed to spend any additional time defining vocabulary. Similarly, the instructor of Class A did not appear to spend additional time defining vocabulary, though she was observed to allow a certain amount of time after the reading of literature for students to ask for the definition of any words that appeared that they may not have understood. In contrast, the instructor of class C was observed to spend a great deal of time

defining vocabulary and double-checking that the students understood the meaning of vocabulary that NS students might have been expected to know, including such things as the difference between “abstract” and “concrete”, the multiple meanings of the word “stand”, the definition of the word “howling” along with its animal association, and on one memorable occasion the meaning of the word “sap” defined by the teacher with an elaborate drawing of a tree on the whiteboard. This was all done in addition to providing the students with a glossary of literary terms that were essential to the course, which the instructor made mention of and drew the students attention to several times in the class. If NNS students struggle with academic vocabulary, it may be understandable that the instructor with the most NNS students spent more time defining vocabulary has more than one meaning or is less commonly heard. Regardless, explicit attention to vocabulary and the institution of multiple methods of accessing difficult vocabulary is a practice often cited as crucial to the success of NNS students (Carlo & Sylvester, 1996; Drucker, 2003).

5.2.2 Group Activities

A second practice that requires further attention is the use of group discussion activities. As was mentioned earlier, this was a surprising result given previous research that painted a picture of university education as teacher centred with a primary focus on knowledge transmission. In contrast, the literature classes that were observed appeared to focus more on the students collaborative creation of knowledge which included such things as their own interpretations of the literature, their ability to conduct library and internet research in and out of the class and bring this research to bear in discussions, and at times to share responsibilities for the gathering and dissemination of this information. This approach to education, which appears to move away from the knowledge transmission model to one which attempts to synthesize

multiple perspectives on education and be more inclusive of competing perspectives on education including its social and critical dimensions (Miller & Sellar, 1990; Wrigley, 1993), has generally been accepted as a positive approach to the instruction of NNS learners, especially given its connection with Vygotskian notions of the social attributes of language learning and effective pedagogy (Johnson, 2004, Yandell, 2007).

In the mainstream classroom, however, the institution of more social and collaborative methods of knowledge creation is not without risk. As mentioned previously, research has shown NNS learners to face social obstacles and pressures in the mainstream classroom that work to ostracize these students and lead to their becoming silent and withdraw. Harklau (1994), in particular, mentions that “perhaps the single most salient aspect of observation of ESL student in mainstream classes was their reticence and lack of interaction with native-speaking peers” (p.262-263). In such circumstances, the effectiveness of group activities might be limited in its effectiveness for NNS students.

In general, Harklau’s statement appeared to be supported by the observation of this research. For instance at no time in Class A or B, where the ratio of NNS student to NS student was quite small, were NNS students observed to readily volunteer answers for questions directed to the whole class or provide opinions or information during whole class discussions (the exception perhaps being Generation 1.5 students, who for reasons related to privacy were not explicitly identified in the observations). Another more specific example that seemed to support this claim occurred in Class A, where the division of students into groups for an activity left a NNS student without a group to participate with that was only rectified after the instructor intervened.

In contrast, there were moments of NNS participation that seemed to defy this claim. In Class C, where the ratio of NNS to NS student was actually higher, voluntary NNS contributions to whole class questions and whole class discussion were observed to occur more often. In addition, the instructor's chosen group activities, which required collaborative preparation outside of class and the participation of all group members in class, featured the oral contribution of NNS students quite prominently. The contribution of NNS students to whole class discussion immediately after group activities was also observed to occur in Class B. Questions during interviews revealed this to be an aspect of a practice instituted by the instructor requiring each member of a group to contribute something orally during the whole class discussion due in part to his past experience that ESL learners were "less likely to voice their opinion during a class-wide discussion". These adjustments to group activities therefore appeared to encourage the participation of NNS speakers, at least in regards to their oral presence in the classroom.

5.2.3 Instructional Support and Visual Aids

The use of multiple modes of delivery, especially the use of visual aids for instructional support, is another observed practice supported by second language research. What is well known in second language education, and perhaps just as easily discovered by anyone who has attempted to learn a second language, is that aural reception is an extraordinarily difficult skill to master, especially in a transactional rather than interactional context such as an oral lecture (Rost, 1990). The increase in the use of technical language that university professors bring to their instructional lecturing might pose an additional challenge that second language learners may be ill-equipped to deal with. In such circumstances, additional teaching supports that the instructor brings to the classroom might have a tremendous impact on the NNS student's ability

to follow oral lecture and class discussions and also cater to a variety of learning styles (Scarcella, 1990; Johnson, 1995).

In these classes, each instructor approached adding teaching support to their oral lecturing in different ways. They all made use of the whiteboard, on which they would write key words, short notes, and occasionally draw pictures and symbols. The instructor of Class C added to this the use of the internet as a modelling device on one occasion in which she demonstrated how to use trusted websites to check for literary terms, as well as the use of handouts as a guide for activities. The instructor of Class A, however, made the greatest use of teaching support by having the overhead projector in constant use—either to display the piece of literature that was being discussed or to display the teaching points that she wished to cover with the students. This enabled her to do things such as point to or underline sections of the literature she was discussing or more coherently indicate how her short notes and key words connected to the literature. As mentioned previously, this instructor also supplemented this use of visual stimuli with additional pictures and realia related to some of the images in the literature that may have been difficult to understand, as well as handouts with the main questions that were being discussed in the group activities in class. Though this use of visual support may have been an extension of her natural teaching repertoire that she might have use regardless of NNS students, there is a great deal of support in the literature for the ways in which she employed additional instructional support.

5.3 NNS-Specific Pedagogical Adjustments Identified by the Instructors

Within the interviews, the instructors of these courses identified a number of pedagogical practices that they had instituted solely for the benefit of NNS students or that they felt were effective practices for teaching NNS students. Some of these practices would have been difficult to observe given such factors as participant privacy and the length of observation,

therefore they are recorded separately in this section and supplemented by observations that indicate how these practices were being employed in the classroom.

5.3.1 Assessment

An adjustment that many students need to make at the university level regards differences in assessment. Many literature courses at the tertiary level make far greater use of written essays as an assessment measure and rely much less on the paper based tests that assess using measures such as short answer or multiple choice questions that many learners are far more familiar with. Regarding reading comprehension, the instructors of each of these classes stated that they all at one point in their classes issued short factual quizzes after readings but that the intention of these quizzes was more as a contingency management practice—to ensure the students were in fact doing the reading—than to test for actual comprehension. Written essays, then, became the main measure by which students were assessed because, as the instructor of Class B pointed out, “you can’t write a university literature essay without having a really good [reading] comprehension”.

At the same time, the demands of research for a literature essay might be, in the words of the instructor of Class A, “extremely daunting” for NNS students in their first year of university. For this reason, one of the pedagogic adjustments that she made for NNS students in her class was to include essay topics that might rely less on literary criticism and allow them to discuss the literature they had read in the course as it relates to “topics that involve some psychology or that sometimes involve the immigrant experience...so that they can make connections to real world experience and also so that maybe it doesn’t get so esoteric as, say, literary theory.” The idea of making such an adjustment in assessment, given the struggles that NNS students might have with the technical language of this academic subject, is not without support from ESL theorists and educators. As Miller and Endo (2004) state, a “very important step teachers can take is to make

every effort to reduce the ‘cognitive load’...The key is to choose activities and assignments that allow students to draw on their prior knowledge and life experiences” (p.789). Pedagogical adjustments in assessment, at least for one instructor in this study, was one of the areas in which she was cognizant of making a change in order to aid her NNS students.

5.3.2 Background Information

Another area where the instructor of Class A made pedagogical adjustments for NNS students is related to the providing of background information. Research on second language reading comprehension has shown that learner have better comprehension of reading with which they have some familiarity or previous knowledge (Koda, 2005; Grabe, 2009). It is important, then, that this knowledge is activated prior to the reading assignment in order to maximize the comprehension possibilities of the learner. While all the instructors were observed to provide background information regarding the readings that the learners were engaged in, this was often delivered orally, and was also given after the readings had already been assigned. In the interviews, however, the instructor of Class A stated that she would often post background information and supplemental materials about the readings to an internet site provided by the university. This would have the benefit of making background information to the readings accessible to the students before they engaged in the reading in order to activate any schema they might have regarding the reading. The instructor added that in cases where she had a high ratio of NNS students she would also post outlines and notes from the class discussions which would be accessible to the students for use on essays and exams, allowing them to activate knowledge they had gained from the class at pivotal moments in assessment. Providing access to trusted background information regarding the readings via the internet might have another benefit as well, in that it might prevent students from accessing misinformation available via the web. An

incident in Class C, in which several NNS students utilized incorrect information regarding a reading made it evident that ESL students may not always be able to discern whether the background information they are accessing regarding readings can be trusted. In such circumstances, background information that the instructor provides which is voluntarily accessible might prove invaluable to the ESL learner.

5.3.3 Material Selection

Another area where two of the instructors indicated that they made pedagogical adjustments for their ESL students was with materials selection. As a course which serves to introduce students to the literature of modern English, instructors have at their discretion the choice of any literature dating from about the time of Chaucer, which encompasses nearly 600 years of English writing. Of course, despite being designated as “modern” the language has changed drastically throughout the centuries to the extent where, for example, most NS readers struggle to comprehend Shakespeare on their first reading attempt. In somewhat similar circumstances writing that uses complex grammar or complicated vocabulary might present severe obstacles for NNS reading comprehension. Second language reading researchers are in agreement that comprehension hinges on reading fluency, which requires automatic word recognition, wide and deep vocabulary knowledge, and the ability to read with speed (Birch 2007; Grabe, 2009). As noted in the previous paragraph, reading comprehension is enhanced if the reading taps into the knowledge and experience of the learners.

There were several changes to material selection that the instructors stated they did to improve the possibility of NNS reader comprehension. Both of the instructors of Classes A and C dropped certain authors from their instruction including the works from authors such as Donne, Marvell, and T.S. Eliot because they felt they were too difficult for NNS students to

comprehend. The instructor of Class C, who was teaching her first class, also stated that she had eliminated a number of works from her syllabus after realizing that her NNS students did not appear to be able to handle the amount of reading she had originally proposed, a decision that would probably be supported by second language educators because NNS learners read at a much slower rate than their NS peers (Koda, 2005). In addition, both instructors stated that they had included at least one story from an author of Asian heritage, with the instructor of Class A including a poem in translation from an Asian author. The inclusion of multicultural literature is an adjustment found favourable with second language educators not only because it may resonate with ESL students but also because it may positively affect the motivation of second language students and also act as a concrete demonstration of their social inclusion in the makeup of the class (Blair, 1991; Vandrick, 1996).

