AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

Kay Mathews Davis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in
Education presented on May 24, 1995. Title: Language and
Learning: A Case Study of a Vietnamese Unaccompanied Minor
in a Post Secondary Setting.

Redacted for Privacy

Abstract approved:_____
Kenneth M. Ahrendt

This study was an ethnographic case study of a
Vietnamese unaccompanied minor in a post secondary setting.
There were two guiding questions for the study: (1) How
does the subject perceive language as it relates to
educational experience? (2) What kinds of observable
personality, cognitive, or affective factors have
contributed to his language and educational experience, and
in what way have they contributed?

The subject for this study was selected because he had
declared himself an unaccompanied minor and immigrated to
the United States as a young adult. He was an ESL student
who graduated from an American high school within two years
of arrival. He was deemed successful by the academic
community based on hours of completed course work and grade
point average. The subject was extremely motivated to
receive a four year degree, but was hampered by college

requirements in classes which required high levels of English proficiency and competence.

The theoretical base for this research was phenomenology. The subject, purposefully selected, was observed for six months in three different classroom settings: philosophy, physics, and English composition. Validity/replicability was obtained through triangulation of personal interviews and written questionnaires, interviews with faculty and other college personnel, and examination of artifacts such as school records, diaries, and journals. With the exception of school records, portions of artifacts are included in this thesis.

The subject exhibited unusual abilities to comprehend complex written and oral material, relate information across disciplines, and adapt to instructional requirements and methodologies. Based on the results of this case study, three hypotheses were generated:

1) Listening skills and memory/recall, or auditory memory, appear to be essential to the subject's academic success.

2) General information about learning styles and strategies may be less useful than specific strategy application in academic situations for this subject.

3) Explicit, structured writing instruction may be more useful than process writing for this subject.

Language and Learning:
A Case Study of a
Vietnamese Unaccompanied Minor in a Post Secondary Setting

by

Kay Mathews Davis

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Completed May 24, 1995
Commencement June 1996

Doctor of Philosophy thesis of <u>Kay Mathews Davis</u> presented on <u>May 24, 1995</u>

APPROVED:

Redacted for Privacy

Major Professor, representing Education

Redacted for Privacy

Associate Director of School of Education

Redacted for Privacy

Dean of Graduate School

I understand that my thesis will become part of the permanent collection of Oregon State University libraries. My signature below authorizes release of my thesis to any reader upon request.

Redacted for Privacy

Kay Mathews Davis, Author

DEDICATION

There are several people to whom I would like to dedicate this work:

- my father who always told us we could do anything

- my husband who always believed in me

- my mother and sisters, Ruth and Dona, who encouraged me

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A very special thank you goes to my husband, Duane, for his love, effort, patience, time, and computer skills. If two authors could be listed on the title page, his name would appear beside mine.

And finally, I wish especially to thank the subject of this study who so willing allowed me access to him and his life. He is, indeed, a very special person.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF APPENDICES

LANGUAGE AND LEARNING: A CASE STUDY OF A VIETNAMESE

UNACCOMPANIED MINOR IN A POST SECONDARY SETTING

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

According to Hernandez (1989), by the year 2030 the
number of Hispanics in the United States will grow from
14.5 to 37 million, and the number of Asians will quadruple
from 3.5 to 17 million (p. 14). As a result of the
expected growth in minority populations in the near future,
teachers and administrators in the educational system need
to acquire more knowledge about minority language learners.
They need to know how these learners perceive their
educational experience so the needs of second language
students can be met. If the educational system is to
accommodate the language minority populations, more
information is needed about the social, linguistic, and
cultural factors which contribute to educational success
and failure of these students.

As yet, there appears to be no comprehensive
explanation for why some second language learners achieve
high levels of second language proficiency and others do
not, nor is there any comprehensive explanation for the
cultural, linguistic, familial, affective, cognitive, or
ethnic factors and their relationship to academic success
and failure. Studies to date have focused on specific

characteristics (Ogbu, 1978; Mehan, 1982; Shultz, et al., 1982) and factors such as literacy, attitudes towards literacy in the first language, and family class, educational background and age of entry into the American school system (Collier, 1987; Field and Aebersol, 1990; Gradman and Hanania, 1991) considered influential in second language proficiency and minority achievement. However, these studies have not addressed the learner or the learner's perspective in an uncontrolled, nonsheltered learning or classroom situation, particularly at the post secondary level. The second language learner's view of the learning experience in a classroom setting could provide a different perspective of the language, strategies, and learner characteristics necessary for successful completion of classes at the post secondary level.

Ethnographic Research

Ethnographic, qualitative, or naturalistic research (Gilmore and Smith, 1982) is an approach or technique used in anthropology to generate or build theory, not to test hypotheses (Glaser and Strauss, 1967; Seidman, 1991; Strauss and Corbin, 1990). It is empirical and happens "in vivo" (Glaser and Strauss, 1967, p. 40) or "*in situ*" and can be used on any size social unit (Glaser and Strauss, p. 21). Ethnography addresses questions that deal with "how" and "what" (Eisenhart, 1988; Mehan, 1982) and presents the

information gleaned from the study through the perspectives of those being studied (Glaser and Strauss, 1967).

Ethnography is considered a technique (Pershkin, 1982) and an approach (Spindler and Spindler 1982, p. 29), not a method *per se*. While there is no unified definition of ethnography (Hymes, 1982), there are criteria which must be met in part or in whole in ethnographic research. To be considered ethnographic, the research should include the following elements:

- field work, observation, participant-observation, (open-ended) interviews (Hymes, 1982; Merriam, 1988, Fetterman, 1989; Eisenhart, 1988)

- description (Heath, 1982; Wolcott, 1982; Eisenhart, 1988) or "thick description" (Lincoln and Guba, 1985; p. 328)

- social and/or cultural context (Gilmore and Smith, 1982; Heath, 1982; Mehan, 1982; Schneider, 1976)

- interpretation (Geetz, 1976; Eisenhart, 1988)

Ethnography is selected when one wishes to study, indepth, a current problem or topic (Fetterman, 1989) within a sociocultural context from the insider or participant's perspective (Fetterman, p. 12) in order to "integrate all that is known, or to fill a gap" (Hymes, 1982, p. 23). The entire ethnographic process should be nonjudgmental (Wolcott, 1982), holistic (Mehan, 1982), collaborative and cooperative (Gilmore and Smith, 1982; King, 1974; Seidman, 1991), long term, indepth, personal,

intensive, and encompassing (Pershkin, 1982; Wolcott, 1982; Seidman, 1991).

The purpose of ethnographic research is to generate hypothesis or theory (Glaser and Strauss, 1967; Cobb and Hagemaster, 1987) through inductive analysis (Gilmore and Smith, 1982) of multiple sources (Seidman, 1991; Yin, 1989; Merriam, 1988) in a social and cultural setting. Using a small, nonrandom sample, the researcher as the research instrument records information from interviews, observations, and artifacts to produce a comprehensive, holistic account of the investigation. All of the ethnographic process is flexible and subject to adaptive and evolutionary data collection and data analysis (Hymes, 1982; Heath, 1982). Table 1 presents the characteristics commonly found in the literature related to ethnographic research. (See Table 1.)

The goal of ethnographic research is to provide information about concepts and perceptions in order to generate or ground theory in context because "People act on their individual perceptions, and those actions have real consequences-thus the subjective reality each individual sees is no less real than an objectively defined and measured reality" (Fetterman, 1989, p. 15). Ethnographic research provides a process (Wolcott, 1982) for examining the truth and reality from an individual's perception (Geetz, 1976) within a socially defined context of that reality by another individual. The context may be a large

Table 1

Characteristics of Ethnographic Research

Focus of research:	Quality (nature, essence) [perspective created reality]
Philosophical roots:	Phenomenology, symbolic interaction [ideational, partial materialistic]
Associated phrases:	Fieldwork, ethnographic, naturalistic, grounded, subjective [qualitative]
Goal of investigation:	Understanding, description, discovery, hypothesis generating [multi-realities, action-oriented]
Design characteristics:	Flexible, evolving, emergent [re-designed as needed]
Setting:	Natural, familiar [social and cultural]
Sample:	Small, nonrandom, theoretical [single case or subject]
Data collection:	Researcher as primary instrument, interviews, observations [histories, documents, artifacts]
Mode of analysis:	Inductive (by researcher) [process oriented]
Findings:	Comprehensive, holistic, expansive [often narrative or story]

(adapted from Merriam, 1988, p. 18)

social unit or organization like a town or village, or it
may be a culturally defined institution such as a school
(Heath, 1982; McDermott and Hood, 1982).

Ethnography in Education

Two levels of culture exist for everyone: the primary
culture of the home and the home community and the
secondary culture of everything outside the home, such as
social institutions and recreational services (Heath,
1986). When one moves beyond the home environment and into
a social institution, ways of being and ways of knowing
frequently change. Social institutions impose actions and
attitudes on those within; social institutions are cultural
institutions. As institutions, the schools make up "the
school community" (Gilmore and Smith, 1982, p. 9). To be
successful within the culture of the school, the members
must know how to act, how to talk, and how to be. As Susan
Philips (1972) has documented, this affects the success and
failure of certain American Indian children. The home
culture and home community school set the children up for
failure once the students transfer to the outside,
secondary culture, high school. As Shirley Brice Heath has
pointed out in <u>Ways with Words</u> (1983), the success and
failure of children begins in the home. It is in the home,
amongst the primary culture, that thoughts, actions, and
language related to the folklore of school are learned.

Thoughts, actions, and language used successfully in the home culture do not necessarily transfer to the secondary culture. Heath (1982), discussing ethnography and children in school, comments on the use of ethnographic research which could help both schools and children in schools. She laments the lack of research which deals with the culture of individual children, individual schools, and individual communities in which children and schools are set. Her concern stems from the "emphasis on 'multicultural education' [and the need for] more data on culture as both art and artifact" (p. 46). She is also concerned with "what it is that students need to know and do to become acceptable participants in classrooms" (p. 52). She recommends that case studies about individuals be used in educational settings as a means of learning about communities, participation, and acceptance.

As Shultz, Florio, and Erickson (1982) discovered, words and actions necessary to get and hold the floor for conversational purposes in the home, may be contrary to the acceptable practice of the teacher and the school environments. To McDermott and Hood (1982), schooling is about "intelligence and cleverness" (p. 236) and therefore schools are "a *social mechanism for sorting children*" (p. 233). In order to be successful in a school or other social institutions, participants must know not only how to act, but how to interpret the actions of others (Mehan, 1982, p. 64). In order for students to achieve success in

school, they need to know or learn what it takes to be successful.

Hymes (1982), referring to ethnography in education, believes "There are still many people, about whom knowledge has never been adequately systematized, for whom there are serious gaps in knowledge" (p. 23). Heath (1982) concurring with Hymes, stresses the sociocultural nature of schools and states that "large-scale surveys, correlational studies, and exclusively quantitative studies do not provide actual data" (p. 43) for the students, the teachers, or the community. In order to truly understand the what and the how of students, teachers, and schools, more ethnographic studies are needed (Hymes, 1982; Heath, 1982).

Ethnography, with its thick description, long term, indepth and holistic observation in a cultural context, is able to show relationships between and among participants in the school environment. Ethnography can offer fresh perspectives and new theories for all participants in an educational setting. The role of ethnography is best summed up by Gilmore and Smith (1982) when they state "What ethnography should bring to education is not answers, but listening, learning posture that . . . leads to the explication of the important, unaddressed questions" (p. 5). Ethnography does not answer questions, it seeks to offer information and insight about what questions to ask.

The Study

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to identify possible characteristics, experiences, and observable qualities and/or strategies which may contribute to second language learner success in a post secondary institution. It is an indepth study of one Vietnamese male in three different academic subjects and classroom settings, over a six month period of time, in an attempt to develop grounded theory related to language learning and academic success. The second language learner's perspective of the learning process is needed to provide insight into effective and ineffective educational practices if language minority students are to be successful at the post secondary level.

Guiding Questions

This study was based on two basic or guiding questions: (1) How does the subject (emic) perceive language as it relates to educational experience? (2) What kinds of observable (researcher, etic) personality, cognitive, or affective factors may have contributed to the subject's language and educational experience, and in what way have they contributed?

Since a major characteristic of qualitative research is flexibility based on emerging data gathering and

analysis (Glaser and Strauss, 1967; Hymes, 1982), it was expected that these guiding questions would lead to additional questions and/or refining of the purpose of study. Theories which were thought to impact the research included language acquisition and language learning (Krashen, 1985; Krashen and Terrell, 1983), communication skills and academic achievement related to language proficiency (Cummins, 1984, 1989), minority status (Ogbu, 1978; Ogbu and Matute-Bianchi, 1986; Haines, 1985; Cortes, 1986; Sinclair and Ghory, 1987), sociolinguistics (Heath, 1983, 1986; Schneider 1976; Mehan, 1982; Gumperz and Cook-Gumperz, 1982), cognition (Brown, 1980; Schumann, 1978), and affective variables (Gardner and Lambert, 1972; Brown, 1980; Seliger, 1982, 1983).

Significance of the Study

Since the 1970's anthropologists and language teachers have been concerned with language competence (Hymes, 1971), language learning (Stevick, 1976; Gardner and Lambert, 1972), teachers (King, 1974), and learners (Dunn, Dunn, and Price, 1985; Gardner and Lambert, 1972). Collier (1987) and Cummins (1984) have investigated the length of time necessary for English as a second language learners to learn adequate English for academic purposes. Jupp, Roberts, and Cook-Gumperz (1982), in a study of Southest Asian immigrants in Great Britain, have concluded that

language differences and communication styles within the
same language, English, contribute to minority status in
employment and adult second language learning. August
(1987) has investigated the effects of peer tutoring in
children; Byers and Byers (1972) have investigated
interaction between black children and teachers and white
children and teachers; Schinke-Llano (1983) has
investigated length and type of teacher interactions for
LEP students; and Schulz, Florio, and Erickson (1982) have
investigated differences and similarities in interaction
contexts between home and school communities. Other
studies have addressed issues of second language writing
relevant to post secondary institutions, namely
universities. Gass (1983) has attempted to discover the
role and significance of intuition in second language
writing; Gradman and Hanania (1991) have reported factors
which demonstrate a reading and writing relationship to
TOEFL scores; Robb, Ross, and Shortreed (1986) have
examined teacher feedback on compositions, as has Cohen and
Cavalcanti (1990) and Zamel (1985); Friedlander (1990) and
Kroll (1990) have explored planning for writing and time
for conferences; and Vann, Meyer, and Lorenz (1984) have
investigated error gravity as perceived by university
faculty. All of these studies are related to English as a
second language, but they are all focused on foreign
university students attending school in the United States.
To date, researchers have not addressed the issue of

adolescent second language learners who have attended high school in this country and enrolled in a post secondary institution. As language minority student populations continue to grow, more second language learners will enroll in post secondary institutions. Many of these language minority students will have graduated from high schools in the United States. No current study addresses the language, issues and perspectives of English as a second language learners who have immigrated to the United States, been educated in the American school system, and enrolled in post secondary institutions. The identification of successful learner characteristics and strategies, combined with learner perceptions of the learning environment should help strengthen second language learning research. Empirical evidence of what a successful second language learner actually does in a classroom may prove beneficial to both teachers and students at the post secondary level for developing policy and practice.

Limitations of the Study

This study has several delimiting factors. This study is an ethnographic case study of a single subject. The subject of the study was purposefully selected: he was an unaccompanied minor; he had immigrated as a young adolescent and had attended high school in the United States; he was in his second year at a community college

and had declared his intention to transfer to a four year post secondary institution; he was willing to be the subject of this study.

The selection of an ethnographic case study design is also a delimiting factor in this study. The purpose of the study was to develop grounded theory, not to test hypotheses.

Another limitation of this study was the use of English for all interviews and observations. All diaries and journals were also written by the subject in English.

No intelligence tests, cognitive styles tests, learning styles tests, personality tests, native language proficiency or English proficiency tests were a part of this study.

Thesis Overview

The organization of the remainder of this thesis is as follows: Chapter II is a review of selected literature regarding language and academic achievement, status/ sociocultural factors and academic achievement, and personal characteristics: affective and cognitive variables related to language and academic success. Chapter III presents information about sampling, subject selection, research protocol, and validity and replicability. Profiles of the subject and the researcher conclude Chapter III. Selected observation data is

presented in Chapter IV. Chapter IV is divided into sections on format, classroom language and culture, and characteristics and strategies of the subject. Sections of specific classroom observations and journal and diary entries by the subject are included. Chapter V concludes the thesis with a discussion of the findings of the study and recommendations.

Appendix 1 is a copy of a paper written by the subject about his escape experience. This paper was provided by the subject and written prior to the commencement of this study. References are made throughout Chapters IV and V to the journal and diary of the subject. The subject's complete journal and diary are included in Appendices 2 and 3 respectively. Longer transcripts of observation data included in Chapter IV, separated into specific classes chronologically, are provided in Appendix 4. Appendix 5 is a class handout from the Writing 122 class which is referred to by the subject. Appendix 6 is learning strategies as defined by Chamot (1984).

Definition of Terms

Affective factors - a term which refers to characteristics unique to each individual, such as personality, attitude, emotions, and motivation.

Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills/BICS - a term coined by Cummins (1984) to describe the language

skills necessary for daily conversation and survival
skills.

Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency/CALP - a term
coined by Cummins (1984) to describe the language
skills necessary to describe, discuss, and understand
language as it is used in a school or other academic
setting.

Cognitive factors - a term, often used interchangeably for
learning style, which refers to an individual's
intelligence, memory, aptitude, field dependency/field
independency, etc.

English as a foreign language (EFL) - a term used to
describe programs and individuals in those programs in
a foreign setting. This is the preferred term for
students who are studying English in their country of
origin.

English as a second language (ESL) - a term used in the
United States to describe programs and individuals in
those programs for whom English is a non-native
language. The term is used for both written and oral
skills.

Immigrant - a person or group of people who has chosen
to relocate or immigrate for economic, social,
educational, or religious reasons (Ogbu, 1978).

Learning Strategy - a way or technique in which a learner
personalizes, remembers, connects, relates,

manipulates, uses and/or applies information and
material.

Limited English Proficient (LEP) - a term used to described
students in K-12 schools who speak a language other
than English and who lack sufficient English skills
for classroom purposes.

Minority - a person or group of people classified by self
or others as being fewer in number or outside the
dominant culture because of language or ethnicity
(Ogbu, 1978).

Refugee - a person or group of people who has moved or
immigrated due to persecution or fear of persecution
based on race, religion, nationality, social, group,
or political affiliation (Haines, 1985, p. 10).

Unaccompanied Minor - a refugee classification assigned to
children, under the age of 18, who immigrated
to the United States unaccompanied by a father or
mother (Bousquet, 1987).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE

A characteristic of ethnographic research is multiple realities, often referred to as phenomenology. Phenomenology is multi-faceted and allows for multiple causes, explanations, and effects in any situation at any time. Phenomenology is evolutionary, not static or single faceted. The ethnographic case study researcher is concerned with all contributing factors to a particular phenomenon. Use of a phenomenological framework, allows the researcher to explore multiple theories which may have contributed to the case being studied. Fetterman (1989) describes phenomenology as having "a multicultural perspective because it accepts multiple realities" (p. 15). According to Fetterman, research is divided into two categories: positivistic or phenomenological; the latter is then divided into ideational or materialistic. A positivistic framework believes that a single explanation or cause is the reality; a phenomenological framework believes in multiple explanations or causes (p. 16). (See Table 2.)

Phenomenology was chosen as the philosophical framework for this study because it is capable of encompassing multiple realities. Phenomenology allows for the reality as perceived by the subject, as well as the reality as perceived by the researcher. The subject

perceives reality through thoughts and ideas tempered by personality, cultural and personal beliefs, and self and world knowledge. The researcher, influenced and tempered by personal beliefs and knowledge much as the subject, analyzes the subject's observed behavior through multiple, relevant theories.

Table 2

Implicit or Explicit Types of Theory used in Phenomenology

Ideational	Materialistic
mental/cognitive	conditioned by resources
- thoughts and ideas revealed through speech by culture, personality, beliefs, and knowledge	- observable behavior revealed by social organization, class, economic condition
- analysis through theories of culture, personality, and sociolinguistics	- analysis through political and economic theories, i.e., Marx
(adapted from Fetterman, 1989, p. 16)	

According to Seidman (1991), literature, although important in academic work, serves only as a guide to a qualitative study. Glaser and Strauss (1967) believe that the phenomenon being studied develops its own categories and those in turn lead the researcher in new and different

directions; theories are generated, not tested. Merriam
(1988) divides the literature review into theory testing
(rarely used in education) and theory generating (p. 59).
The former uses deduction and the latter uses induction.
Literature, to Merriam, serves to guide the researcher and
thus help her/him avoid duplication and mistakes and the
pursuit of a trivial problem (p. 61). The literature can
be divided into *integrative*, *theoretical*, or
methodological reviews, thus allowing the researcher to
refine existing knowledge or generate new information
previously not known or not studied (p. 62). A case study
literature review can be both data-based and non-data-based
research, "from the highly theoretical to popular
testimonials" (p. 61). Possible studies and theories which
may have a bearing on this study are varied:

- language and academic achievement (Krashen, 1982,
  1985; Cummins, 1984, 1989; Hymes, 1971)
- status/sociocultural factors and academic
  achievement (Ogbu, 1978, 1990; Sue and Padilla,
  1986; Haines, 1985; Colson, 1987; Bousquet, 1987;
  Heath, 1982, 1983, 1986; Wells, 1990; McDermott,
  1974; Spindler, 1974)
- personal characteristics: affective and cognitive
  variables (Brown, 1980; Schumann, 1978; Cortes,
  1986; Shultz et al., 1982; Spolsky, 1969; Field and
  Aebersol, 1990; Oxford, 1990; Reid, 1987; O'Malley
  and Chamot, 1990)

The literature review, then, is to help the researcher refine the study.

Language and Academic Achievement

The most popular second language acquisition and learning theories have been proposed by Krashen (1982, 1985), Cummins (1984, 1989), and Hymes (1971). Krashen (1982, 1985) proposes that students acquire certain language skills because they are exposed to certain types of language; learning is separate from acquisition and involves the study and application of rules. The rules are then governed by a monitor which corrects utterances or texts. Acquisition takes place through comprehensible input in the form of understandable speech or text supplied by teachers, friends, or environment. Learning is the study of rules, such as what a teacher might assign for homework. The monitor, according to Krashen, is used when a learner has learned a rule and has ample time to apply it to the utterance or text. The monitor hypothesis is directly related to learned language, not acquired language. To Krashen, learners acquire language through exposure and learn language through the conscious application of taught rules. One may assume, therefore, that learners who are exposed to adequate amounts of proper and/or academic English and who are enrolled in appropriate ESL/EFL would, over time speak and write English well

enough to succeed in an academic setting. However, this is not always the case as Gass (1983) has discovered. She found that the learner's intuition about what was right and what was wrong with a writing sample was not always obvious to the learner. Student writers were able to recognize some errors, but were unable to correct the error. As for the monitor functioning when learners have sufficient time to apply it, Kroll (1990), specifically excluding immigrants in her study, found that the difference between essays written in classroom situations with 60 minute time constraints did not significantly differ from essays written by the same subjects at home over a 10-14 day period. Length and quality of the essays were similar, with the home-written essays showing a slightly better syntactic level. Given ample time to revise, correct, and edit the essays, the student writings were similar to those written in class. Friedlander (1990) in a study of planning for writing in both the first language, Chinese, and the second language, English, discovered that the students' knowledge of the subject was directly related to the language in which the knowledge had been gained. However, in both essays the level of detail was better when Chinese was the language of planning. Although he was not specifically addressing the issue of learning versus acquisition, Friedlander's study may cast doubt on the acquisition/learning model. The knowledge about the subject matter and the language in which the subject matter

had been learned appears to have been heavily influenced by and recalled through the first language. Saville-Troike (1984), in a study involving 19 children who were temporary residents of the U.S. and who had at least one university educated parent, found that children communicating with other children did not provide sufficient language to develop English skills. She also discovered that content area achievement was directly related to discussions about the content in the first language. A strict interpretation of the learning versus acquisition model does not account for first language influence on the learning of the second language.