5.3.4 Bridging the Cultural Divide

The addition of literature that ESL students might culturally identify with may also have been done in part as a response to the instructors perceived views on the difficulty that their NNS learner have with cultural content. Each of the instructors identified the cultural content of literature as the most difficult aspect of the course with which their ESL learners must contend. As the instructor of Class C indicated, “the cultural content that is assumed for native speakers who have gone to the school system here and have, one assumed had stories read to them and have been exposed through, through movies and so on, um, that cultural void, um, for ESL students where background for poetry and for the short stories is missing for them...must have been very difficult”. This echoes the sentiment of second language researchers, who all concur that the cultural aspects of literature present difficulties for NNS learners (Lazar, 1993; Hall, 2005).

Each instructor's awareness of the hurdles in cultural knowledge that their NNS were required to clear led them to different approaches in dealing with culture in the classroom. As mentioned previously the instructor of Class A made the decision to include additional background information for some of the material as well as include stories from other cultures and that dealt with the immigrant experience as well as suggesting topics that might allow NNS students to bring their own cultural knowledge into their essays. The instructor of class B, on the other hand, stated that in dealing with NNS students he tried to never assume that they had the same cultural knowledge as their NS peers and then tried to communicate some ideas in ways they might more easily understand. He was observed to do this on one occasion where he brought in the Taoist idea of yin yang and used it to relate to an idea from an English poem that he was teaching. Similarly, the instructor of class C also said that in awareness of cultural distance she "offered them the opportunity to make connections from...their own background". This was seen to take place on several occasions where she would ask the students to offer comparison words in their own language or to share stories from their own culture that had parallels to the ideas she was sharing. Though the effects of these measures towards NNS students would be hard to measure empirically, they are in the least attempts at bridging the perceived cultural divide between the material and these students and, perhaps more importantly, represent the willingness of these instructors to create classrooms that are culturally inclusive.

5.3.5 The Desire to Build Relationships

The instructors' concern that their classes were welcoming to ESL students extended beyond such things as using multicultural literature and group activities to encourage the motivation and contribution of NNS speakers. In the interviews each of the instructors in their own way expressed sympathy with the plight of the ESL learners that had participated in their

classes, while also relating the idea that those students whom they could develop positive relationships were those that fared best in their classes—expressed by the instructor of class B as establishing a “relational connection” and the instructor of class C as making “a community of ESL students comfortable with one another and with the materials”.

This attempt at relationship building revealed itself in a number of different ways in this classroom. At times it appeared as relationship building through recognition. This was most easily seen through the practices of the instructor of Class C, who would often call upon the NNS students in her class by name to relate stories and discussions they had previously discussed. It was also apparent in the decisions of the instructor of Class A, who expressed that she was always looking for great work from NNS speaking students that she could use as models for the rest of the class, aware that this recognition might positively motivate her ESL students.

Relationship building also occurred as what might be referred to as “over-accommodation” for ESL students. This was observed to happen on several occasions when the instructors of Classes B and C were observed to be proactive in arranging after class meetings with ESL students who had struggled with an assignment, in providing extra time for ESL students to complete a test as was observed to occur in Class C, and in providing additional explanation of activities for NNS students as was observed in Class B. Inclusion might be seen as another aspect of this attempt at relationship building, which was observed to occur in Classes B and C when the instructors attempted to relate aspects of the ESL students’ culture to the literature they were studying as well as in the aforementioned selection of stories related to the immigrant experience in Class A.

Finally, relationship building appeared to occur in the amount of time that the instructors attempted to build into their course where they could deal with ESL students individually or in

groups. The instructors of Classes A and C both stated that ESL students with whom they met or arranged to meet during their office hours or in out of class sessions appeared to derive great benefit from these individual meetings. The instructor of Class B, on the other hand, stated that in the past he had welcomed ESL students exclusively into his home for meals with his family, which he felt provided students with the feeling that he was paying extra attention to them in recognition of the obstacles they face while attending university far away from their homes and the comfort of their native language. Relationship building, therefore, appeared to be an important method by which these instructors attempted to create a positive learning environment for the NNS students participating in their classes.

5.4 NS/NNS Perceptions of Pedagogical Practice

The following are the results of the survey, grouped according to some of the categories that were revealed in the observations and the interviews. The data is presented as averages from the six-point Likert scale with 1 being “Strongly Disagree” and 6 being “Strongly Agree”. The data is divided according to class, with the number in parentheses representing the NS students and the number outside of parentheses representing NNS students.

5.4.1 Characteristics and Reading Habits of the Participants

	A NNS (NS)	B NNS (NS)	C NNS (NS)	Total NNS (NS)
I often read in my first language for enjoyment	n=3(n=12)	5(15)	9(6)	17(33)
	Avg. 4.33(4.5)	3.6(4.73)	5(5.5)	4.42(4.78)
I read in English on the internet often	4.67(5.42)	4.6(5.87)	3.67(5.83)	4.17(5.69)
I only read in English what I am assigned in school	4(3)	3.2(2.2)	3.56(2.5)	3.54(2.55)
I often read in English for enjoyment	3(4.58)	4.8(5.2)	3.11(5.17)	3.62(4.97)
I often use a dictionary (<i>electronic, internet, or paper</i>) to help me understand what I was reading for this course	4.67(2)	3.8(3.13)	4.33(2.67)	4.24(2.63)

This first section gives an idea of the types of the participants divided by class and by NNS/NS in regards to their reading habits. This may give some indication about their general reading ability if the principle is accepted, as most reading theorists’ (first and second language) claim: that those who read more tend to be better readers (Eskey & Grabe, 1988; Nuttall, 1996; Krashen, 2009). The NNS participants of class A indicated that they only somewhat agreed with enjoying reading in their first language. They also somewhat agreed that they only read in English what they are assigned in school and were slightly more in agreement with read English on the internet and using a dictionary while reading course material. They somewhat disagreed that they read in English for enjoyment. The NNS participants of class B, in comparison to the NNS participants of Class A, were less likely to claim that they read in their first language for

enjoyment, were quite similar in respect to reading English on the internet, were less in agreement with only reading English for school, were more in agreement with reading in English for enjoyment and relied less on a dictionary to help understand course readings. The NNS participants of class C, on the other hand, were much more similar to the participants of Class A. They were even more in agreement that they read in their first language for enjoyment, were the least in agreement with reading English on the internet, were in between both Class A and C in regards to only reading in English what they were assigned in school, were only slightly more favourable to enjoying reading in English than the participants of Class A, and relied only slightly less than the participants of class A on a dictionary.

There are two points that are of interest in this data. The first is the difference in the data in comparing the participants of Class B from Classes A and C. Comparing the numbers from the NS students finds them to be slightly more similar, but yet different enough to be distinguishable as a separate group. This may be an indication of the effect of Generation 1.5 students on the data, as their representation was the highest in this class as compared to the others. Had English become their dominant language, this might explain why they would not indicate to enjoy reading in their first language, which for the purposes of this study was defined for them as their mother tongue. This would also explain why they indicated enjoying reading in English more than the other two classes and why they were less reliant on the dictionary, though it does not explain why they were less likely to read in English on the internet than their NS peers.

The data also indicates that the NNS students were less likely to read English on the internet or for enjoyment, were more reliant on a dictionary, and were more likely to read in English only what they had been assigned in school. This suggests that many of these students

perhaps did not have much previous exposure to reading in English, and their reliance on a dictionary may indicate that they might still experience some difficulty with English reading comprehension. The high indication of reading enjoyment in the first language among the participants in Class C might also be favourable in regards to reading skills transfer from the first language.

5.4.2 Perception of Reading Difficulty of Different Genres of Literature

	A NNS (NS)	B NNS (NS)	C NNS (NS)	Total NNS (NS)
Shorter stories in English are easier to understand than novels.	n=3(n=12)	5(15)	9(6)	17(33)
	Avg. 4.67(4)	3.6(3.3)	3.56(4)	3.8(3.7)
Short stories in English are easier to understand than poetry	5.3(4.58)	4.2(4.8)	5.3(4.33)	4.98(4.64)
I like to read short stories in English more than novels	5(3.9)	4.2(2.9)	3.67(3)	4.11(3.31)

This section, with questions comparing short stories to other forms of literature, appears to indicate why NNS students choose the short fiction and poetry class over studying the novel as their English literature requirement. Though the NNS learners perceived short stories to be only marginally easier than novels to understand, they showed a preference for reading short stories more than their NS peers. That these students would choose to study the short story and poetry, despite finding poetry much more difficult to understand, may then speak to another factor such as anticipated reading load as a factor in their choosing one course over another.

It is interesting to note that the NNS participants of Class B differed from the participants of the other classes in regards to the belief that short stories are easier to understand than poetry. This could be a result of the influence of Generation 1.5 students in this class, who might find the

language and culture influence of poetry easier to contend with than their international counterparts.

Alternatively, because the survey was distributed at the end of their semester of study, their preference for short stories could be a reflection of the favourable impression that short stories left on them from the selections they studied in the course. Though the sample size is too small (n = 3), the results of Class A may be an indication of the NNS students positive perception of the material selection of the instructor, who in interviews stated that she had made a number of changes in the past years to accommodate NNS students. That being said, it is worth noting that the class with the highest amount of NNS students also had the lowest opinion of short stories as compared to novels, though they were quite clear in their perception that they were easier to understand than poetry. One again, this might be explained by the fact that in interviews, the instructor of Class C admitted to choosing materials without NNS learners in mind, and may have selected stories beyond the learners cognitive capabilities.

5.4.3 Perception of Group and Pair Activities

	A NNS (NS)	B NNS (NS)	C NNS (NS)	Total NNS (NS)
If I was having trouble understanding a reading for this course, I asked a classmate for help	n=3(n=12)	5(15)	9(6)	17(33)
	Avg. 3.33(4.08)	2(3.47)	3.89(3.83)	3.18(3.76)
Working with a partner helps me to understand what I am reading	4(4.25)	4(4.53)	4.56(4.67)	4.26(4.45)
Group discussion helps me to understand the reading for this course	3.33(4.25)	4.2(5.2)	4.67(4.67)	4.24(4.76)

This section of the survey was used to gain a measure of the participants’ perception of group activities, which was used by all three instructors as a predominant class activity in the

observed classes and was mentioned by all of the instructors as a practice they felt to be effective for NNS students. The first question measured the students' willingness to ask a peer for assistance with difficulties understanding a reading. It is interesting to note that NS students appeared more willing to ask a classmate for help, with the exception of Class C, the class with more NNS students, where they were marginally less likely to ask classmates for help than their NNS peers. Once again, the NNS speakers in Class B replied quite differently from the NNS students in the other class towards this question. The results from Class C may indicate that international ESL students are more willing to engage students with similar international backgrounds, and conversely that NS students are less willing to engage NNS students and more willing to engage other NS students regarding difficulties with understanding a reading. The results of Class B, on the other hand, may indicate that Generation 1.5 students are less likely to engage any of their fellow peers if they are having difficulties with comprehension.

The next two questions attempted to gauge the perception of partner and group activities. Regarding partner activities, the results were quite similar across classes and between NS/NNS students, with the participants of Class A feeling marginally more positive towards partner activities. This may have been the result of favourable impressions towards the construction of the pair activities in the class, which the instructor stated she had designed as projects meant to be longer in duration that included out of class homework, a statement confirmed by observation.

The second section, regarding group activities, showed the NNS participants of Class A to be the least favourable to group activities compared across classes, and the NNS participants of Classes A and B to be the least favourable in comparison with the NS peers. This may indicate that NNS students, who were the minority in Classes A and B, may have felt stigmatized in group activities regarding perceived deficiencies regarding story interpretation, whereas in

Class C group activities would likely contain more than one NNS per group, allowing NNS students to feel more comfortable. There are two observations of the group activities in Class A that might support this interpretation. The first is the incident of the NNS student who was left without a group rectified only by the intervention of the instructor, and the second was that NNS students were never observed to contribute to the whole class discussion after group activities. Still, the perception of group activities with the exception of the NNS participants of Class A was somewhat favourable; therefore the instructor’s belief that these activities were beneficial appears to be supported by NS and NNS perception.

5.4.4 Perception of Instructional Support

	A NNS (NS)	B NNS (NS)	C NNS (NS)	Total NNS (NS)
The instructor’s use of technology (<i>Mycourses, Internet, Videos, PowerPoint, overhead projector</i>) helped me to understand the readings in this course	n=3(n=12)	5(15)	9(6)	17(33)
	Avg. 5(4)	3(2.92)	4.56(4.5)	4.22(3.63)
The notes I take in class from the instructor’s lectures help me to understand the readings for this course	3(n=11) 4.3(4.36)	5(4.8)	4.56(4.5)	17(n=32) 4.65(4.59)
Handouts the instructor gives in class helped me to understand the readings.	4.3(4.3)	N/A	4.78(4.83)	n=12(n=18) 4.67(4.5)

This series of questions aimed to measure participant perception towards the instructor’s use of additional teaching support. The number of participants for the second question from Class A was amended due to an unanswered question from one participant. Similarly, a number of responses for the last question for Class A suggested that this instructor did not distribute handouts during class. In regards to teaching support, the assumption being made regarding students notes is that they would often be “cued” by key words and other notes that the instructors would write on the whiteboard.

The response to the first question regarding the use of technology found somewhat favourable responses for in Class A and C, and somewhat less favourable responses in Class B. The numbers were comparable between NS/NNS in each class with the exception of Class A, where NNS were more in agreement than NS students. In the second question, the response was comparable between NS/NNS in every class, with the student participants in Class B slightly more in agreement concerning note-taking. The third question was also comparable between NS/NNS participants, with the students in Class C slightly more in agreement than Class A.

As expected, this appears to indicate that the NNS students of Class A perceived to benefit more from the visual and technological supports that the instructor implemented than their NS peers. This was expected because the instructor of Class A was observed to have made the most use of visual support in class and stated to provide the most background information online for NNS students, two things that NS students may not find necessarily beneficial due to more advanced aural abilities and cultural understanding.

In similar fashion, the instructor who was observed to use the most handouts in class also had the most favourable response regarding their use, though it was only slightly better than the response from Class A. Conversely, the results from Class B are not surprising. The instructor was observed to make less use of teaching aids and stated in interview that his teaching style was largely oral based. In such circumstances, the students would be more reliant on their notes for studying and essays. As such, it appears that they perceived the instructor's use of the whiteboard to be a sufficient aid for note-taking purposes.

This is an interesting result because it appears there may be no clear-cut benefit for the use of additional teaching aids. Though the instructor who made the most use of technological instructional support and the instructor who used the most handouts both received the most

favourable perceptions of their pedagogical activities, student perception was just as positive towards their note taking with an instructor whose primary mode of delivery was oral. Once again, this may be an effect of the Generation 1.5 students in Class B who might have had better listening skills than international ESL students, or it may be a reflection of the instructor’s skill in explaining in a way that was effective for NNS students. Alternatively, it might speak to the adaptive process of these students to work well with what their instructors are providing them. Regardless, it does appear to suggest that instructional support is perceived more positively by NNS students than NS students in most situations, and that the student’s perceptions of their use of instructional support is quite adept in that it reflected most positively on the type of support that each instructor used the most.

5.4.5 Perception of Feedback

	A NNS (NS)	B NNS (NS)	C NNS (NS)	Total NNS (NS)
Comprehension quizzes in this class helped me to learn if I understood a reading properly	n=3(n=12)	5(15)	9(6)	17(33)
	Avg. 4(4.92)	4(4.29)	3.33(3.17)	3.68(4.33)
The comments the teacher makes on my essay drafts helps me to understand what I have read better	4(4.83)	4.5(5.07)	4(4.83)	4.19(4.94)

These questions were aimed at determining student perception to the effectiveness of feedback. Response to this question found participants to be somewhat in agreement with the helpfulness of comprehension quizzes and feedback on essays, with NNS participants slightly less in agreement than native speaking students. The exception to this was in Class C, whose participants were somewhat in disagreement with the helpfulness of comprehension quizzes.

The results of these questions indicate that the NNS participants were somewhat ambivalent towards feedback. This is somewhat surprising, because it was expected that NNS students would respond more favourably to this more concrete and personalized type of feedback; particularly in Class A, whose instructor had arranged individual meetings in order to improve the quality of feedback on their essays. This could be explained by the international ESL student’s own lack of confidence in their essay writing ability, but it might also speak to the fact that international ESL students may not be able to respond to the types of feedback given in these classes as readily as their NS peers. This would also explain why the Generation 1.5 group from Class B responded more positively to essay feedback than the NNS students of the other classes. That being said, all respondents responded to in the range of somewhat agreeing to agreeing with the helpfulness of feedback, which indicates that the instructor’s use of feedback was still viewed positively.

5.4.6 Perception of Overall Classroom Operation

	A NNS (NS)	B NNS (NS)	C NNS (NS)	Total NNS (NS)
The instructor explains what I need to know about the readings for this course during class time	n=3(n=12)	5(15)	9(6)	17(33)
	Avg. 4.67(4.67)	4.6(4.53)	4.56(4.5)	4.59(4.58)
I ask the instructor questions about the reading during class	3.33(3.58)	3.6(4.2)	3.89(4.33)	3.68(3.99)
I think the activities the instructor chose in class helped me to understand the readings.	3.33(4.42)	4.2(4.73)	4.56(3.67)	4.19(4.43)
I believe that working on research essays will help me to understand future reading	2.67(4.3)	5.4(4.47)	3.78(4.33)	4.05(4.39)
In this course, I always knew what the instructor expected me to read for class	4.3(5)	4.6(5.67)	4.56(4.67)	4.52(5.25)

The purpose of these questions was to determine participant perception of the instructors' ability to give directions and explain information as well as their choice of in-class activities, as an aspect of task sequencing, and the participants comfort with asking questions in the classroom. The first question, regarding teacher explanation, had consistent results across classes and between NS and NNS. The second question, regarding asking question, resulted in slightly more negative results with NNS as compared to NS participants across classes.

The third question, regarding activities, had contrasting results, with the NNS participants in Class A having a more negative perception of activities in comparison with NS peers and across classes, and the NNS participants in Class C having a more positive perception as compared to their NS peers and slightly more positive perception than the NNS peers of Class B.

The fourth question, regarding working on research essays helping to improve reading understanding, also had very different results across classes. While the NS participants all had a somewhat positive perception of working on research essays, the NNS participants in Class A had a negative perception of research essays, while in Class C they had only a slightly positive perception and Class B had a most positive perception of research essays, even in comparison with their NS peers. The final question, which tracked directions regarding assigned reading, found the NNS participants to be slightly less in agreement that they always knew the expected reading.

This appears to indicate a number of different things. First, the NNS participants in this class were more reticent than their NS peers and were slightly less able to follow directions or intuit what was expected of them in class. Similarly, the results in the question regarding research essays appears to suggest that the instructors in Classes A and C were not as successful in helping NNS students understand the purpose of essays as an assessment tool as the instructor

in Class B, though the results in Class B could again be effected by the Generation 1.5 participants.

That being said, participants still had a positive opinion of their instructor's ability to explain the literature in the class, though the NNS participants in class A and the NS participants in class C were less enthusiastic than the NS and NNS peers about the activities that the instructor chose. This might indicate that the instructor of class A, who had a smaller number of NNS students, chose activities that catered more to the needs of NS students while the instructor of Class C, who had more NNS students, chose activities that catered more to the needs of NNS students. Observations that appear to support this were that the NNS students of Class C were observed to participate more vocally in class in both group and partner activities, while the NNS students in Class A were not once observed to participate vocally during class discussion. In such circumstances, perhaps the NNS students in Class A felt more like casual observers in the class than active participants, which might explain why they still had a positive impression of the instructor's ability to explain the material. Conversely, the NS participants in Class C might have felt more like casual observers when the instructor spent parts of class engaging in activities more in line with the needs of NNS students such as explaining vocabulary or engaging the NNS in cultural explanations of the literature that might be more transparent to NS students.

5.4.7 Perception of Overall Reading Difficulty

	A NNS (NS)	B NNS (NS)	C NNS (NS)	Total NNS (NS)
The reading for this course was difficult	n=3(n=12)	5(15)	9(6)	17(33)
	Avg. 3.67(2.08)	4.2(2.73)	4.22(3)	4.1(2.54)
I had to read most of the reading assigned in this class several times before I understood them	3.33(2.67)	3.6(3.07)	4.11(3.12)	3.79(2.94)
I feel confident to write research essays on the reading in this course	3(5.08)	4.2(4.8)	3.33(4.67)	3.54(4.88)

These questions attempted to determine participant perception regarding the material selection for the course. The first and second questions, which attempted to determine reading difficulty, showed that NNS participants in each class were more likely to re-read material and also perceived the reading to be more difficult than their NS peers, though the NNS participants in Class A found their reading to be slightly easier than the other classes, while the NNS participants in Class C found their reading to be the most difficult. Similarly, the NNS participants in Classes A and C were less confident in their ability to write research essays about the course material, while the NNS participants in Class B were more confident about writing research essays.

This suggests that the material adjustments made by the instructor of Class A did have an effect on the perceived difficulty of the material; as even the NS participants found the reading in the course to be easier than the other classes. On the other hand the instructor of Class C perhaps selected reading that was more difficult, with both NS and NNS participants in the class perceiving the material to be more difficult than the perceptions of the other classes.

The results regarding research essays, on the other hand, could be interpreted several ways. The more positive results in Class B may be an effect of the Generation 1.5 students, or may be a result of the instructor’s success in explaining the material and the purpose of essays as they related to the material; which further suggests that the instructors of Class A and C were less successful at this task. Unfortunately, there were no observations that might confirm this, and this also calls into question the pedagogic adjustments that the instructor of Class A had made regarding essay topics.