Cummins (1984) has suggested that language learners actually need to learn two different types of language to be successful. The first type of language he has labeled basic interpersonal communication skills or BICS. This is the language one learns and uses in order to communicate in everyday living and working situations. BICS is context embedded and refers to objects in the here and now. BICS is the language of daily and interpersonal conversation. The second type of language Cummins has called cognitive academic language proficiency or CALPS. This second type of language is more specialized and more cognitively demanding and therefore more difficult. CALPS, unlike BICS, is not context embedded and involves abstract words and ideas, removed in time and space, to convey meaning. CALPS relates well to abstractions found in an academic

setting such as the language of philosophy, mathematics, and literature. Cummins places BICS and CALPS on a continuum with BICS at one end of the continuum and CALPS at the other. Others, disagreeing with Cummins' theoretical framework (Genesee, 1984; Spolsky, 1984; Troike, 1984; Wald, 1984), have attempted to interrelate these types languages to form a more complete theoretical model for language learning and language use. Spolsky (1984) has stated that by using acronyms to describe a language theory, Cummins has actually created vagueness. Spolsky questions Cummins' word choice because of the connotations associated with the word "basic" when compared to the words "cognitive" and "academic" (p. 41) the notion of academic language in the Western tradition as "the least tolerant and cooperative of any communication situation" (p. 43). Canale's (1984) critique of the BICS/CALPS explanation is that the theory cannot adequately encompass all language issues. Wald (1984) believes that CALPS is a literacy issue and is closely tied to socio-linguistic issues of class and academic achievement. Genesee (1984) is also concerned with the lack of consideration for the social situation of language and the issue of teacher expectation. Troike (1984) reporting on the aforementioned roundtable discussions notes that Cummins dropped the BICS/CALPS distinction and moved toward a continuum using context-embedded and context-reduced language demands (footnote, p. 51). By 1989, Cummins discusses the issues

of social interaction and minority status in language use. He believes that it is at the level of individual teachers and students that minorities and minority language speakers will either fail or succeed in the academic setting. Cummins, by addressing the issue of social factors, is moving toward the interrelationship of language, society, and education.

Hymes (1971), on the other hand, has proposed that communication is the goal of language learning; a learner is considered competent when she or he is able to communicate with others. When one's needs, wants, and desires are met, then communication has taken place; when one's needs, wants, and desires remain unmet, then no communication has taken place. Hymes does not attempt to divide communication into levels or skills. He is concerned with the ideas of grammar or competence on the one hand and acceptability or performance on the other (p. 12). Learners need to be competent in their speech and use acceptable utterances in a sociocultural setting. It is this combination that allows learners to be considered linguistically competent speakers. Hymes, however, continues by stating that an adequate theory of learner communication must also consider possibility, feasibility, appropriateness, and performance of language (p. 12). Consideration must also be given to the audience's language capability and capacity and all the metalinguistic elements of communication such as silence, setting, situation, and

hetero or non-heterogeneity of the speech community Hymes (1971, pp. 12-17). Hymes believes that a linguistic theory should start with the social context first and then proceed to look at language, "thus functions guide, structures follow" (p. 23).

Hymes (1972a) expanding his theory of a sociocultural approach to language stresses the influence and importance of the contextual setting. Language use not structure should drive language theory (p. xii). Those in the classroom setting may share the language of the classroom such as the situation, but not be members of the same speech community and thus have different uses and interpretations of the language in the classroom (p. xxxviii). To Hymes, language performance and competence are related to social not cognitive factors (p. xxxi). The more that is known about language use and function in a social context such as school, the better one is able to understand the interaction of language and social change.

Cortes (1986) addressing minority student education believes that people, and researchers in particular, have confused correlation and cause and that explanations have been decontextualized (p. 16). He notes that educational achievement differences between individuals within a group where language, social class, and ethnicity are homogeneous are not adequately explained. Factors within the society and school contexts only partially explain differential educational attainment or lack thereof (p. 16). The

individual student's belief that opportunity exists or that
education will enhance future opportunities is necessary
for success (p. 23). Cazden (1982) believes that the more
we know about students' lives in the learning environment,
the more capable we will be at finding a remedy for the
disparity in education and educational opportunity (p.
212).

Krashen's acquisition versus learning theory does not
account for different types of language, language contexts
or social considerations, nor does it address the issue of
the first language in second language learning and second
language application. Cummins' BICS/CALPS theory has given
way to a context-embedded and context-reduced continuum
model so that language use can more readily encompass the
social and cultural situations in which it is used. Hymes,
always concerned with the social and cultural context of
language use, believes that an adequate language and
communication theory must address the socio-economic,
socio-political, and sociocultural issues; competence and
performance must both be analyzed (Hymes, 1971, p. 10).

Status/Sociocultural Factors and Academic Achievement

Many studies have attempted to address the issues
of minority academic achievement. Ogbu (1978, 1990), Sue
and Padilla (1986), Ogbu and Matute-Bianchi (1986), and
Cortes (1986) have all attempted to determine what

characteristics are most important for academic success: ethnicity, home language, minority status, and majority view of the minority group. They have determined that minority status alone does not predict success or failure in an academic setting, but rather sets of characteristics. Ogbu (1978, 1990) states that there are three different types of minorities: autonomous minorities, immigrant or voluntary minorities, and castelike or involuntary minorities (1990, p. 145). He believes that "The cultural models of minorities are shaped by the initial terms of their incorporation in American society, and their subsequent treatment by white Americans" (1990, p. 149). The success or failure in schools of a particular minority group is shaped by the view of the majority population as well as the view of the minority population. Autonomous minorities judge themselves against themselves (1978, p. 23), for example the Amish or other religious groups. The immigrants compare themselves to the group back home (1978, pp. 23-24). It is the castelike minorities, those "forced to become part of the country through conquest, slavery, or colonization" (1990, p. 145, footnote) that fare the worst in school. The way individuals view themselves within their own group and compared to the dominate group helps to determine their attitude toward the social and cultural institutions of the majority culture. Expanding on the theory of different types of minorities, Ogbu and Matute-Bianchi (1986) have determined that membership in a

language minority group *per se* does not in and of itself contribute to academic failure (p. 87). Cortes (1986), quoting the 1974 Lau versus Nichols court decision, is concerned with the societal agenda of the schools and the fact that some minorities do succeed educationally when single cause explanations such as socio-economic class or minority status deficit theory are used as plausible arguments.

According to Sue and Padilla (1986), there are four perspectives which have been used to explain educational or academic failure: 1) genetic inferiority, some groups do not have the innate ability to learn; 2) cultural deficit, some groups lack the cultural competence necessary for social and academic success; 3) cultural mismatch, although the culture may be different, certain aspects fit well and thus members are successful, for example the Confucian work ethic is similar to the Protestant work ethic; and 4) contextual interaction, cultures interacting in dynamic ways may achieve compatibility or confrontation (pp. 43-49). It is thought that folk beliefs come from this latter perspective. Sue and Padilla focus on the contextual interaction perspective and suggest that it is when and where majority and minority cultures interact that alterations may need to occur for the system, the group, and the community.

Heath (1986) details information about the culture of the home and academic achievement for Mexican-American

families, Indo-Chinese-American families, and Chinese-
American families.   She concludes that it is the genre of
language use by each group in the home and in the community
that contributes to academic success and failure for these
minority groups.   As in her study of the family units in
the Piedmont Area (Heath, 1983), children in these minority
groups are in a family unit which influences their success
or failure.   Not mentioned by Heath, if examined, is the
impact of living outside the family unit, immigrating, and
learning English as an adolescent.   Heath (1982, 1983,
1986) and Wells (1990) have examined what kinds of family
background and educational folklore are conducive to
educational achievement.

Heath (1983), in Ways with Words, details the academic
goals and achievements of three groups of people living in
a community in the Piedmont Area of the Carolinas.   Her
indepth interviews and participation as a community member
over a 10 year period lead her to conclude that the
language, use of language, and culture of the home,
combined with the folk culture about education in the home
and in the immediate community, significantly contribute to
the success and failure of students in school.   To Heath,
"The school is not a neutral objective arena; it is an
institution which has the goal of changing people's values,
skills, and knowledge bases" (p. 367).   If education has
this goal, then more knowledge about the ways people act,

speak, think, and perceive have an impact on their educational outcome.

Wells (1990) examining at-risk youth and schooling, reports that cultures such as Blacks and Hispanics which have been "incorporated by conquest . . . tend to not fare as well educationally as those who have chosen to immigrate (Orientals)" (p. 8). The family background and living style, cooperative versus competitive and oral versus literary learning, disadvantage students in the structured, competitive authoritarian school setting. Wells further states that early exit from school is "more common among students who are not English-speaking, or are limited English speaking" (pp. 8-9). While English language skills have a critical bearing on school participation and success, family background and communication style also have serious ramifications for the educational setting.

Philips (1972) has studied the ways in which schools themselves contribute to the failure of American Indian children. According to Philips, the actions and language cultivated in the primary culture of home and community school promote failure by supporting and encouraging a cooperative learning style in primary school. When the Warm Springs children then transfer to a non-primary culture secondary school, conditions change. In the secondary school the cooperative learning style is replaced with a competitive, individualistic style, and many of the Warm Springs children fail.

McDermott (1974) and Spindler (1974) address the issue of differences in academic achievement between majority and minority groups. McDermott (1974) suggests that minority groups succeed or fail because of learned behaviors associated with their assigned place in society, "Pariah status appears almost as achieved as ascribed" (1974, p. 85). It is the relationship between the majority and the minority group in the greater social community that is replicated in the classroom, "In short, the teacher handles the children in a way the children are used to being handled" (McDermott, 1974, p. 92). Parents have a status, and children learn that status from them. Schools are institutions set within cultural communities and to "minority people the schools have been experiences as damaging attempts to recruit their children into an alien culture" (Spindler, 1974, p. 77). To Spindler, the fact that all community members are subject to the "alien cultural system" of the school offers some consolation; however, some groups may be irreparably damaged.

Suarez-Orozco (1987), after interviewing 50 families in the San Francisco Bay Area with children in the public schools, reports that the category of "Hispanic" does not adequately describe the differences between urban/rural and educated/uneducated immigrants. The country of origin and cultural difference between and among various Central American countries and Mexico can not be accounted for in the single term "Hispanic." Sue and Padilla (1986),

reporting on Sue's study of Chinese-Americans and Mexican-Americans state that both groups are formed by new immigrants as well as sixth or seventh generation members. The surface homogeneity may, in fact, mask vast cultural and linguistic differences. If Spanish speaking immigrants wish to maintain their separate country and cultural identity, and if Chinese-Americans and Mexican-Americans are not considered homogeneous because of their date of entry and cultural identity, how much more so is this compounded when one is a refugee? The issue of an individual's perception to and about the host country may, in fact, help form the individual's place within the society. The refugee as a subsection of immigrant may only be a convenience of classification, much like the term "Hispanic" is for Spanish speakers.

Haines (1985), Colson (1987), and Bousquet (1987) have examined refugee status as a different type of minority. To Haines (1985) the element of an urgent exit from the country of origin and the threat of imminent danger throughout the flight contribute to feelings of alienation and permanent exile which must be overcome before readjustment and acceptance by the new culture can be established. He further states that the greater the difference between the home or primary culture and the culture of the country of asylum, the more adjustment problems refugees exhibit (pp. 22 and 25).

In her study of unaccompanied youth in a refugee camp, Bousquet (1987) discusses the "state of limbo" in which many young refugees find themselves (p. 34). She also expresses the concern of resettlement agencies on the negative impact camp life can have on one's future when the unaccompanied minor youth is placed with unknown adults, and the minor is once again subjected to adult supervision and authority (p. 52). Colson (1987) is concerned with the differences and similarities of immigrants, refugees, and aliens. She examines the interplay between hosts and newcomers and the ambiguity that exists between immigrants and refugees (p. 3). She postulates that refugees are a twentieth century phenomenon. Refugees are created and "emerge from and provoke acute crises" (p. 4). Refugees force themselves upon the world's attention and conscience, and by doing so make a claim on the world's sympathy. When the numbers of refugees who claim the world's sympathy reach epidemic proportions, individuals lose their individuality and become merely one of a very large group. Resettlement and acceptance then become the means by which refugees are able to "emerge from the anonymity . . . and they become again individuals with particular statuses which ensure their personal dignity" (p. 3). Colson also questions the refugees' long term acceptance of the new culture, since refugees, unlike immigrants, do not have plans to return home, "Immigrants whose long-term goals focus upon the home country which continues to be

accessible have less reason to try to alter themselves or to demand acceptance" (pp. 9-10).

Ogbu (1989) reviewing his research with Blacks, Mexican-Americans, Chinese, Japanese, Filipinos, and whites in Stockton, California, and comparing his findings to other research on minorities in California, including Suarez-Orozco's (1987), states that all studies support the notion that the minorities who do better are immigrants. Again he stresses the issue of subjugated minority status as contributing to academic failure and disenfranchisement from other social institutions. However, Ogbu continues to classify refugees as a type of immigrant, even though Colson (1987) questions the refugee's acceptance of the host country over a longer period of time. The exact relationship that refugees have to immigrants has not been explored in any systematic manner. As Bousquet (1987) has stated, the combination of the limbo state in refugee camps without adult supervision and the readjustment to adult supervision after camp life may lead to negative adjustment for the unaccompanied minor.

<div align="center">

Personal Characteristics:

Affective and Cognitive Variables

</div>

All individuals have characteristics which contribute to their learning. Brown (1980) discusses both affective and cognitive factors which contribute to language

learning. He is concerned with motivation, attitude, egocentricity, learning strategies, learning styles, and first and second language knowledge. He posits that all of these characteristics in combination with social and cultural factors contribute to a second language learners' acquisition. Cortes (1986), discussing language minority students, urges researchers to look beyond the single cause explanations and to examine the relationship between social, cultural, and linguistic factors within the context of who succeeds and who fails. He is interested in the interrelationship of personal and societal factors. Schumann (1978) describing pidginization of a 33-year-old Costa Rican male, hypothesizes that accent and pidginization may be related to cognitive factors and their relationship to social acceptance into or social distance from the majority culture.

Gardner and Lambert (1972) in a landmark 12 year study, attempted to clarify what factors contributed most significantly to learners' language learning ability and achievement. After examining various familial characteristics, including such areas as family background, parental attitudes toward the target language, and socio-economic class, and student characteristics, such as attitude toward the target language and people, intelligence, egocentricity, happiness with own culture, study habits, and grades, Gardner and Lambert determined that learners who had integrative motivation, wanting to be

like or be accepted into the target language group, were slightly better language learners than those learners who were motivated for an instrumental reason, using the target language for personal and/or professional gain. The other factors which seemed to contribute to learner success in the target language were intelligence, family attitude toward learning, in general, and family attitude toward learning another language and about other people, specifically. Gardner and Lambert in a direct reference to linguistic minority groups in North America, state that both instrumental and integrative motivations need to be developed (pp. 141-142). Other concluding references appear to be related to Ogbu (1989), McDermott (1974), Sue and Padilla (1986), and Heath (1983) who have all suggested that family attitude about place in society and family folklore about success in the majority culture affect academic achievement and failure. According to Gardner and Lambert, "the strong relationship we find between parents' and children's attitudes . . . suggests [sic] that attitudes are developed in the home, before language training starts" (1972, p. 143).

If attitude for language and learning is actually established in the home or primary culture prior to exposure to the secondary culture, then one's attitude toward risk may also be attributed to family background. Beebe (1983) has studied risk-taking and language learning and concludes that risk-taking traits are not stable, are

situation specific and value laden, that is an individual alone will demonstrate more risk-taking traits than in a group and will balance the gain against the loss in each situation. Risk-taking is also attributed to an individual's locus of control in that individuals with an internal locus of control seem to take more risks than individuals with an external locus of control. The cultural implications of risk-taking behavior have not been specifically addressed, so, "We cannot assume that students from various cultural backgrounds will share the same values or perceive the same risks" (p. 59). While moderate risk-takers are thought to be the most successful, all language situations involve some degree of risk because of "uncertainty and a possibility of failure" (p. 52). If all language situations involve risk, then the productive skills of speaking and writing involve the most risk to the learner, and hence, to the learners' self-esteem.

According to Rivers and Melvin (1981), cognitive ability affects how people approach everything. Without understanding how and what students learn, effective teaching may not be possible. Learning styles as defined by Dunn, Dunn, and Price (1985) permeate an individual's way of learning and include 21 environmental areas and also include such factors as time of day, light level, noise level, temperature, and modality (visual, auditory, tactile, and kinesthetic).

Reid (1987), using information from Dunn, Dunn, and Price and experts in the fields of linguistics, education, and cross-cultural studies, has attempted to determine the learning style preference for non-native English, ESL/EFL, speakers compared to native English speakers. Results from 1,234 intermediate and advanced respondents, approximately one-half of whom had been in the U. S. six months or less, in intensive English language programs were compared to 154 native speakers. Results varied, in particular for Japanese speakers, but also between and among the 98 countries, 29 different college majors, and 52 language backgrounds represented. Reid found that ESL/EFL students who had been in the U.S. more than three years showed learning style preferences closer to native English students than did other second language respondents. All respondents rated group work negatively, or at best a minor preference, but kinesthetic learning was a positive learning preference for all. Reid's study suggests the possibility that some learning style preferences are not stable, but flexible. This flexibility could be related to language proficiency, language task, or application of more world knowledge gained over time or with practice. As noted, Reid's study focused on university intensive English language programs which cater to foreign students who come to the U.S. to study and then return to their country of origin. The application of the study results to immigrants who have attended high school in the U.S. is not addressed.

If included, Vietnamese respondent responses were not noted.

Stebbins (1995) has replicated Reid's (1987) study and concurs with her results. The most remarkable result, again, was the preference of ESL students for kinesthetic and tactile learning when compared to native English speaking students. Stebbins also found that preferences for modality and learning style were able to be categorized by first language and cultural background, ". . . ethnicity or language background is a factor that influences the learning-style preferences of college-level international students" (p. 110). In Stebbins' study, Spanish speakers were kinesthetic, Arabic and Korean students had multiple learning styles, and Japanese speakers' preferences were not strongly identified (p. 110). An interesting finding in Stebbins' results, which contradicts her own conclusions about culture, ethnicity, and learning style preference, is preferences for group learning, despite their traditional beliefs in the necessity of group cohesiveness" (p. 112). At issue here, then, is the reliability of a culturally based learning style preference when the surrounding or alien culture is different with different norms and expectations.

Several studies (Horwitz, 1990; Politzer and McGroarty, 1985; Oxford, 1990) have addressed learning strategies as a category of cognitive style (Nelson, 1995; Gilligan, 1982), others as a category of learning style

(Reid, 1987; Oxford, 1990), and still others as a learner (as opposed to learning) style (Brown, 1980; Gilligan, 1982; Abraham and Vann, 1987). There is much controversy and confusion concerning both the definition and the application of the words strategy and cognitive style in language learning. To Oxford (1990) learning strategies can be divided into memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, social, and affective strategy classifications. Reid (1995) provides six pages of different models, uses, and definitions of the learning strategies and learning styles. O'Malley and Chamot (1990) devote three chapters to the definition of cognitive skills and the relationship between cognition and learning strategies. Oxford and Cohen (1992) sum up the problems of discussing learning strategies best when they say any discussion suffers from "'moving target' syndrome" (p. 3).

To Oxford and Cohen (1992) learning strategies are definitely included in cognitive factors, but cognitive factors are affected by social and affective variables such as emotions, attitudes, motivation, anxiety, social interaction, and personality type, as well as demographic variables such as age, sex, and ethnicity (p. 27). They also include in their definition of strategies memory and "managing the learning process, and producing language while lacking adequate linguistic knowledge" (p. 4).

Oxford (1990) proposes that learning strategies are adapted and used by learners in different ways: strategies are appropriate to the situation, advanced language learners use more task-appropriate strategies, teaching environments influence the choice of strategies, and learning strategies can be learned or modified by teaching. She also introduces the aspect of "leveling-sharpening, another style dimension . . . Levelers blur differences, while sharpeners magnify them" (p. 45). Tolerance for ambiguity she qualifies as an affective or personality factor, while others include it in learning style (p. 45). Oxford stresses that "Language learning is not like learning mathematics or biology or typing; it requires an understanding of the nature of language and the process of language learning . . . " (p. 48).

Oxford's reference to the nature of language and language learning is reflected in research regarding language learners' expectations about language learning by Horwitz (1990). Horwitz found that motivation and anxiety both influenced language students, but that extreme anxiety caused little learning. She also discovered that students' beliefs about the length of time necessary to learn a language was vastly underrated, "5-8% of the students in each language group answered under a year and well over a third of each group chose one to two years . . . This anticipation of rapid progress, coupled with an emphasis on linguistic correctness, would seem to guarantee frustration

for some students" (p. 25). If a learner believes that vocabulary is primary to learning another language, then s/he will focus on learning vocabulary to the detriment of other language skills. The learners' beliefs about language learning need to be addressed if effective language learning and proficiency is to be achieved.

Ely (1995) has addressed the issue of ambiguity in language learning. He defines ambiguity as a mental uncertainty that produces feelings which may inhibit risk taking and interfere with learning (p. 87). The outward manifestation of a low tolerance for ambiguity may be resistance on the part of the student, but a high tolerance for ambiguity may lead to errors in perception and "relatively early and permanent pidginization or fossilization of incorrect pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, and pragmatic use" (p. 93). It appears that tolerance for ambiguity may be likened to risk taking (Beebe, 1983), either too much or too little can be detrimental to learning.

Abraham and Vann's (1987) study of the learning strategies and learner strategies of two very different learners, one successful and one unsuccessful, indicate that learner differences in age, motivation, education, background, field dependence and other factors, including perseverance and persistence, influence learning strategies. Further, the subjects' strategies "provide some clues to their [subjects'] language learning

philosophies, that is, their beliefs about how language operates, and, consequently, how it [language] is learned" (p. 95). They go even further when they "suggest that learners have, at some level of consciousness, a *philosophy* of how language is learned. This philosophy guides the *approach* they take in language learning situations, which in turn is manifested in observable (and unobservable) *strategies* used in learning and communication" (p. 96). If their results are to be believed, as Horwitz (1990) also suggests, then learning strategies are specifically and individually related to learner strategies, possibly as a way to organize and interact with the world. If their hypothesis is correct, learning strategies are not limited to language learning situations.