5.4.8 Perception of Instructor Approachability and Participant Use of Internet

	A NNS (NS)	B NNS (NS)	C NNS (NS)	Total NNS (NS)
If I had trouble understanding the reading, I went to see the instructor during their office hours	n=3(n=12)	5(15)	9(6)	17(33)
	Avg. 4.3(2.42)	3(2.47)	4(2.83)	3.75(2.51)
If I was having trouble understanding a reading for this course, I searched the internet for answers.	4.67(4.08)	4.6(3.93)	4.45(4.17)	4.54(4.03)

These last two questions, though unrelated in nature, offer some final insights regarding the nature of the NNS students in these classes. The results of the first question found that NNS students were more likely to visit the instructor during office hours if they had difficulties understanding the reading, especially in classes A and C. This appears to indicate that NNS students are more reliant on their instructor, especially given the results of the question that showed they were less likely to ask their peers for help with comprehension problems. This also appears to suggest that working individually with NNS students, which might be considered a form of relation building in that it is a reflection of the approachability of the instructor, is perceived by the students as an important aspect of their success in the course.

Finally, the results of the second question showed that NNS students were slightly more likely to search the internet for answers if they were experiencing difficulties understanding reading, which appears to support the decision made by the instructor of Class A to make information about the literature available on the internet. The NNS participants' greater reliance on the internet also appears to indicate that it is pedagogically important for instructors of NNS students to be aware of the type of information that can be accessed regarding the literature they are teaching in order to steer these students away from misleading information.

5.5 Implications

Similar to the research of Wang, Many, & Krumeraker (2008), this study found the instructors of these English literature courses to make a number of adjustments to their teaching practice in order to help their NNS students. This differed from past research on mainstream teachers which found them to be generally unresponsive or incapable of meeting the needs of the ESL students in their classes (Harklau, 1994; Duff, 2001). Also unlike previous research that had found mainstream instructors to have attitudes that tended towards the negative for ESL students (Youngs & Youngs, 2001), these instructors appeared to be sympathetic to the plight of the NNS students, to have at least intuitive understanding of their struggles, and to be open to aiding them as much as possible. In fact, each of these instructors, despite their lack of ESL specific training, incorporated a number of measures that have been supported by second language educators and researchers, such as a shift towards the incorporation of more group work as opposed to oral lecture, the use of visual support during oral lectures to aid comprehension, and the selection of material that was less cognitively demanding and more culturally inclusive. Many of these adjustments were also perceived by their students to be

beneficial in the support of their reading comprehension, though this support varied between NS/NNS students as well as between classes.

At the same time, the practices of each instructor were quite different, and each instructor made adjustments to different extents depending on their circumstances. The instructor of Class A, who had the most previous experience instructing NNS students, incorporated the greatest amount of practices that would be beneficial to ESL students, despite having very few ESL students in the class that was a part of this research. This included such things as adjustments to make the reading material more accessible, the inclusion of group activities, providing online support to aid comprehension, arranging individual appointments to aid essay writing, and a teaching style that was highly visual. Despite these measures, the NNS students in this class only perceived a few of these practices to be beneficial, such as the incorporation of technology in the class and the accessibility of the literature, while others were perceived to be less successful, such as the use of group activities and the way in which the instructor provided feedback.

The instructor of Class B, who perhaps made the fewest ESL specific adjustments to his class, still enacted effective adjustments to group activities that would encourage the participation of NNS speakers, as well as adjustments in attitude that led him to seek out relational connections with NNS students that would help them to feel more comfortable in his classroom. Though he confessed to having a primarily oral teaching style that NNS students might struggle with, the NNS student perception of his ability to help them understand the material did not appear to be unduly affected by this, and may have in fact led to improvements in note-taking that were not apparent in the other classes. That being said, this particular group of NNS, in which 3 of the 5 participants had the most experience both living in an English

speaking country and attending mainstream English classes, were perhaps the best prepared for his primarily oral style of instruction.

The instructor of Class C, who has the least experience and the most NNS students, made a number of adjustments including the incorporation of more group and pair work, the inclusion of handouts that guided activities, and taking the time in class to define vocabulary that would have been difficult for NNS students specifically. While NNS student perception appeared to be supportive of her use of handouts and the selection of activities, it was less supportive of material selection which may have been too cognitively demanding, and some of the adjustments in the course made for the benefit of the NNS students may at times have come at the expense of the NS students in the class, who were not as supportive of the activity selection. This is again similar to the research of Wang, Many, & Kumenaker (2008) which suggested that the adjustments instructors make for ESL students have varying effectiveness and at times may come at the expense of overall quality of learning, which “exposes the dilemma in which mainstream teachers are likely to be caught when making efforts to include ESL students through instructional modifications” (p.80). The concern to help NNS students who may appear to struggle in such a highly charged cultural course may cause instructors to choose to focus on activities that have less benefit for the NS students in the course. For this reason, pedagogical adjustments made for NNS students must be chosen judiciously in order to minimize their impact on quality of education for all students in the class while maximizing their positive effect on ESL students.

5.5.1 Instructor Experience

Several factors appeared to play a role in the determination of which pedagogical practices were utilized in each class, the first of these being a combination of the instructors’

educational experience as well as prior-experience with ESL students. The instructor of Class A, having the most experience in both areas, incorporated a number of practices helpful to ESL students that did not appear to favour the NNS students over the NS students, and did not appear to detract from the overall quality of education. For instance, the use of the overhead projector to display the piece of literature being discussed in class provided her with a visual reference point that would allow the NNS students to more easily follow the lecture but would not detract from the experience of the NS peers. The selection of reading material that was less cognitively demanding and more culturally inclusive would also not detract from the experience of most NS students, perhaps with the exception of the most avid of readers or those considering literature as their academic discipline. Providing background information on the internet that could be accessed voluntarily by the students also did not burden the NS students with information they may have felt was unnecessary, and proactively arranging individual appointments to discuss the first drafts of essays would also not have detracted from the NS experience in the classroom. Of course, it is highly likely that many of these practices had developed over time, with many trial and error iterations, and through the years of experience with the many NNS students that had attended this course in the past.

By comparison the instructor of Class C, who was teaching her first ESL students as well as her first literature course, was in the first iteration of her experiments with different instructional practices, and therefore quite understandably employed strategies that appeared to vary in their effectiveness. For instance, her intuition that group and pair activities worked more effectively for NNS students led her to employ that strategy more in her class, which was also perceived more favourably by her NS and NNS students. On the other hand, her use of comprehension quizzes was viewed less favourable by her students than that of the other classes,

and there was a lower perception of her overall activity selection by NS students than NNS students. By her own account during the interview, the instructor stated that if faced with a similar class makeup in the future she would make more significant changes to her selection of literature that would be more accessible to her students. It might reasonably be expected then, that further experience with these diverse types of mainstream classes would allow her to select activities that would fit more seamlessly into the course. The hope then, is that unlike the research of Walker, Shafer and Liams (2004), which suggested that new instructors are naively positive about the inclusion of NNS students until ESL-specific hardships occur and their attitude becomes more negative, that experience would, as in the case of the instructor of Class A from this research, allow instructors to become more capable of handling ESL-specific challenges and more able to balance the demands of these diverse mainstream classrooms.

5.5.2 Classroom Makeup: NS, NNS, and Generation 1.5

A second issue brought to light in this research is that the utilization of pedagogical adjustments also appears to be dependent on the classroom makeup, including the proportion of NNS students, and perhaps additionally the proportion of Generation 1.5 students to international ESL that are a part of the NNS student population. The instructor of Class B, whose oral teaching style was self-admittedly believed to be “difficult for ESL learners”, did not appear a hindrance in the perception of the NNS students in the class, but that positive perception could perhaps have been buoyed by a number of Generation 1.5 students that professed to having the most experience studying in mainstream English classes. While it is tempting then, to lump these students in with their NS peers, the data appears to indicated that they differ both from international ESL students and from their Native Speaking peers, which would then support the

research of Song (2006) and Vásquez (2007) that suggest Generation 1.5 students receive treatment as an individual group with its own set of unique qualities and challenges.

On the other hand the makeup of Classroom C, which had a proportion of international ESL students greater than NS students, demanded a greater number of pedagogical adjustments from an instructor with very little experience dealing with the challenges of teaching NNS students. Not only does this expose the complicated realities of diverse mainstream classrooms, but also the dilemmas that instructors face when their “naive optimism” regarding the instruction of ESL students confronts problematic realities. For instance, when interviewed, the instructor had this to say about the practices she enacted for the benefit of her ESL students:

Well, I would say that I took, ahh, I took all my plans and shifted them. Um a, a lot of the content of my, I, I based my syllabus on the other syllabi that I had gathered from people in the department and um, and was gauging to an ideal class based on what the syllabi of my colleagues looked like and as I began to..., you know as the semester was progressing first class, blank looks, second class, I started realizing I’ve got to pitch, ah, off the side of the boat a few of these short stories, spend more time on it and um, and the same with poems like, Marvell was just wasn’t going to fly um, so I, I selected what seemed to be more accessible of the poems that were in the, were in the in the course pack...”

Inherent in this quote is the idea that NNS students, to an inexperienced mainstream instructor, present unexpected challenges in the literature classroom that set them apart from their NS peers in regard to areas discussed throughout this paper such as confidence and motivation, classroom behaviour, language proficiency, cultural understanding and literary competence. In such circumstances, instructors must make decisions that help to unravel the mystery of what the

specific challenge is and the best fashion in which to overcome it. While time and experience would assuredly be an important factor in overcoming these obstacles, a greater amount of students with these types of issues and challenges undoubtedly increases the pressure on the instructor to seek out solutions that would allow these students to find success, perhaps to the point where their ability to meet the needs of NS students suffers and they are forced to abandon many of their content goals and objectives. A mainstream instructor, as appeared to be the case in Classes A and B of this study, may be able to devote additional time to the individual needs of their one or two international ESL students without alteration to their original content goals; but greater numbers of these type of students, as in the case of Class C, appeared to place the instructor in a position where alteration was a necessity.

In turn, this may suggest a point at which mainstream classes can be differentiated along the language learning continuums suggested by second language researchers (Met, 1998; Williams & Davison, 2001; Wesche & Skeehan, 2002; Stoller 2004), allowing more precise discussion to occur regarding particular types of mainstream classes. For instance, classes with high proportions of NNS students that are international ESL students, based on pedagogical practice, might more closely resemble language classes, and thus require strategies to deal with the specific cultural and proficiency challenges that this learner group necessitates. Classes with high proportions of NNS students that are Generation 1.5, however, may require a different set of strategies to deal with their own unique challenges. On the far end of this spectrum might then be found classes that have mostly NS students and thus a high content focus. In this case pedagogical practices can be explored that meet the individual needs of this smaller proportion of NNS. The extension of the language learning continuum to include different types of

mainstream classes may then facilitate discussions of the most effective pedagogical practices for each distinct type of class.