The cultural aspect of learning strategies and learning style and their implications for language learning have been explored by Politzer and McGroarty (1985). In their study of foreign students in an intensive English program, they found that specific behaviors often associated with good language learning strategies yielded mixed results. Asians surpassed Hispanics in "average linguistic competence (as measured by the CELT) and in gains on the discrete-point measure of communicative competence" (p. 114). Politzer and McGroarty determined that social interaction behaviors, often associated with linguistic gain and communicative competence, "are apparently more a part of the Western rather than the Asian

learning behavior repertoire" (p. 114), and do not necessarily lead to measurable gains in linguistic competence. The greatest impact of this study, however, is that specific behaviors were found to lead to measurable gains on language tests: self repeating of corrections, clarification of appropriate forms, correction of grammatical forms (although this seemed to negatively affect auditory comprehension if practiced out of class), vocabulary lists or cards, word and phrase association with the first language, asking for repetition of words or phrases, and correcting oneself. Politzer and McGroarty conclude that good behaviors need to be appropriate to a specific skill and there may, indeed, be differences between strategies used for communicative competence and linguistic competence. Another finding suggests that "cultural background (and possible professional specialization) has a great deal to do with type of language learning behavior likely to be used by students" (p. 119).

Nelson (1995) has specifically addressed cultural differences in learning styles and the inherent ambiguity that the two terms imply. Learning style inventories are designed "to distinguish one kind of learner from another" (p. 6) while culture is defined as a shared set of beliefs. Nelson notes that "culture is also learned" (p. 6), and it is in the culture that learners learn their beliefs about learning. To illustrate her cultural learning definition

she uses examples from Condon (1984) describing school differences between Japan and the United States and Salzman (1986) describing his experiences in China. In each instance, the authors note the differences between the learning/teaching systems: the Japanese school system promotes group cohesiveness and cooperation under the authority figure of the teacher compared to the competitive, individual expression, autonomous learning encouraged by the teacher in the United States. Salzman's learning experiences in China reflected the "master" concept-study what is modeled and learn from it. To Nelson, the culturally imposed beliefs about learning in the first or primary culture are often replicated in the second or target culture, regardless of the appropriateness for the situation, learned learning behavior and beliefs are unconscious (p. 15). The teaching environment in United States secondary institutions which encourages individuality and spontaneity in a casual academic atmosphere may add to students' unconscious assumptions about the learning environment and heighten their anxiety level, which in turn may hinder their ability to learn.

Rossi-Le (1995) supports the findings of Reid (1987) and Stebbins (1995). Investigating adult immigrant ESL students, Rossi-Le found first language background did influence respondents' learning style preferences. She also found that kinesthetic learning style preference was dependent on background, "specifically language proficiency

and work history" (p. 121). It appears that learning style preference changes over time as language proficiency improves. If this change in preference is valid for other groups, as others have hinted, then language learning strategies training can be adapted to learners' language proficiency levels. The key, then, is discovering which strategy is appropriate to which language level.

Thompson (1987) specifically addresses the issue of memory in language learning. Although she does not specifically address memory as a learning strategy, she addresses memory training techniques in language learning, "The ability to understand spoken and written language, and to produce it in speaking and writing depends on the ability to recognize and retrieve information stored in memory, and the difficulty in carrying out such tasks is often contingent upon the weight of memory demands that they require" (p. 43). How the information is stored, retrieved, and used may relate to specific learning strategies that enable learners to connect, relate, and use the target language in real and meaningful communication. Canale's (1987) discussion of communicative competence in real communication situations could also be related to Thompson's memory techniques. If speech acts and communication between individuals require world or topic knowledge combined with language skill or competence (p. 5), language learners must be able to remember similar speech situations and extrapolate structures, vocabulary,

setting, and appropriate interactions and apply them in creative and innovative ways in new speech situations. Canale's concern with the appropriateness of utterances, meaning and form (p. 7), is compounded by the limitations of the learner in real language and communication situations. Learners are limited and restricted by their ability to recall ideas and forms, stored in memory according to Thompson, and are forced to rely on other communication devices or strategic competencies such as unusual but related terminology, for example 'place for trains' or 'train house' for the preferred 'train station' (p. 10). If learners can be taught to increase their communicative competence by using memory enhancing techniques and methods, then these memory techniques might be included in learning strategies.

Chamot (1984), on the other hand, has examined learning strategies, a term she uses to describe strategies employed by learners to self-manage the learning situation. She has described three basic categories: metacognitive strategies, social affective strategies, and cognitive strategies. Metacognitive strategies involve thinking about the learning task, planning for the task, and monitoring and evaluating the learning task. Social affective strategies are the ways learners interact with others as a means of learning a task. Cognitive strategies are the way a learner manipulates material (mentally or physically) and applies the necessary means to the learning

task. Within each of the main categories are specific skills or techniques which learners use or can be taught.

O'Malley and Chamot (1990) have since perfected Chamot's taxonomy of learning strategies. In <u>Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition</u> they report on four studies involving different types of learners, ESL learners in high school and foreign language learners (Spanish and Russian) in high school and college, in both short term and long term studies. Study one involved the self-report of learning strategies of 70 good ESL high school students, five of whom were Vietnamese; students exhibited similar learning strategies both in and out of class. While video taped observations of the students in classroom situations were attempted, the classroom observations were considered unreliable because of interrater variances. Unfortunately, the differences between the Vietnamese and Spanish speaking ESL students were not addressed in the results of the study. The second study involved 34 college students studying Russian formally and 677 high school students studying Spanish formally. Results from Study two were similar to Study one as to variety and type of learning strategies. However, since both effective and ineffective learners were involved in Study two, differences between learners were discovered: effective language learners used a greater repertoire of strategies than did ineffective language learners. As in Study one, Study two subjects self-reported on their type

and range of learning strategies. Study one was focused on the learning strategies involved in oral language; Study two involved oral skills in combination with reading and writing skills. The researchers concluded that cognitive strategies may be related to the task at hand and place different demands on the learners, thereby altering the type of learning strategies necessary.

In O'Malley and Chamot's third study, learning strategies related to listening comprehension were examined. Eight Spanish speaking high school ESL students who had been deemed effective and ineffective language learners by their ESL teachers were interviewed. Using a think-aloud protocol, O'Malley and Chamot determined that there were differences in types of strategies between the two types of learners. Effective learners were more focused and less distracted than ineffective learners; effective learners listened to larger chunks of information and used both top-down and bottom-up processing compared to the smaller chunks and predominantly bottom-up processing of ineffective learners; and, effective learners used less translation, more strategies, more world knowledge, and more self-questioning than did the ineffective learners. As in the two previous studies, differences were found between ineffective and effective language learners; however, as noted by the researchers, the think-aloud protocol appears to be related to short term memory. The strategies reported by subjects may, in fact, be only those

strategies that are most easily and obviously retrievable within the think-aloud protocol framework. Both effective and ineffective learners may employ strategies not easily reported because the strategies are so much a part of their overall cognitive and affective functioning.

The fourth study of O'Malley and Chamot involved the subjects from study two in a longitudinal, four semester, study. Students from the bottom and the top of beginning, intermediate, and advanced college students studying Russian and high school students studying Spanish were selected and trained in think-aloud protocol, advanced organizers for reading and listening, and organizational planning for writing. Subjects were taught to use appropriate strategies for the language task. The results of the study were similar to Studies one, two, and three above. The effective learners used more strategies and the strategies were more varied than the strategies of the ineffective learners. As learners progressed in target language proficiency, strategies changed and learners adapted appropriate strategies to the task. The single most significant factor realized from Study four was discovered in interviews with the subjects: motivation for learning the target language. Students who displayed a positive motivation for learning another language tended to learn more than students with a low motivation for learning another language.

Again, while the motivation or affective domain of the language learner may be key to effective use of learning strategies, reported motivation and observed strategy use may be different. The strategies and strategy use reported by O'Malley and Chamot (1990) and the supposition that they change over time relate to Reid's (1987) observation that learning preferences appear to change over time. Gardner and Lambert's (1972) affective characteristics and integrative/instrumental motivations also appear to be related to O'Malley and Chamot's studies. The relationship between learning strategies, learning preference, and learner motivation has not been explored in an empirical manner. A study which combines observational data with the declared goals for learning another language and academic language and information learned in non-target language classes may yield different information about these learner characteristics. If learning strategies are pervasive and representative of the way a learner obtains knowledge, then language strategies and learning preferences may, in fact, be used in all learning situations and settings.

The motivational reasons related to foreign and second language achievement have been addressed by others. Spolsky (1969) discovered that second language achievement was closely correlated with integrative reasons for learning the second language-wanting to be like the second language speakers. Shultz et al. (1982) is concerned with

cognitive style as it relates to communication. The communicative competence that one displays varies from individual to individual and within and among groups (p. 89). This premise, based on differing communicative styles which may be cognitively determined among different cultures, contributes to perceived misbehavior in school settings and may contribute to academic failure (p. 92).

Scollon and Scollon (1987), Fraser (1987), and Wolfson (1987), in related research on language use address the role of methods and manners of communication. Scollon and Scollon discuss four different aspects of discourse that affect all types of language use: turn taking, topic control, information structure, and schemata or scripts; hence, inter-ethnic and inter- and intra-language communication is hampered by affective factors about the very nature of discourse and communication. Wolfson is concerned with the appropriateness of speech situations. She stresses that the grammar and vocabulary need to fit the speech situation, and the interpretation of the speech situation is often based on cultural or affective factors, "Language use must be recognized as being conditioned by factors outside the purely linguistic structure such that there is always a cross-relationship between internal meaning and extra-linguistic factors" (1987, p. 85). Fraser (1987), studying pragmatics or linguistic communication, states that in order to communicate, speakers must agree to certain "mutually shared beliefs"

(p. 45). If the individuals or groups involved in the communication act use the same language, but do not share the same beliefs, then communication is difficult at best and impossible at worst. Since belief systems are based in primary or home culture (Philips, 1972), differing beliefs may be related to affective factors which are based in different ethnic and linguistic backgrounds. Affective and cognitive factors appear to be related, but the relationship and the influence is still unclear.

Another component of cognitive style is that of field dependence/field independence. Abraham (1985) has studied the effect of field independence and field dependence on grammar lessons. Using a pre-test/post-test research design, subjects' field dependency was determined by use of the *Group Embedded Figures Test.* Two computer lessons were constructed, both with the same introduction. One lesson explained in detail the rule on participal phrases, and the second lesson only provided examples. The post-test results showed that when subjects were matched with their field independence or field dependence cognitive style, subjects performed better. She concluded that when learner cognitive style matches the grammar presentation, rules are formed by the field dependent subjects and rules are remembered by the field independent subjects. Abraham and Vann (1987) alluded to the possibility that the field dependence/independence factor was relevant in their two subject case study. Referring to Pedro, the unsuccessful

learner, they write that his field dependence "may have led to his difficulty in paying attention to detail" (p. 96).

Summary of Literature Review

While more research is needed in the area of cognitive style and language learning, research thus far supports the interrelatedness of cognitive style, rate, fluency/ proficiency, and acquisition or language learning. The sociocultural factors of minority ethnic groups, their type of minority status and self-perception to the majority culture have not been adequately explored in the literature, especially for recent groups such as refugees. The influence of family background and its relationship to educational folklore and academic achievement for adolescent second language unaccompanied minors has not been addressed in the literature.

It appears that culture, language, and cognitive factors are mutually inclusive where academic success and failure are concerned, yet no studies have observed what language learners actually do in learning situations. Studies to date have focused on self-reported learning strategies and self-reported learning styles preferences, with interview data to supplement the self-reports. Observational studies (O'Malley and Chamot, 1990) have been attempted, but discarded because of interrater differences in group observations. Gardner (1991) has suggested that

some learning strategies may in fact be learner strategies that individuals use to promote proficiency (p. 11). The division between learning strategies that may be unique to a learner and learning strategies that may be taught to promote learning is still unclear.