5.5.3 Institutional Support

This brings into question the idea of institutional support and the role it might play in mainstream courses that have high ratios of NNS student participation. Though it was not a focus of this research, it is interesting to note that none of the instructors mentioned or were observed to have any consultation with those knowledgeable in the education of NNS students. In the case of the instructors of Classes A and B this may be understandable, given both the experience of the instructor of Class A, the high ratio of Generation 1.5 students in Class B, and the low ratio of international ESL students in both classes. But the instructor of Class C is a much different case and one which exemplifies a situation that may become increasingly more common given the rising numbers of international students. Despite the enacting of measures such as minimum scores on English proficiency tests and introductory courses to help with academic writing, the NNS students in this class were a very distinct group from their NS peers that had unique needs requiring additional support and assistance, as indicated through the survey from such areas as their confidence in writing research essays, their perception of the difficulty of the literature, their lowered ability to understand the purpose of research essays and comprehension tests as they relate to reading comprehension, and their dependence on the instructor. Combined with the inexperience of the instructor, who had planned her course based on the “ideal classroom”, it is not surprising that her encounter with these NNS students led the instructor to rethink her planning and implement significant changes to her instructional and educational goals and objectives.

However had the instructor, upon realizing these challenges, received the aid of ESL professionals, she may have been more aware and more prepared to deal with the challenges. For instance, trained ESL professionals might have been able to aid the instructor to become aware of the cognitive difficulties that the readings might have posed, allowing her to select alternatives that may have aided comprehension. They may also have been able to make suggestions regarding pedagogic practices that could more seamlessly be incorporated into the milieu of instruction that might have bolstered NNS lesson comprehension without sacrificing overall educational quality. Of course, many of the adjustments would still require a degree of planning and foresight that might be beyond the abilities of the instructor alone. Of course, the fact that none of the instructors sought additional support may be more an issue of the instructor's independence than a lack of institutional support. Regardless, any aid that an instructor in such circumstances can receive in the form of communication and collaboration with ESL professionals, especially with new instructors, may help to prevent moments of crises that might leave instructors with negative impressions of the instruction of NNS students.

The silver lining that emerges from this research is that despite the difficulties and challenges that are present when teaching a course with two, or even three, groups as diverse as international ESL, Generation 1.5, and NS students, these instructors and the pedagogical practices that they enacted were generally perceived favourably by both the NS and NNS learners they endeavoured to educate. In these mainstream classes, each of the instructors was confronted by a different learner population with different needs, and each instructor utilized an array of instructional types to reach their diverse learners. Depending on their past experience with NNS students, or the number of NNS students that they presently had in their class, each instructor made a number of pedagogical adjustments in order to reach these NNS learners

specifically. In some instances these adjustments were centred on the individual, such as when an instructor proactively arranged a meeting with a NNS student to discuss an essay; while in other instances the instructor made adjustments that would affect the whole class, such as choosing not to teach a certain author because their writing was considered to be cognitively demanding, or electing to use pair or group activities instead of individual assignments. Though NNS students still appeared to struggle more than their NS peers with the particular academic demands of a literature class, their overall impression of their instructor and the activities they chose to use in the classroom remained positive. On the other side of this teacher/student equation, each of the instructors also remained positive and open to the possibility of educating NNS students in the future, each maintaining in interview that they were open to making further pedagogical adjustments in order to create classes that were more welcoming to and inclusive of NNS students in the future should circumstances allow it.

CHAPTER SIX

6. Conclusion**6.1 Summary**

A paucity of research on the pedagogical practices of university instructors in mainstream classes with second language learners was the impetus behind the present research, which explored these practices as well as the perceptions of NS and NNS students in three English literature classes taught by three instructors. The research indicated that of Tharp's seven instructional types (1993), all were used in each of the classes (see a raw count of each observed instructional type per class in APPENDIX E), but directing, questioning, and explaining were used more commonly than modeling, feeding back, contingency managing and task structuring. There were differences, however, between the instructors and whether their practices were predominantly oral and visual, and whether they addressed their practices to individuals, groups, or the whole class. The instructor with the most experience incorporated the most visual elements, while the instructor with the most NNS students more often addressed individuals rather than the whole class.

In regard to the pedagogical adjustments each instructor made specifically for NNS learners, the research indicated that each instructor made a number of adjustments, but they appeared to differ based on the experience of the instructor or the number of NNS students that were present in the class. The instructor of Class A, with the most experience, made the most significant adjustments followed by the instructor of Class C, who had the most NNS students, and then by the instructor of Class B, whose NNS students had the most experience with mainstream education in English and the most years living in an English speaking country. Though the adjustments varied in quantity and quality between instructors, they could be

classified into broad categories such as a greater awareness to and inclusion of cultural differences, explicit language focus, providing additional information, the inclusion of more group and pair activities, the establishment of relational connections, and changes to material selection and assessment.

Each of the instructors displayed strengths in one or more of these categories, supported not only by observations and previous second language research but also by the perceptions of their NS and NNS students. For instance, the instructor of Class A had positive perceptions of her material selection and incorporation of technology, the instructor of Class B had positive perceptions for feedback as well as explaining course material, and the instructor of Class C had positive perceptions for group activities and her use of handouts. Student perception, however, appeared to differ somewhat between classes, between NS and NNS, and also between international ESL and Generation 1.5 NNS students. Examples of these differences included international ESL students being less confident than their NS or Generation 1.5 peers about writing essays on the material, NNS students being more dependent than NS students on the instructor, and the NS students of Class C being less satisfied than NNS students about the instructor's selection in activities.

These differences highlighted a number of important issues regarding the participation of second language learners in mainstream classrooms. First, the population of a mainstream classroom might consist of three different groups in terms of such things as language proficiency and cultural knowledge, each with its own unique perceptions and needs. Second, mainstream instructors may face unexpected and difficult challenges when attempting to instruct these learners. Third, experience and/or the number of NNS students participating in a given course appear to factor in the instructor's ability to negotiate these challenges. To wit, a more

experienced instructor may be better prepared to face the challenges of instructing NNS students and therefore better able to instruct larger numbers of NNS students, but an instructor with less experience and fewer NNS students may have more time to meet these students' unique and individual needs. Finally, unlike previous research that found mainstream instructors to be unable or unwilling to meet the needs of NNS students (Harklau, 1994; Clair 1995; Kubota, 2001; Youngs & Youngs, 2001; Walker, Shager & Liams, 2004), the three instructors in this study were all able to meet the unique needs of NNS students in a variety of different ways, though with different levels of success; a conclusion similar to that reached in the research of Wang, Many, and Krumenaker (2004). These instructors also remained willing to make further adjustments to their pedagogy practices should they be required to teach more NNS students in the future.

6.2 Future Research Suggestions

This research was exploratory in nature, therefore it points towards a number of areas from which further research could be undertaken. Due to the small number of participants in this study and the variance in classrooms populations that were explored, this study would benefit from repetition in order to confirm the validity of the conclusions. Because this study also focused solely on literature classes, it might also be expanded to focus on other university disciplines which have a high proportion of NNS learner participation in order to discover if the same pedagogical practices and adjustments are employed by the mainstream instructors of other disciplines.

Alternatively, this study appeared to find experience to be a factor in a mainstream university instructor's ability to face the challenges of teaching NNS students. This would undoubtedly benefit from a longitudinal study that followed a mainstream instructor through a

number of years of teaching, tracking the instructor's iterations in pedagogical adjustments and their effectiveness. Research might also be conducted to determine the effectiveness of the different pedagogical adjustments observed in this study and/or the effectiveness of different types of interventions with mainstream university instructors including professional development or greater collaboration with ESL professionals.

To the researcher's knowledge this was also the first time that an adaptation of Tharp's (1993) types of instruction were used to analyze the pedagogical practices of an instructor in a classroom. For the purpose of the research, these were expanded to include categories that explored different modes of delivery (oral and visual) and different addressees (individual, group, and whole class). This appeared to be an effective model to describe the different pedagogical practices of these literature classes, but further studies would be needed to confirm its validity for other instructional situations.

6.3 Caveats

Despite careful planning, there are a number of weaknesses inherent in this research. Due to the fact that the research was conducted at a small university, the results may be difficult to generalize to the settings of larger universities with larger class sizes. The predominant Asian heritage of the NNS student participants would also make the results difficult to generalize to NNS populations of other backgrounds. That being said, some of the findings regarding the use of additional support for oral lecture may be helpful in larger classes that are more oriented towards this style of instruction.

Also, because the participants were chosen opportunistically, variables in the data could not be controlled for that may have revealed more conclusive data, variables such as instructor experience and the proportion of second language learners in each class. Related to this are

reliability issues from the data in the surveys. Due to the nature of the questions and the small numbers of NNS or NS participants in some of the classes, the data gathered from the survey may have been subject to a number of unknown factors that affected the results. For this reason, further research may be warranted to confirm the interpretations of the survey results.

It was also mentioned earlier, but bears repeating, that it remains unclear how much of the theory used to justify the participation of NNS students in mainstream classes can be transferred to students at the tertiary level of education. Though it is never clearly stated that the theory covered in this research was intended for younger learners, reference to younger learners in the writing does occur, therefore future research must explore to a greater extent the applicability of the theory to the university NNS population. Much of the theory used to describe the issues that NNS learners face at higher levels of education was also taken from studies that focused on language courses and IEPs. Though the results of this study appear to indicate that the two NNS learner groups, Generation 1.5 and international ESL, demonstrate the same attributes and confront the same issues as were outlined in past studies, a future research model that was more student-centred in its focus would need to be conducted in order to validate what was indicated in relation to the NNS student participants of this study.

Finally, the observations in the research were limited to the poetry sections of each course—had the observations been extended to include the short story sections, then perhaps different pedagogical practices may have factored more prominently in the data. Wherever possible, each results section was triangulated with the other data sources as well as checked against previous research and literature, but the limited amount of previous research in this specific area of study warrants future research to confirm the results and conclusion of this study.

References

- Abasi, A.R., Akbari, N., & Graves, B. (2006). Discourse appropriation, construction of identities, and the complex issue of plagiarism: ESL students writing in graduate school. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 15(2), 102-117.
- Aebersold, J.A. & Field, M.L. (1997). *From reader to reading teacher: Issues and strategies for second language classrooms*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Alderson, J.C. (1984). Reading in a foreign language: A reading problem or a language problem? In J. Charles Alderson & A.H. Urquhart (Eds.), *Reading in a foreign language*, (pp.1-24). London: Longman.
- Alvstad, C., & Castro, A. (2009). Conceptions of literature in university language courses. *The Modern Language Journal*, 93(2), 170-184.
- Applebee, A.N. (1996). *Curriculum as conversation: Transforming traditions of teacher and learning*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Arkoudis, S. (2003). Teaching English as a second language in science class: incommensurate epistemologies? *Language and Education*, 17(3), 160-173.
- Arkoudis, S. (2005). Fusing pedagogic horizons: Language and content teaching in the mainstream. *Linguistics & Education*, 16, 173-187.
- Arnold, J., & Brown, H.D. (1999). A map of the terrain. In Jane Arnold (Ed.), *Affect in language learning* (pp.1-24). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Barwell, R. (2005). Critical issues for language and content in mainstream classrooms: Introduction. *Linguistics and Education*, 16, 143-150.