Single subject observations have not been discussed in the literature, but may help to verify learning strategy and learning style preference adaptability to context and stability to situation. The relationship between characteristics such as extroversion and risk taking to learning strategies and proficiency have not been explored (Gardner, 1991, p. 14). Gardner also states that there are few studies which investigated "personality variables simultaneously, and their relation to proficiency in a second language, even though such studies would seem to be basic" (1991, p. 11). The real or perceived differences between foreign students studying English in intensive language programs at the post secondary level compared to ESL students, who have graduated from American high schools, enrolled in regular college content classes has not been addressed in the literature.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

An ethnographic case study is chosen by the researcher when a holistic view of the unit to be studied is desired. Ethnographic case study designs do not depend solely upon observation, participant-observation, or key informant information (Yin, 1989, p. 22); instead, this design is selected when the researcher determines that the following are present:

- the research focuses on a contemporary phenomenon in a real-life context

- clear boundaries do not exist between the phenomenon to be studied and the context

- multiple sources of information are to be used (Yin, 1989, p. 23)

The study design in classical case study research uses the analytical unit of one, an individual (Yin, 1989). According to Merriam (1988), "a case study is an examination of a specific phenomenon such as a program, an event, a person, a process, an institution, or a social group" (p. 9). He further states, "Case studies in *education* can focus on individual students" (p. 23). The case, then, "is analogous to a single experiment [in quantitative research]" (Yin, 1989, p. 47).

Case study design focuses on the unit of analysis, the case, in a naturalistic, holistic, context embedded manner (Merriam, 1988; Yin, 1989). It allows the researcher to analyze data collected from a sociocultural perspective. Just as ethnography is rooted in a culture, the use of ethnographic case study research seeks to explain or build theory based on the case within a cultural context.

Case study research interests come from a variety of sources. Strauss and Corbin (1990) list three possible sources as follows: "[a] suggested or assigned research problem" (p. 34), "technical literature", and "personal and professional experience" (p. 35); Yin (1989) suggests that case studies be used when one wishes to explain, describe, or explore unanswered questions (p. 16); and Merriam (1988) recommends case study design when one wishes to "uncover the interaction of significant factors characteristic of the phenomenon" (p. 10) because of "personal experience, deductions from theory, related literature, current social and political issues, and practical situations" (p. 42). Case study design is, therefore, chosen when the researcher is interested in a particular phenomenon because of personal or professional interest and/or experience, and the phenomenon is thought to have sociocultural causes or implications in the present. Yin (1989) stresses that case studies must address all relevant theories and cultural views, but that the data itself provide the final and ultimate empirical proof upon which the case rests.

Sampling

Unlike traditional anthropological ethnography where
the researcher is studying an entire social unit such as a
town or village, ethnographic case study design is narrow
in scope. Through the case study the researcher desires to
explain or describe a particular phenomenon within a
sociocultural context. Just as the case study design is
chosen for personal or professional reasons/experience, the
case is selected because it represents the phenomenon to be
studied. Sampling in case study design is purposeful and
chosen for a variety of reasons. (See Table 3.)

From Table 3, it can be seen that a case may be chosen
because it represents a "typical case," an "extreme or
deviant case," a "critical case," a "sensitive case," a
"convenience," or a "maximum variation" (Patton 1989 qtd.
in Seidman, 1991, p. 42). The case is purposefully
selected because it represents one or all of the phenomenon
to be studied.

Yin (1989) stresses that case selection is purposeful
because the researcher has selected a case study design for
descriptive, interpretive, or evaluative purposes (pp. 27-
28) and the case fulfills that function. Seidman (1991)
suggests that cases are chosen because their involvement
may help the researcher answer questions of significance,
[contributing] background factors, benefits [to the
researcher and others], and contributions to existing

Table 3

Nonprobability Sampling Strategies

Purposeful Sampling	Criterion-Based Sampling
(Patton, 1980)	(Goetz and LeCompte, 1984)
1. Extreme or deviant	1. Initial group
2. Typical	-comprehensive - quota
3. Maximum variation	- network - extreme
4. Critical	- typical - unique
5. Politically important or sensitive	- reputational - ideal - comparable
6. Convenience	2. Sequential
	- theoretical - negative - discrepancy
(Taken from Merriam, 1988, p. 49)	

research or theory (p. 25). Unlike quantitative research where the researcher attempts to avoid bias through random sampling and digital calculations, in an ethnographic case study, the researcher purposefully selects the case because it represents the phenomenon.

The non-random sampling associated with case study design places a greater burden on the researcher. Some have accused the case study researcher of a lack of "rigor" (Yin, 1989, p. 21). The purpose of an ethnographic case study is not to test theory, but to generate theory (Yin,

1989; Strauss and Corbin, 1990; Eisenhart, 1988). The case study researcher must insure rigor by addressing issues of bias, in him or herself and the study, and stipulating that the design contributes to "theoretical propositions and not to populations" (Yin, 1989, p. 21).

Heath (1982) acknowledges that by selecting a particular setting and phenomenon to explore, one is not entirely objective. Pershkin (1982) and Fetterman (1989) readily admit that researchers have biases and must admit them to the audience throughout the study. The selection of both the design and the case to be studied are stamped with researcher bias from the outset. By selecting what to observe, record, omit and include, "the data [are] stamped with the researcher's imprint" (Pershkin, 1982, p. 52). To alleviate as much bias as possible, a personal and professional history of the researcher is included as suggested by Seidman (1991) and Pershkin (1982).

The study must be written in such a way that others can read and understand the information. According to Kleine (1990) this writing is problematic in that the writing of ethnography is a socially constructed, recreated form that is in itself a form of discourse (p. 121). To have readers truly understand the report of the observations, the researcher must be allowed to include him or herself in the writing and "allow ourselves to write even more in the first-person singular" (p. 124). Brodkey (1987) more pointedly states that "the single most

important lesson to be learned from ethnographic field work is that experience is not-indeed, cannot be-reproduced in speech or writing, and must instead be narrated" (p. 26). It is the methodology of an ethnographic case study, the involvement in the scene and setting, in the life of the subject on a regular and personal basis that defy the impersonal, third person, academic discourse. The final text authored by the methodology would be very different from the text authored by the academy (Brodkey, 1987). It is through the researcher that the combination of empirical observations and interpretive analysis meet. The dichotomous nature of ethnography confounds the writing of the report when the writer has to move between the world of observation and the world of explication. In the final result, the writer is caught trying to narrate academic discourse.

Case Study/Subject Selection

This study describes and explains the language and educational experiences of a second language learner in a post secondary, community college, setting. The subject was purposefully selected for the following reasons:

- the researcher, in her professional experience, deemed the subject an unusual language student and language learner (Strauss and Corbin, 1990; Merriam, 1988)

- the subject was willing to work with the researcher on this research project ("convenience," Patton qtd. in Seidman, 1991, p. 42)
- the subject was a self-selected unaccompanied minor who was granted refugee status (Haines, 1985)
- the subject immigrated to the United States at age 17 and began studying English as a young adult (Ogbu, 1978, 1990; Cafferty and Rivera-Martinez, 1981; Collier, 1987)
- the subject deems himself a successful learner based on hours of college credit completed and accumulated grade point average ("emic" view, Fetterman, 1989, p. 12 and p. 31; Geetz, 1976, pp. 222-223)
- the subject is deemed successful by the academic community based on college credit completed and accumulated grade point average ("etic" view, Schneider, 1976, p. 199; Fetterman, 1989, p. 32)
- the subject involves himself in language intensive situations (Beebe, 1983)

Research Protocol

Various methods of data collection are necessary in an ethnographic case study:

- observation (Hymes, 1982; Seidman, 1991; Eisenhart, 1988; Yin, 1989; Fetterman, 1989)

- interviewing (Hymes, 1982; Seidman, 1991; Eisenhart, 1988; Yin, 1989; Fetterman, 1989; King, 1974; Wolcott, 1982)
- artifacts and/or documents (Merriam, 1988; Hymes, 1982; Heath, 1982)

It is only by using multiple methods of data collection that the researcher is able to form a complete description of the case. Yin (1989) has recommended that the researcher provide complete details of data collection so that an audit trail can be established.

In accordance with university requirements, the subject signed a release in which he agreed to participate in this study. The form stipulated that the subject's identity would remain anonymous and that all data and records pertaining to the study would also be anonymous or held in strictest confidence. Additionally, the researcher was bound by college policy and state law as they related to the subject's privacy. The subject retained the right to approve all interviews and observations.

The subject was observed in three different classroom settings during the researcher's sabbatical leave. Observations took place over a six month period of time beginning January 1993 and ending in June 1993, winter and spring terms. Together the subject and the researcher contacted the subject's instructors during the first week of classes winter term and received verbal approval for classroom observations. Permission was granted to record

classroom information by tape or transcription.
Instructors were assured that the object of the study was
the subject and not the class, that the transcripts of
classes would only be used in this study, and that the
researcher would not interfere with the class in any way.
The philosophy instructor, who had allowed additional
students into her class, was concerned about available
seats, but assured that the researcher would not displace
students. The physics instructor expressed reservations
about days on which examinations were held; it was agreed
that no observations would be conducted on those days.
There were no reservations or concerns from the two
different writing instructors for winter and spring terms.

In all instances, observations were conducted on
Mondays when the subject had classes in writing,
philosophy, and physics. Each observed class was 50
minutes in length. Descriptions of the classroom setting
and the instructors are included in the transcriptions in
Appendix 4. The subject informed the researcher when he
would not be attending classes, so no observations were
conducted on those days. In those instances when the
researcher was unable to attend the subject's classes, the
subject and researcher were in telephone contact.

Attempts were made to tape record each of the observed
class sessions, but poor tape quality and background noise
made the recordings unintelligible. Hand written
transcriptions were made in each of the observed classes.

These transcriptions were later typed and sorted by date and class. All transcriptions were kept at the researcher's home in a file cabinet. Only those portions of the complete transcripts utilized in Chapter IV are included in Appendix 4 of this study. Entrance and placement test scores were obtained from the college testing office with the permission of the subject. Copies of test scores were retained by the researcher and are not a written part of this thesis.

Although categories of preliminary analysis emerged as the transcripts of classes were being typed, final analysis of the transcriptions commenced at the end of the study. Data were analyzed based on patterns within each class over the course of the study. After patterns of language use and behavior were discovered in one class, similar patterns emerged in other classes. Analysis focused on the subject's verbal class participation and actions in classes. Much of the analysis was concentrated on the physics classes where the subject was the most vocal and the philosophy classes which the subject reiterated as being his favorite and most useful class.

The subject was asked to write journals about his thoughts and reactions to classes and a diary about his time away from school. These documents were transcribed and are included, unedited, in Appendices 2 and 3 of this study. Journals and diaries by the subject permitted the researcher to have glimpses of the subject's thoughts and

concerns regarding classes. The subject submitted a copy of a paper written for a class prior to the commencement of this study when requested to supply information about his escape from Vietnam. A copy of the paper is included in Appendix 1. The subject also requested an unofficial copy of his college transcript for use by the researcher. This transcript, not included as a part of this thesis, was used to verify classes, grades, and progress reported by the subject. Copies of homework, course syllabi, tests, and papers were also provided by the subject; these documents have been returned to the subject for his personal records.

Formal interviews about the subject's life history and background were held at the researcher's home. These interviews were recorded, with hand-written notes as backup. The formal interviews were later transcribed into a narrative and given to the subject for correction and verification. These interviews form the basis of the Profile of the Subject. Permission to interview the subject's extended family members about his life away from the school was denied by the subject. Handwritten notes about informal conversations with the subject and the subject's instructors were recorded after the conversations. These notes were not transcribed, but portions of these conversations are included as support material to the data.