- Bernhardt, E.B., & Kamil, M.L. (1995). Interpreting relationship between L1 and L2 reading: Consolidating the linguistic threshold and the linguistic interdependence hypothesis. *Applied Linguistics*, 16(1), 15-34.
- Bifuh-Ambe, E. (2009). Literacy skills acquisition and use: A study of an English language learner in a U.S. university context. *Adult Basic Education and Literacy Journal*, 3(1), 24-33.
- Birch, B. (2007). *English L2 readings: Getting to the bottom* (2nd Ed.) New York: Routledge.
- Birch, D. (1989). *Language, literature and critical practice: Ways of analyzing text*. New York: Routledge.
- Blair, L. (1991). Developing student voices with multicultural literature. *The English Journal*, 80(8), 24-28.
- Bourdieu, P. (1973). Cultural Reproduction and Social Reproduction. In Richard Brown (Ed.), *Knowledge, education and cultural changed: Papers in the sociology of education* (pp. 71-113). London: Tavistock Publications Limited.
- Boyer, E.L. (1987). *College: the undergraduate experience in America*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Brinton, D.M., Snow, M.A., & Wesche, M. (2003). Content-based second language instruction. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.
- Brumfit, C. J. (1986). Reading skills and the study of literature in a foreign language. In C.J. Brumfit & R.A. Carter (Eds.), *Literature and langauge teaching* (pp. 184-190). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brumfit, C.J. & Carter, R.A. (1986). *Literature and language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Carlo, M.S., & Sylvester, E.S. (1996). *Adult second-language reading research: How may it inform assessment and instruction*. Philadelphia: National Center on Adult Literacy.
- Carrell, P.L. (1988). *Introduction*. In Patricia L. Carrell, Joanne Devine & David Eskey (Eds.), *Interactive approaches to second language reading* (pp.1-7). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Carrell, P.L. (1991). Second language reading: Reading ability or language proficiency. *Applied Linguistics*, 12(2), 159-179.
- Carrell, P.L., & Carson, J.G. (1997). Extensive and Intensive Reading in an EAP Setting. *English for Specific Purposes*, 16(1), 47-60.
- Carrell, P.L., & Eisterhold, J.C. (1988). Schema theory and ESL reading pedagogy. In Patricia L. Carrell, Joanne Devine & David Eskey (Eds.), *Interactive approaches to second language reading* (pp.73-92). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Christie, F. (1999). *Pedagogy and the shaping of consciousness*. New York: Continuum.
- Clair, N. (1995). Mainstream classroom teachers and ESL students. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(1), 189-196.
- Clarke, M.A. (1988). The short circuit hypothesis of ESL reading—or when language competence interferes with reading performance. In Patricia L. Carrell, Joanne Devine & David Eskey (Eds.), *Interactive approaches to second language reading* (pp.114-124). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Collier, V.P. (1989). How long? A synthesis of research on academic achievement in a second language. *TESOL Quarterly*, 23(3), 118-140.
- Cox, K.E., & Guthrie, J.T. (2001). Motivational and cognitive contributions to students' amount of reading. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 26, 116-131.

- Crandall, J.A., & Kaufman, D. (2002). Content-Based Instruction in Higher Education Settings: Evolving Models for Diverse Contexts. In JoAnn Crandall and Dorit Kaufman (Eds.), *Content-based instruction in higher education settings* (pp.1-9). Alexandria, VA: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc.
- Culler, J. (1975/2002). *Structuralist poetics: Structuralism, linguistics, and the study of literature*, (2nd ed.) London: Routledge & Keegan Paul.
- Cummins, J. (1979). Linguistic interdependence and the educational development of bilingual children. *Review of Educational Research*, 49(2), 222-251.
- Cummins, J. (1980). The cross-lingual dimensions of language proficiency: implications for bilingual children and the optimal age issue. *TESOL Quarterly*, 14(1): 175-87.
- Cummins, J. (1981). Age on arrival and immigrant second language learning in Canada: A reassessment. *Applied Linguistics*, 2(2), 132-149.
- Cummins, J. (1992). Bilingualism and second language learning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 13, 50-70.
- Cummins, J. (1996). *Negotiating identities: education for empowerment in a diverse society*. Ontario: CA: California Association for Bilingual Education.
- Daniels, H. (2001). *Vygotsky and pedagogy*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Davison, C. (2001). ESL in Australian schools: From the margins to the mainstream. In Bernard Mohan, Constant Leung & Chris Davison (Eds.), *English as a second language in the mainstream: Teaching, learning and identity* (pp.11-29). Reading, MA: Pearson Education Limited.
- Davison, C. (2005). Learning your lines: Negotiating language and content in subject English. *Linguistics and Education*, 16, 219-237.

- Davison, C., & Williams, A. (2001). Integrating language and content: Unresolved issues. In Bernard Mohan, Constant Leung & Chris Davison (Eds.), *English as a second language in the mainstream: Teaching, learning and identity* (pp.51-69). Reading, MA: Pearson Education Limited.
- Day, R.R., & Bamford, J. (1998). *Extensive reading in a foreign language*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Derwing, T.M., DeCroy, E., Ichikawa, J., & Jamieson, K. (1999). Some factors that affect the success of ESL high school students. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 55(4), 532-547.
- Dong, Y.R. (2004). *Teaching language and content to linguistically and culturally diverse students: Principles, ideas, and materials*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Dooley, K. (2004). Pedagogy in diverse secondary school classes: Legacies for higher education. *Higher Education*, 48, 231-252.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2003). *Attitudes, orientations, and motivations in language learning*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publsing.
- Drucker, M.J. (2003). What reading teachers should know about ESL learners. *The Reading Teacher* 57(1), 22-29.
- Dudley-Evans, T., & St John, M.J. (1998). *Developments in English for specific purposes: A multi-disciplinary approach*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Duff, P.A. (2001). Language, literacy, content, and (pop) culture: Challenges for ESL students in mainstream courses. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 58(1), 103-132.
- Duff, P.A. (2002). Pop culture and ESL students: Intertextuality, identity, and participation in classroom discussions. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 45(6), 482-487.

- Echevarria, J., & Graves, A. (2003). *Sheltered content instruction: Teaching English-language learners with diverse abilities*, 2nd Ed. Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Eckert, L.S. (2008). Bridging the pedagogical gap: Intersections between literary and reading theories in secondary and postsecondary literacy instruction. *Journal Of Adolescent & Adult Literacy* 52(2), 110-118.
- Eskey, D.E. (1988). Holding in the bottom: an interactive approach to the language problems of second language readers. In Patricia L. Carrell, Joanne Devine & David Eskey (Eds.), *Interactive approaches to second language reading* (pp.93-100). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Eskey, D.E., & Grabe, W. (1988). Interactive models for second language reading: Perspectives on instruction. In Patricia L. Carrell, Joanne Devine & David Eskey (Eds.), *Interactive approaches to second language reading* (pp.223-238). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Evans, F.B., & Youmans, M. (2000). ESL writers discuss plagiarism: The social construction of ideologies. *Journal of Education*, 182(3), 49-66.
- Fecteau, M.L. (1999). First- and second-language reading comprehension of literary texts. *The Modern Language Journal*, 83(4), 475-493.
- Foertsch, J. (2006). Books as broccoli? Images as ice cream? Providing a healthy menu in a college English classroom. *Pedagogy: Critical Approaches to Teaching Literature, Language, Composition and Culture*, 6(2), 209-230.
- Gallagher, S.V. (2001). Contingencies and intersections: The formation of pedagogical canons. *Pedagogy: Critical Approaches to Teaching Literature, Language, Composition, and Culture*, 1(1), 53-67.

- Goldschmidt, M.M., Notzold, N., & Miller, C.Z. (2003). ESL student transition to college: The 30-hour program. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 27(2), 12-17.
- Grabe, W. (2009). *Reading in a second language: Moving from theory to practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Grabe, W., & Stoller, F.L. (1997). Content-Based Instruction: Research Foundations. In Marguerite Ann Snow and Donna M. Brinton (Eds.), *The content-based classroom Perspectives on integrating language and content* (pp.5-21). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Gunderson, L. (1991). *ESL literacy instruction: A guidebook to theory and practice*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Gunderson, L. (2008). The state of the art of secondary ESL teaching and learning. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 52(3), 184-188.
- Haley, M.H., & Austin, T.Y. (2004). *Content-based second language teaching and learning: An interactive approach*. Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Hall, G. (2005). *Literature in language education*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1978). *Language as a social semiotic: The social interpretation of meaning*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar*, 2nd Ed. New York: Arnold.
- Hamner, R.D. (2003). The study of literature. In Wilburn T. Stancil (Ed.), *A student's guide to the liberal arts* (pp. 59-76). Kansas City, MO: Rockhurst University Press.
- Harklau, L. (1994). ESL versus mainstream classes: Contrasting L2 learning environments. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(2), 241-272.
- Harklau, L. (2000). From the "good kids" to the "worst": Representations of English language learners across educational settings. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34(1), 35-68

- Haworth, P. (2008). Crossing borders to teach English language learners. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 14(5-6), 411-430.
- Hedgcock, J.S., & Ferris, D.R. (2009). *Teaching readers of English: Students, texts, and contexts*. New York: Routledge.
- Hinkel, E. (1999). *Culture in second language teaching and learning*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Howatt, A.P.R. (1984). *A history of English language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Irujo, S. (2000). A process syllabus in a methodology course: Experiences, beliefs, challenges. In Michael P. Breen & Andrew Littlejohn (Eds.), *Classroom decision-making: Negotiation and process syllabuses in practice* (pp.209-222). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Johnson, K.E. (1995). *Understanding communication in second language classrooms*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Johnson, M. (2004). *A philosophy of second language acquisition*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Jordan, R.R. (1997). *English for academic purposes: A guide and resource book for teachers*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Jussim, L. (1986). Self-fulfilling prophecies: A theoretical and integrative review. *Psychological Review*, 93, 429-445.
- Jussim, L., & Eccles, J.S. (1992). Teacher expectations II: Construction and reflection of student achievement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 63(6), 947-961.

- Jussim, L., Eccles, J.S., & Madon, S. (1996). Social perception, social stereotypes, and teacher expectations: Accuracy and the quest for the powerful self-fulfilling prophecy. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 28, 281-388.
- Kachru, B.B. (1985). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the Outer Circle. In R. Quick & H. Widdowson (Eds.), *English in the world: teaching and learning the language and literatures* (pp. 11-30). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Karathanos, K. (2009). Exploring US mainstream teachers' perspectives on the use of the native language in instruction with English language learner students. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 12(6), 615-633.
- Kim, M. (2004). Literature discussions in adult L2 learning. *Language and Education*, 18(2), 145-166.
- Koda, K. (2005). *Insights into second language reading*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kramsch, C. (1993). *Context and culture in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Krashen, S.D. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. New York: Longman.
- Krashen, S. (2009). Anything but reading. *Knowledge Quest*, 37(5), 18-25.
- Kubota, R. (2001). Discursive construction of the images of U.S. classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35(1), 9-38.
- Lazar, G. (1993). *Literature and language teaching: A guide for teachers and trainers*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lems, K., Miller, L.D., & Soro, T.M. (2010). *Teaching reading to English language learners: Insights from linguistics*. New York: The Guildford Press.