Validity/Replicability

In an ethnographic case study, validity is established through inductive analysis of multiple sources (Gilmore and Smith, 1982; Seidman, 1991; Yin 1989; Merriam, 1988) or triangulation. According to Fetterman (1989), triangulation is the means one uses to test "one source of information against another" in order to "understand more completely . . . and ultimately to put the whole situation into perspective" (p. 89). The use of triangulation improves the quality of the data and makes the findings more accurate because it can work with any topic, from natural conversation to investigative records (Fetterman, 1989).

Triangulation for this study was achieved through a variety of means: interviews, direct observations, participant-observation and physical artifacts (Yin, 1989). Yin states that these contribute to "construct validity . . . because multiple sources of evidence essentially provide multiple measures of the same phenomenon" (p. 97). By including information from a variety of sources, the researcher can ascertain the veracity of the findings.

An audit trail of the time, place, setting, and situation helps fulfill the issues of validity (Eisenhart, 1988). Yin (1989) goes further by including "sufficient citation . . . for] documents, interview, or observations . . . [and] the circumstances under which evidence was

collected" (p. 102) to address researcher bias and research validity. Internal validity was achieved through formal interview and informal conversation with the subject as well as life histories, lists and form, and written and electronic information (Merriam, 1988). Yin (1989) and Fetterman (1989) both stress the importance of having all information checked by participants and informants to help insure validity.

Even through no one can completely replicate any study by recreating exactly the role interpretations and the situations, the researcher attempted to answer positively, the question: "If another person had these experiences, would he identify *these* data as significant?" (King, 1974, p. 409). Since the concern for validity must be directly addressed in ethnographic research, the researcher was concerned with an honest and truthful accounting of her biases by including sufficient and detailed information about all facts, perspectives, and phases of the research. A brief history of the researcher and her experiences has also been included so that personal biases could be more easily identifiable to others.

Background to the Study

The study was conducted in a rural community college. The Office of Research and Planning College Profile report dated January 1994 reported a total yearly headcount of

27,178 students or 4,877 FTE for the 1992-93 academic year; 6,518 students enrolled in lower division college transfer classes. The lower division college transfer classes accounted for 2,250 or 46.1% of the FTE figure. The college employed a total staff of 729 with 512 total faculty. There were 148 fulltime faculty and 364 parttime faculty during the 1992-1993 academic year. Minority student enrollment increased 12.2 percent between 1991-1992 and 1992-1993. There were a total of 1,762 self identified minority students in 1992-1993. Ethnic groups follow:

African American	139
Hispanic	671
American Indian/Alaskan Native	164
Asian or Pacific Islander	788

The college, although considered to be located in a rural area, is situated within 20 minutes of a large metropolitan area. The metropolitan area encompasses a four county area with over a million inhabitants.

Originally this study was intended to describe the language and learning experience of five English as a second language students who had entered the community college from district high schools. The original group consisted of two Hispanic females, both immigrants from Mexico, and three Asian males, two Vietnamese and one Cambodian, all of whom were refugees and unaccompanied minors. All five were enrolled in the same ESL class winter term of 1991. The genders and different ethnic and

family structures, compounded by different schedules and different majors, made any comparison among the group impossible. Also, after initial interviews and questionnaires, the different levels of first language schooling and age of entry into the United Stated further compounded any comparison. Of the original five, only one female and the Vietnamese male reported here remained in the school for the duration of the study. Of the remaining two, only the Vietnamese male has successfully completed his course work at the community college and transferred to a four year school to complete his education.

Profile of the Subject

The subject for this case was a 23 year old Vietnamese male. In 1988, the subject, a 17 year old youth and his 13 year old brother, escaped Vietnam leaving behind his mother and two sisters. His father held a bachelor's degree in Vietnamese literature and taught as a university English professor at a Vietnamese university prior to the subject's birth. The father was able to read, write, and speak Vietnamese, English, and French. He could also read and write Chinese, but was unable to speak it. When the subject was born, his father was serving as a captain/chief of police for a province. Four months before the fall of Saigon, his father began working as a Commander, serving as assistant to the General of the country's police force.

After the fall of Saigon in 1975, the subject's father surrendered himself to the Vietcong and was sent to a Vietcong re-education camp. The majority of his time in the re-education camp was spent in north and central Vietnam. During the father's internment, the mother visited him twice, and the subject visited his father once. While the father was in a re-education camp, the subject lived with his mother, brother, and sisters as well as between maternal relatives, (grandparents, cousins, and aunts). The subject spent one month with his father's parents in an isolated and rural area of the countryside in Vietnam and stated: "While living with my [paternal] grandparents, they had no electricity, plumbing, or running water." By the time his father was released from the re-education camp, the subject, one brother and two sisters were living together in Ben Tre, approximately 80 kilometers from Saigon. His mother was living in Saigon with a younger brother. The subject stated: "My father was very different after returning from the camp. He had started smoking and drinking and his health in general was bad." The subject indicated that his father's deterioration was both mental and physical; he had gone away as a young man and returned an old man. His father died in 1987 at the age of 46 from a stroke and major organ failure in a Saigon hospital. The subject's sister and brother were present.

The subject's mother was a homemaker with 12 years of education. One sister attended college in Vietnam and majored in chemistry. Presently, the mother lives with two daughters, the subject's other sisters, in Saigon. The subject stated: "I attended 11 years of school in Vietnam and completed half of the tenth grade. I studied math (pre-calculus), physical science, chemistry, politics, physical education, geography, world history, and Vietnamese literature. You know, it's not like here. I studied everything everyone else did. I am able to read and write Vietnamese fluently." The subject attended a local, provincial high school and studied the traditionally required classes, as did his brothers and sisters. When asked about his attending school even though his father had been declared an enemy of the people and sent to a re-education camp, the subject replied: "We lived in a small village, so it didn't matter. My sister, though, she's the smart one. She had the highest scores in the province so she, they [the village elders] held a meeting and got a special permission so she, could go to college; otherwise she couldn't go because of my dad."

The subject had originally planned to escape Vietnam in 1980 with a friend of his mother's and other unknown refugees, but after a delay at the pick-up-point of 14 days, the subject returned to Saigon and missed the escape opportunity. He then moved to Ben Tre where he lived with two older sisters between 1981 and 1983. His father lived

with them from 1983 to 1987. The subject escaped in 1988 after his father's death. Because of this delay of eight years, the subject enrolled in local Vietnamese schools. He finally escaped with his younger brother, a cousin, a niece, and other refugees. The trip was harrowing, but far better than some had expected. The escape boat was plagued with multiple engine failures, but each time the boat and refugees were rescued by friendly Thai locals, not the dreaded Thai pirates. The engine failures also created water and food shortages, but again these shortages were alleviated by friendly Thais. On the occasion of one engine failure, a ship from the Thai guard ("like Coast Guard" the subject explained) actually helped repair the engine and then towed the boat back out to sea after provisions were replenished. Unfortunately, the engine failed again within a few hours, and the second Thai landing site was not as friendly as the one the refugee boat had just left. Although no one was killed, shots were fired by a Thai policeman at the boat which had managed to get within swimming distance to shore. As the refugee boat frantically paddled back out into the China Sea, they were once again rescued by friendly Thai ships that loaned them tools to repair the engine and supplied them with additional water. The uncorrected (by the researcher or the writing instructor) and unrevised account of this adventure was written by the subject for one of his writing classes and is included in Appendix 1. This incident, like

many in the subject's life, succeeded. He was scared many times during his escape, but he also feels that he and the others on the boat were very lucky to have escaped unscathed. He indicated that he could not believe some of the horror stories others told of their escape from Vietnam and their encounters with Thai pirates.

The subject finally ended up at Pulau Bidong Refugee Camp in Malaysia. This refugee camp was under the protection of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). He and his brother lived in the men's quarters and spent their days in school studying English. They shared their meals with 10-15 people from the same boat in which they had escaped. In preparation for settlement in the United States, the subject studied English five hours per day for six months. The multi-level classes consisted of 15-20 students. The first three classes were taught by a Vietnamese teacher. The classes were lessons which lasted one to two weeks in length. The majority of the class was conducted in English (80%) with some Vietnamese (20%). The last three classes were taught by a British teacher, so all classes were conducted in English. Materials consisted of each lesson being printed on four to ten pages of paper. The subject learned grammar and vocabulary in the beginning English lessons. He said that he tried to learn an average of 20 words per day. Regarding the last two months in the camp, the subject stated, "I started read children stories, since I started

this I did not attend class regularly but only self-taught."

The subject's resettlement agency was the Intergovernmental Committee for Migrants (ICM). After the subject and his brother were accepted for immigration by the United States Ambassador, ICM scheduled the flight and arrival information. Relatives in the United States were contacted regarding the date of arrival. Both the subject and his brother had to sign an agreement to repay the flight costs once they had arrived in the United States. Upon arrival in the United States, the subject lived with a maternal aunt and one female cousin. The family unit spoke Vietnamese at home. He was enrolled at a metropolitan area high school one week after arrival. After being interviewed and tested in Vietnamese and English, the subject was placed in the tenth grade. He was enrolled in a beginning level ESL class, pre-calculus, physical education, and ESL reading. The ESL class was 10 hours per week and covered skills in listening, speaking, and grammar. His junior year consisted of United States history, calculus, chemistry, economics, and ESL reading, writing, listening, and speaking. His senior year of high school, the subject studied United States government, photography, and ESL reading and writing. He stated that the ESL class really only consisted of going to class four hours per week and talking. He graduated from the high school in 1991 with a 2.9 grade point average. After

completing high school he enrolled in a local community college with a declared major in computer science.

The subject was accepted as a regular high school graduate by the community college. As is common for all fulltime students, he was given the standard college placement tests in English and mathematics (The Assessment and Placement Services for Community Colleges, provided by the College Board). These tests are normed on the college students and subject to periodic review and adjustment, (as deemed necessary, by the mathematics and English departments). All questions on the test are objective. Based on norms established at the college, all students are advised to register in classes appropriate to their entry level; however, exceptions may be made on an instructor recommendation for students whose first language is not English. Placement scores for the subject indicated that his language skills were below those necessary for college level classes: writing and reading tests taken on August 27, 1991, indicate that his local percentile scores were 15%ile and 5%ile respectively; an algebra II test from the same series and date indicated a local percentile score of 65%ile. The same tests taken on September 9, 1991, yielded the following scores based on local percentiles: writing, 12%ile; reading, 10%ile, and algebra II, 91%ile. The subject registered in Writing 10 and Reading 11, remedial classes designed for native English speakers, which were indicated by his placement scores and recommended by the

counseling department; the subject also registered for English 110, a college level reading and writing class designed for English as a second language students and taught by the researcher, CG 114 - New Student Orientation, HE 250 -Personal Health, and MTH 151 - Differential Calculus. Both the Writing 10 and Reading 11 classes noted are non-credit bearing, developmental classes designed for native English speakers. The first term the subject enrolled in 17 hours and completed 13. He was successful in New Student Orientation, English 110, Differential Calculus, Reading Fundamentals, and two of three credit hours in Writing 10/Writing Lab. He received six hours of Pass, two C's (Calculus and ESL), and one D (Personal Health). His grade point average at the end of his first term of college was 2.00. This was the lowest grade point average the subject was to receive over the next nine terms. Eager to begin regular college classes in his major, the subject signed a self advising form to remove himself from developmental classes. By signing the form, the subject made himself ineligible for one-on-one tutoring services. He did agree, however, to continue the ESL course as a non-credit class for an additional term. The second term of classes consisted of the following: Fortran, Introduction to DOS for beginning programming, Introduction to UNIX, Integral Calculus II, General Psychology, Reading and Study Skills, and non-credit ESL. The subject completed 14 hours of credit during his second

term of college and received Pass in four classes, two B's (Fortran and Calculus), and one C (Psychology 201). His grade point average at the end of the second term was 2.66.