- Leung, C. & Franson, C. (2001). Curriculum identity and professional development: System-wide questions. In Bernard Mohan, Constant Leung & Chris Davison (Eds.), *English as a second language in the mainstream: Teaching, learning and identity* (pp.199-214). Reading, MA: Pearson Education Limited.
- Lincoln, F., & Rademacher, B. (2006). Learning styles of ESL students in community colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 30, 485-500.
- Maloney, W.H. (2003). Connecting the texts of their lives to academic literacy: Creating success for at-risk first-year college students. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy* 46(8), 664-673.
- Marshall, S. (2010). Re-becoming ESL: Multilingual university students and a deficit identity. *Language and Education*, 24(1), 41-56.
- McCurrie, M.K. (2004). From the edges to the center: Pedagogy's role in redefining English departments. *Pedagogy: Critical Approaches to Teaching Literature, Language, Composition, and Culture*, 4(1), 43-64.
- McElvain, C.M. (2010). Transactional literature circles and the reading comprehension of English learners in the mainstream classroom. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 33(2), 178-205.
- Met, M. (1998) Curriculum decision-making in content-based language teaching. In Jasone Cenoz and Fred Genesee (Eds.), *Beyond bilingualism: Multilingualism and multilingual education* (pp. 35-63). Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.
- Miller, J.P. & Seller, W. (1990). *Curriculum: Perspectives and practice*. New York: Longman Group Inc.

- Miller, P.C. & Endo, H. (2004). Understanding and meeting the needs of ESL students. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 85(10), 786-791.
- Mohan, B. (1986). *Language and content*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Mohan, B. (2001). The second language as a medium of learning. In Bernard Mohan, Constant Leung & Chris Davison (Eds.) *English as a Second Language in the Mainstream: Teaching Learning and Identity* (pp. 107-126). Edinburgh: Pearson Education Limited.
- Mohan, B., Leung, C., & Davison, C. (2001). *English as a second language in the mainstream: Teaching, learning and identity*. Reading, MA: Pearson Education Limited.
- Nation, I.S.P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Nation, I.S.P. (2009). *Teaching ESL/EFL reading and writing*. New York: Routledge.
- Nuttall, C. (1996). *Teaching reading skills in a foreign language*. Oxford: Macmillan Education.
- O'Byrne, B. (2001). Needed: A compass to navigate the multilingual English classroom. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 44(5), 440-449.
- Onukaogu, C.E. (1999). Effective and efficient ESL and Nigerian mother-tongue literacy acquisition: Can literature be a catalyst? *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 12(2), 143-155.
- Pappamihel, N.E. (2002). English as a second language students and English language anxiety: Issues in the mainstream classroom. *Research in the teaching of English* 36, 327-355.
- Park, C.C. (2002). Crosscultural differences in learning styles of secondary English learners. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 26(2), 443-459.
- Paulson, W. (2001). *Literary culture in a world transformed: A future for the humanities*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

- Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical applied linguistics: a critical introduction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Peterson, P.W. (1997). Knowledge, skills, and attitudes in teacher preparation for content-based instruction. In Marguerite Ann Snow and Donna M. Brinton (Eds.), *The content-based classroom: Perspectives on integrating language and content* (pp.158-186). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Platt, E., Harper, C., & Mendoza, M.B. (2001). Dueling philosophies: Inclusion or separation for Florida's English language learners? *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(1), 105-133.
- Poulshock, J. (2010). Extensive graded reading in the liberal arts and sciences. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 22(2), 304-322.
- Pulido, D. (2009). Vocabulary processing and acquisition through reading: Evidence for the rich getting richer. In ZhaoHong Han & Neil J. Anderson (Eds.), *Second language research and instruction: Crossing the boundaries* (pp.65-82). Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan University Press.
- Reeves, J.R. (2006). Secondary teacher attitudes toward including English-language learners in mainstream classrooms. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 99(3), 131-142.
- Reid, J.M. (1987). The learning style preferences of ESL students. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21(1), 87-112.
- Reid, J. (1993). Historical perspectives on writing and reading in the ESL classroom. In Joan G. Carson & Ilona Leki (Eds.), *Reading in the composition classroom: Second language perspectives* (pp. 33-60). Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Rost, M. (1990). *Listening in language learning*. New York: Longman.

- Rubenstein, I.Z. (2006). Educational expectations: How they differ around the world: Implications for teaching ESL college students. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 30, 433-441.
- Rumelhart, D.E. (2004). Toward an interactive model of reading. In Robert B. Ruddell & Norman J. Unrau (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (pp.1149-1179). Newark: DE: International Reading Association.
- Scarcella, R. (1990). *Teaching language minority students in the multicultural classroom*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Schall, J.V. (2003). What are the liberal arts? In Wilburn T. Stancil (Ed.), *A student's guide to the liberal arts*, (pp.1-19). Kansas City, MO: Rockhurst University Press.
- Schleppegrell, M.J. (2004). *The language of schooling*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Scholes, R.E. (1998). *The rise and fall of English: reconstructing English as a discipline*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Schwarz, D.R. (2008). *In defence of reading: teaching literature in the Twenty-First Century*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Short, M., & Candlin, C. (1986). Teaching study skills for English literature. In C.J. Brumfit & R.A. Carter (Eds.), *Literature and language teaching*, (pp. 89-109). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Slembrouck, S. (2000). Negotiation in tertiary education: Clashes with the dominant educational culture. In Michael P. Breen & Andrew Littlejohn, (Eds.), *Classroom decision-making: Negotiation and process syllabuses in practice*, (pp.138-149). New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Slevin, J.F. (2006). Academic literacy and the discipline of English. *ADE Bulletin*, 140, 11-16.
- Snow, C.E., Griffin, P., & Burns, M.S. (2005). *Knowledge to support the teaching or reading: Preparing teachers for a changing world*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Snow, M.A., & Kamhi-Stein, L.D. (2002). Teaching and learning academic literacy through project LEAP. In JoAnn Crandall and Dorit Kaufman (Eds.), *Content-based instruction in higher education settings* (pp.169-181). Alexandria, VA: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc.
- Song, B. (2006). Failure in a college ESL course: Perspectives of instructors and students. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*. 30, 417-431.
- Sonstroem, E. (2006). Do you really want a revolution? CyberTheory meets real-life pedagogical practice in FrankenMOO and the conventional literature classroom. *College Literature*, 33(3), 148-170.
- Stebbins, C. (1995). Culture-specific perceptual learning style preferences of post-secondary students of English as a second language. In Joy Reid, (Ed.) *Learning styles in the ESL/EFL classroom* (pp. 108-117). New York: Heinle & Heinle.
- Stewart, J.A., & Santiago, K.A. (2006). Using the literary text to engage language learners in a multilingual community. *Foreign Language Annals*, 39(4), 683-696.
- Stoller, F.L. (2004). Content-based instruction: Perspectives on curriculum planning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24, 261-283.
- Teemant, A., Bernhardt, E., & Rodríguez-Muñoz, M. (1997). Collaborating with content-area teachers: What we need to share. In Marguerite Ann Snow and Donna M. Brinton (Eds.), *The Content-Based Classroom: Perspectives on Integrating Language and Content* (pp.311-318). White Plains, NY: Longman.

- Thaler, E. (2008). *Teaching English literature*. Paderborn, NRW: Verlag Ferdinand Schöningh GmbH & Co.
- Tharp, R.G., & Gallimore, R. (1991). *The Instructional Conversation: Teaching and Learning in Social Activity*. UC Berkeley: Center for Research on Education, Diversity and Excellence. Retrieved from: <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/5th0939d>
- Tharp, R.G. (1993). Institutional and social context of educational practice and reform. In Ellice A. Forman, Norris Minick & C. Addison Stone (Eds.), *Contexts for learning: Sociocultural dynamics in children's development* (pp.269-282). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Thompson, L.C. & Williams, P.G. (1995). But I changed three words!: Plagiarism in the ESL classroom. *Clearing House*, 69(1), 27-30.
- Tucker, A. (1995). *Decoding ESL: International students in the American college classroom*. Portsmouth, NH: Boyton/Cook Publishers, Inc.
- Turner, J. (1997). Creating content-based language tests: Guidelines for teachers. In Marguerite Ann Snow and Donna M. Brinton (Eds.), *The Content-Based Classroom: Perspectives on Integrating Language and Content* (pp.187-200). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Valdes, J.M. (1986). Culture in literature. In Joyce Merrill Valdes (Ed.), *Culture bound: Bridging the cultural gap in language teaching*, (pp.137-147). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Van den Branden, K. (2009). Mediating between predetermined order and chaos: The role of the teacher in task-based language education. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 19(3), 264-285.

Vandrick, S. (1996). Issues in using multicultural literature in college ESL writing classes.

Journal of Second Language Writing, 5(3), 253-269.

Vásquez, C. (2007). Comments from the classroom: A case study of a generation-1-5 student in a university IEP and beyond. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 63(3), 345-370.

Vodicková, M. (2006). Stepping into the shoes of Romeo and Juliet. In Amos Paran (Ed.), *Literature in language teaching and learning*, (pp.147-160). Alexandria, VA: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc.

Vollmer, G. (2000). Praise and stigma: Teachers' constructions of the 'typical ESL student'. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 21(1), 53-66.

Walker, A., Shafer, J., & Liams, M. (2004). "Not in my classroom": Teacher attitudes towards English language learners in the mainstream classroom. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice*, 2(1), 130-160.

Wang, Y., Many, J., & Krumenaker, L. (2008) Understanding the experiences and needs of mainstream teachers of ESL students: Reflections from a secondary social studies teacher. *TESL Canada*, 25(2), 66-84.

Watts-Taffe, S. & Truscott, D. (2000). Using what we know about language and literacy development for ESL students in the mainstream classroom. *Language Arts*, 77(3), 258-265.

Wesche, M.B. & Skehan, P. (2002). Communicative, task-based, and content-based language instruction. In Robert B. Kaplan (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of applied linguistics* (pp.207-228). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Williams, J.A. (2001). Classroom conversations: Opportunities to learn for ESL. *The Reading Teacher*, 54(8), 750-757.
- Wrigley, H.S. (1993). One size does not fit all: Educational perspectives and program practices in the U.S. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(3), 449-465.
- Yandell, J. (2007). Investigating literacy practices within the secondary English classroom, or where is the text in this class? *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 37(2), 249-262.
- Youngs, C.S. & Youngs Jr., G.A. (2001). Predictors of mainstream teachers' attitudes toward ESL students. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35(1), 97-120.
- Zamel, V. (1995). Strangers in academia. The experiences of faculty and ESL students across the curriculum. *College Composition and Communication*, 46, 506-521.
- Zhou, A.A. (2009) What adult ESL learners say about improving grammar and vocabulary in their writing for academic purposes. *Language Awareness* 18(1) 31-46.
- Zulu, C. (2005). Academic reading ability of first-year students: what's high school performance or prior exposure to academic reading got to do with it? *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 23(1), 111-123.

APPENDIX A

Teaching Practices Questionnaire

Thank you for participating in this questionnaire! Your name is not needed on this question form, and all information remains confidential.

A. Background Information

Instructions: Please print your answer in the space provided. The information in brackets () is there to help clarify the information needed.

1. Nationality: _____
2. Age: _____
3. Gender (Male or Female): _____
4. First Language (Mother Tongue): _____
5. Second Language (Most proficient language after your first language):

6. Other Languages: _____

The following questions are for those who are NOT native speakers of English (Your first language/mother tongue is not English):

7. Number of years studying English: _____
8. Number of years living in an English speaking country
(English is the main language of communication): _____
9. Number of years of English university education
(English is the main language of communication): _____
10. Have you at any time paid a tutor to help you understand any of the readings in this course?

B. Questionnaire

Instructions: Please check (✓) the box that most closely represents your feelings.

EXAMPLE:

<i>Instructions:</i> Please check (✓) the box that most closely represents your feelings.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I love vegetables.			✓			
I love coffee.					✓	

<i>Instructions:</i> Please check (✓) the box that most closely represents your feelings.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. I often read in my first language for enjoyment.						
2. Shorter stories in English are easier to understand than novels.						
3. Short stories in English are easier to understand than poetry.						
4. I read in English on the internet often.						
5. I only read in English what I am assigned in school.						
6. I like to read short stories in English more than novels.						
7. I often read in English for enjoyment.						
8. I often used a dictionary (<i>electronic, internet, or paper</i>) to help me understand what I was reading for this course						
<i>Instructions:</i> Please check (✓) the box that most closely represents your feelings.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
9. The instructor's use of technology (<i>Mycourses, Internet, Videos, PowerPoint,</i>						

<i>overhead projector</i>) helped me to understand the readings in this course.						
10. I usually understand shorts stories for this course immediately after I read them.						
11. I usually understood a reading for this course only after discussing it in class with the teacher.						
12. If I was having trouble understanding a reading for this course, I searched the internet for answers.						
13. If I was having trouble understanding a reading for this course, I asked a classmate for help.						
14. In this course, I always knew what the instructor expected me to read for class.						
Instructions: Please check (<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>) the box that most closely represents your feelings.	Strongly Disagee	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
15. If I was having trouble understanding a reading for this course, I asked my friends for help.						
16. Comprehension quizzes in this class helped me to learn if I understood a reading properly.						
17. Working with a partner helps me to understand what I am reading.						
18. I believe that working on research essays will help me to understand future reading.						
19. The comments the teacher makes on my essay drafts helps me to understand what I have read better.						
20. I understand readings more by doing more than one draft of an essay.						
21. I had to read most of the reading assigned in this class several times before I understood them.						

<i>Instructions: Please check (√) the box that most closely represents your feelings.</i>	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
22. Group discussion helps me to understand the reading for this course.						
23. If I had trouble understanding the reading, I went to see the instructor during their office hours.						
24. The instructor explains what I need to know about the readings for this course during class time.						
25. The notes I take in class from the instructor's lectures help me to understand the readings for this course.						
26. Handouts the instructor gives in class help me to understand the readings.						
27. I think the activities the instructor chose in class helped me to understand the readings.						
28. I ask the instructor questions about the readings during class.						
29. I feel confident to write research-essays on the readings in this course.						
30. The reading in this course was difficult.						

This is the end of the questionnaire. Thank you for your participation and good luck with your studies! 😊

APPENDIX B
INSTRUCTOR INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. What do you feel are the most difficult aspects of a literature class for ESL students?
2. What pedagogical practices do you enact in your classes that are most helpful for reading comprehension?
3. Are there any pedagogical practices that you feel you have enacted solely for the benefit of ESL learners? If so, in which specific ways do you believe these practices have aided ESL learners.
4. In which ways do you assess reading comprehension?
5. Have you made any changes to the selection and types of literature that you choose to teach in classes with ESL students? Do you choose pieces of literature with ESL students in mind?
6. Of the pedagogical practices listed in this interview, which do you feel are the most useful for ESL students?
7. Are there any changes to pedagogical practices that you have considered making for ESL students that you have not been able to implement yet?

APPENDIX C
CATEGORIZATION OF CODES & THARP'S (1993) INSTRUCTIONAL TYPES

1. Modeling: offering behaviour for imitation. Modeling assists by giving the learner information and a remembered image that can serve as a performance standard.
2. Feeding back: providing information on a performance as it compares to a standard. This allows the learners to compare their performance to the standard, and thus allows self-correction.
3. Contingency managing: applying the principles of reinforcement and punishment. In this means of assisting performance, rewards and punishment are arranged to follow on behaviour, depending on whether or not the behaviour is desired.
4. Directing: requesting specific action. Directing assists by specifying the correct response, providing clarity and information, and promoting decision-making.
5. Questioning: producing a mental operation that the learner cannot or would not produce alone. This interaction assists further by giving the assistor information about the learner's developing understanding.
6. Explaining: providing explanatory and belief structure. This assists learners in organizing and justifying new learning and perceptions.
7. Task structuring: chunking, segregating, sequencing, or otherwise structuring a task into or from components. This modification assists by better fitting the task itself into the zone of proximal development. (Tharp, 1993, p.271-272).

Primary Codes (*Instructional Type*)

[MOD]	Modeling
[FB]	Feeding Back
[CM]	Contingency Managing
[DIR]	Directing
[QUES]	Questioning
[EXP]	Explaining
[TS]	Task Structuring

Secondary Codes (*Addressee*)

[WC]	Whole Class
[GRP]	Group
[IND]	Individual

Tertiary Codes (*Mode of Delivery*)

[Vis]	Visual
[Oral]	Oral

APPENDIX D
CODING SAMPLE FROM OBSERVATION FIELD NOTES

FIELD NOTES A6

The instructor enters the classroom and the students assemble themselves in the class, from left to right, as such: 3 in the first left, 3 in the second left, 2 in the third left, 2 in the first middle, 1 in the second middle, 2 in the third middle. 1 in the first right, 3 in the second right, 2 in the third right.

The instructor begins by writing “Grammar Mid-Term” on the board in red ink and below that writing “(10%) Avg. 63%” . **[FB-WC-Vis]** The instructor begins to hand out the scores at random. The students check their scores and then the instructor asks them to return their score sheets. Students arrive late while the instructor is handing out the score sheets and gathering them up.

The instructor informs them that they will be writing a poetry essay, the topics of which she hands out as a handout **[DIR-WC-Vis]**. A student asks if it will be in class or at home and the instructor informs the student that it will be at home.

The instructor stands behind the cart upon which she has placed her notes and the overhead projector. She turns on the overhead projector and writes Poetry Essay on the screen along with the due date of the essay and some pertinent information **[DIR-WC-Vis]**. These activities took 10 minutes.

The instructor informs them that they will be studying Atwood’s “Siren Song” . She writes Siren Song on an overhead projector **[DIR-WC-Vis]** and asks if anyone knows what the word “siren” means **[QUES-WC-Oral]**. A conversation ensues about a lingerie store in the mall that has the word sirens.

The instructor removes this overhead and then places up the poem on an overhead projector **[DIR-WC-Vis]**. She dramatically reads the poem **[MOD-WC-Oral]**. When she is finished, a student comments that she should have dressed up as a siren. Laughter ensues. This reading lasts 3 minutes.

She turns off the overhead and takes out some photocopied historical pictures of sirens **[EXP-WC-Vis]**, which she passes around the class.

She turns the overhead back on and informs them that she would like them to answer some questions in groups for five minutes **[TS-GRP-Oral/Vis][DIR-WC-Oral]**. The students form into groups and the instructor passes out the questions which have been prepared on a handout **[DIR-WC-Vis]**. As she hands out the papers, she highlights which question they are meant to answer **[QUES-GRP-Oral/Vis]**.

The instructor asks if anyone in the class knows how to phonetically translate **[QUES-WC-Oral]**. None of the class admits to knowing this.

In the forming of groups, one of the NNS in the class has been left by herself. The instructor requests that three members from a larger group join her in answering a question. Two members from a group do so after some debate in the group about who will go **[DIR-GRP-Oral]**.

As the groups discuss the instructor stands behind the movable cart and arranges her notes. She goes to groups when they indicate they have questions and discusses them **[EXP-GRP-Oral]**. This activity lasts 10 minutes.

They begin to discuss the poem. The group that begins is from the opposite side of the class from the last poetry class. The first group comments on the structure of the poem. Only one member of the group shares information. As the group member speaks, the instructor writes notes directly on to the overhead with the poem **[EXP-WC-Vis]**.

They move on to the second group. The second group discusses the imagery in the poem. As the group member discusses, the instructor writes “Images” on a separate overhead sheet and writes down the images as the group member mentions them. **[EXP-WC-Vis]**

The third group begins to discuss the language in the poem. As they discuss specific words, the instructor underlines them and writes notes in the left and right hand margins on the overhead beside the poem.

This group has several speakers. **[EXP-WC-Vis]**

The next group begins to speak about the adjectives use in the poem. The first speaker shares the information the group discussed, as he speaks the instructor underlines the adjectives and writes notes on the overhead with the poem. **[EXP-WC-Vis]**

The last group discussed the sounds used in the poem. The group members shares what the group discussed and the instructor continues to underline sections and write notes on the poem. This activity lasted 15 minutes. **[EXP-WC-Vis]**

The instructor informs them that this is one of the poems where it is needed to consider the narrator because the narrator is not the poet. She writes “narrator=poet” on the overhead and draws a line through the = to show the narrator is not the poet. **[EXP-WC-Vis]**

The instructor asks solicitation questions of the whole class **[QUES-WC-Oral]**. The group of students in the front left side of the class answer her questions. The instructor also shares additional background information regarding the poem and the myth of Odysseus **[EXP-WC-Oral]**. This activity lasts 10 minutes.

Near the end of class, the instructor asks if there are any additional questions. None are asked, so the instructor informs the students that they are free to leave the classroom. At the end of class, several students approach the instructor and she answers their questions as they approach her. **[EXP-IND-Oral]**

APPENDIX E
OBSERVED INSTRUCTIONAL TYPES RAW COUNT CHART

Primary Codes	Class A			Class B			Class C				
	Primary Code Totals	Secondary Code Totals	Tertiary Code Totals	PC Totals	SC Totals	TC Totals	PC Totals	SC Totals	TC Totals		
[MOD]	14	[WC]	68	1	[WC]	23	8	[WC]	17		
[FB]	4	120		[Vis]	7		112	[Vis]		4	134
[CM]	2	[GRP]		[Vis]	7		[GRP]	[Vis]		2	[GRP]
[DIR]	30	16		[Vis]	26		10	[Vis]		46	15
[QUES]	27	[IND]		[Oral]	28		[IND]	[Oral]		60	[IND]
[EXP]	53	8		[Oral]	60		15	[Oral]		53	34
[TS]	13			[Oral]	3			[Oral]		5	
				[Oral]				[Oral]			