His academic track offered few hurdles in the math and sciences courses, but he began to encounter major problems with the required English classes and their prerequisites. It was his struggle with these classes that piqued the researcher's interest. Although able to function and, at times, excel in courses requiring higher level thinking and rhetorical constructs and devices such as psychology and philosophy, the subject continued to have problems in the required Writing 121 and Writing 122 classes, registering in each class and then changing to an audit before successfully completing the class the second time, from another instructor.

The subject's success in classes which required abstract language and conceptual skills (such as General Psychology 210, 202, 201 and Philosophy 101) compared to his inability to succeed in required writing classes baffled him. It is the subject's experiences in the academic setting that form the basis of this study. As an English and English as a second language teacher and an advisor to the subject and other second language students, the researcher began to re-consider the role of language in academic preparation and the experiences and characteristics that lead to academic success. In the true

sense of the words, this study is teacher/student based and classroom oriented.

The Research Instrument

In the case study design, the researcher is the research instrument. The researcher needs to be responsive and adaptable in order to consider the whole process. The researcher needs to be able to clarify and summarize the words, thoughts, and actions of the subject, yet understand that both the subject and the researcher are involved in an evolutionary process (Merriam, 1988, p. 19). It is through the researcher's eyes, ears, and pen that the subject's perspectives are expressed. The thin line between the subject and the researcher can be compared to a web. A web is able to give and take, yet catch that which is necessary. According to Eisenhart (1988), "the researcher must be involved in the activity as an insider and able to reflect upon it as an outsider" (p. 103).

Since an ethnographic case study focuses on process and meaning in context, it requires an instrument or data collection instrument "sensitive to underlying meaning when gathering and interpreting data. Humans are best suited for this task" (Merriam, 1988, p. 3). Humans within a sociocultural context compose the parts and pieces of the inside and outside of ethnographic or qualitative research.

In keeping with the recommendation of Seidman (1991) to include a researcher autobiography, I hope to show how and why I have chosen an ethnographic case study, and how and why it has chosen me (Pershkin, 1982).

Profile of the Researcher

My interest in students as learners began when I lived and worked in Spanish speaking countries and realized the difficulty of living each and every day in a foreign language and culture. I grew to admire those who could live, learn, and work in a second or foreign language environment. As a participant in another language and culture over a period of time, I became interested in the how and why of some people's success and other people's failure to adjust outside of their native language and culture. As Pershkin (1982) points out, one is drawn toward either qualitative or quantitative study design because of personal interest. It is difficult to say whether I was drawn to ethnography because of my interest in students, because of my interest in living and working in another language, or because of my interest in the methods of ethnographic research. As Gilligan (1982) has noted, perhaps the female predisposition to look at life differently from males has also influenced me toward an ethnographic study. Regardless, I fit ethnography and it fits me. An ethnography of a second language learner's

thoughts and actions in a school setting, intrigues me. According to King (1974), teachers are involved in the business of observing, "recording data is an expected teacher behavior, and interest in the general community as well as individual students . . . is applauded when demonstrated by teachers" (p. 400). My academic and professional preparation have instilled in me a curiosity about the way people live, think, and act. As a teacher, I am doing what comes naturally, observing and writing about it; as the researcher, I am the research instrument.

I have always been interested in language, people, and travel. I studied two years of Latin in high school and passed my college boards in Latin before I was a senior. I started college and continued as an English major throughout my undergraduate study. During my senior year of college, however, I became interested in English as a second language and enrolled in a certificate program to teach ESL. My courses included two years of college Spanish, Latin American history, anthropology (Peoples and Cultures of the World-Southeast Asia and the Pacific), ESL methodology, intercultural communication, and 21 hours of linguistics (Phonemics and Phonetics, Morphology, Applied Linguistic Theory, etc.). While I was an undergraduate student, I worked as an ESL tutor in an adult ESL program and privately tutored a Mexican high school student in English. I graduated with a BA in English and an ESL certificate in 1972.

After graduation, I began teaching ESL to an adult ESL night class in a community college. After one term, I was asked to teach adult basic education for the same school on a fulltime basis. In 1975 I was permanently employed to teach adult basic education and General Education Development (GED) classes by the community college. My classes consisted of the five different GED test areas: English, mathematics, science, history, and literature. In 1976, I was asked to coordinate and design an ESL program for the influx of Southeast Asians. I served as ESL coordinator from 1976 to 1987. As ESL Coordinator I was responsible for writing and monitoring the federal grant that supported the refugee/ESL program, hiring and training personnel, scheduling classes, and curricula, in addition to teaching ESL classes. I also designed and implemented a volunteer tutor training program and served as the college refugee program representative at state and federal meetings.

In 1981 I took a one term sabbatical to field test a video English program (which I had helped write and produce) for a state university, the Office of Refugee Resettlement, and the Center for Applied Linguistics. Between 1983 and 1987 I served as the college representative in a four college refugee programs consortium. I also served on the ESL Curriculum Task Force for the department of education for six years. Concurrent to this, I took additional classes in ESL methodology and

testing for adult ESL students and designed a college level ESL program for the English Department at the community college.

While working fulltime, I pursued a Master's degree in Liberal Arts/Studies at a private, liberal arts college. My major professor was Dr. Carole Urzua, a specialist in first and second language acquisition. From her I learned about the ethnographic techniques of observation and interviewing and whole language learning. Under her tutelage I conducted a mini-ethnographic study of a Laotian student in a local junior high school. My purpose was to determine how he coped in regular classes and provoked comprehensible input (Krashen, 1982, 1985) from his teachers and fellow students. I also studied reading, linguistics, and intercultural communication from a graduate student of John Gumperz. I graduated with an MAT in Liberal Arts/Studies with an emphasis in reading and language acquisition in 1983.

In 1985 I was recommended for an English for Specific Purposes teaching position at a private language school in San Jose, Costa Rica. I went to Costa Rica fall term of 1985 for three months. I designed, wrote, recorded, and taught materials in the language of international banking. While in San Jose I lived with a single Costa Rican woman, who spoke no English, and her teenage daughter, who spoke a little English. Living and working as a Costa Rican, I began to truly understand the complexities of second

language acquisition and proficiency. I returned to my regular teaching schedule in January of 1986 and applied for a Fulbright Scholarship.

I competed in and was selected in national competition for a 1987-1988 Senior Fulbright Lecturer Scholarship to teach writing and American literature in the English Department at the University of Panama. In addition to my scheduled classes, I team-taught a study skills class in English for freshman English majors. I lived with a sixty year old Panamanian widow, whom I had met previously, for the first three months of my one year award. The woman had taught Spanish conversational skills to United States military personnel, and her three adult children are all bilingual. These three months allowed me to re-orient myself to Spanish and learn about the Panamanian culture. Because of the political and social unrest under Noreiga, it was important that I be attuned to the Panamanian view point. Three months after arriving in Panama, I moved into an apartment in a middle/upper class neighborhood. I was the only American in the building.

In addition to my teaching duties at the University, I worked closely with the Regional English Training Officer (RETO) for the U.S. Information Service (USIS). We presented two and three day ESL methodology seminars throughout the country for K-12 public and private school teachers. Another Fulbright professor and I also established a two month series of Saturday Seminars for ESL

teachers in the Panama City area. As 1988 began, heightened confrontations between students and the Panamanian Defense Force (PDF) caused the University to close intermittently. After one particularly explosive incident at the University entrance, the rector closed the University for two months. During this time, I returned to the United States for two weeks then flew to Costa Rica to wait for the University to open.

While on my hiatus in Costa Rica from Panama, I stayed with the same Costa Rican woman I had lived with in 1985 and began private Spanish lessons. I was contacted by the USIS office in Panama and by the Panamanian RETO who was also in Costa Rica waiting for clearance to return to Panama. He and I began to work as native language informants and language experts for the Costa Rican Department of Education by reading and correcting the national secondary English language proficiency examination. We also gave presentations on ESL/EFL methodology at the University of Costa Rica (UCR) and the Costa Rican/American Binational Center in San Jose and the Universidad Nacional Autonoma (UNA) in Heredia, a town near San Jose. I was asked to consider a transfer from Panama to UNA by the ESL teacher trainer.

After two months the University of Panama re-opened for one week. I flew back to Panama City to give my finals, and because of the continued political and economic deterioration, asked to be transferred to UNA in Costa

Rica. I packed my car and drove from Panama City to San Jose within two weeks. Since classes had already started in Costa Rica, I was asked to design a class on current ESL/EFL methodology and present it to English teaching majors from both UCR and UNA in a combined class at alternating campuses. I also taught English conversation to UNA staff and professors and helped the UNA ESL teacher trainer design a two track, one track for adult education and one track for K-12, ESL master's degree program. I continued to work with the RETO, who had been transferred from Panama, and we conducted materials and methodology seminars in rural Costa Rica and at the Binational Center in San Jose. I returned to my teaching position at the community college in the fall of the 1988-89 academic year.

I returned to the community college for two terms of the 1989-90 academic year. While home, I taught the college transfer ESL class and developmental reading classes. I returned to teach at UNA as a Fulbright Professor for an additional six months at the end of the second term. In Costa Rica for my second Fulbright experience, I was solely responsible for supervising the student teachers who were majoring in ESL. I conducted methodology classes for the UNA ESL students and local secondary teachers and students and served as the representative for ESL studies in the Educational Research and Study Department (CIDE). I also helped the USIS RETO establish an English language test and program for a new

Costa Rican Exterior Department diplomatic training corps.
I returned to the U.S. in the summer of 1989.

I applied for and was accepted into the doctoral
program at a state university. I was granted a Graduate
Teaching Assistant position and taught Reading Methodology
in ESL and Grammar for ESL/EFL Teachers to master's and
doctoral students while I was working 75% at the community
college and taking classes at the university. My classes
at the community college consisted of college level ESL
reading and writing, developmental reading, and study
skills classes. I volunteered as a tutor in a local high
school ESL program during the 1991-1992 academic year.
Students were enrolled in ESL, but English was not taught
as a subject; some students worked on homework from other
classes with a paid aide or me, and other students read
novels in their native language and told the teacher or
aide about what they had been reading. This experience led
me to formulate this study. I became very interested in
the learning experiences and educational experiences
available to ESL students and wondered about the success
and failure of students after completing a similar high
school ESL class. I was given a sabbatical during the
1992-1993 academic year.

While on sabbatical I observed ESL students in regular
college classes, studied, and traveled. I worked as a
temporary English Teaching Fellow in Nitra, Slovakia, at
the Pedagogical University, where I advised on ESL/EFL

methodology and materials, wrote placements tests, taught classes, and conducted seminars. This trip was followed by a two-part USIS Academic Specialist assignment in Sonora, Mexico. In Mexico I conducted seminars/workshops on ESL/EFL theory and methodology and advised on format, curricula, personnel, methods, and materials for a new English language center. In addition to these assignments, I have conducted seminars and workshops on ESL/EFL methodology and theory in Thailand and Hungary. I have also taught two graduate classes on multicultural education for a private university. After my sabbatical, I was transferred to the English Department at the community college where I have taught for 20 years. I am currently teaching composition (Writing 121 and Writing 123) to both native and non-native English speakers and American literature. I continue to teach the college level ESL class and continue to study Spanish.

CHAPTER IV

OBSERVATION DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to identify possible characteristics, experiences, and observable qualities and/or strategies which may contribute to second language learner success in a post secondary institution. This research involved the language and learning experiences of an unaccompanied male Vietnamese minor in a post secondary, community college, setting. Two basic or guiding questions served as a focus for this study: (1) How does the subject perceive his language and educational experience? and (2) What kinds of observable personality, cognitive, or affective factors contributed to his language and educational experience, and in what way did they contribute?

An ethnographic case study was chosen as the research methodology because ethnography is capable of dealing with multiple realities (Merriam, 1988). The research happens "*in situ*" and can be used on any size social unit (Glaser and Strauss, 1967), is holistic (Mehan, 1982), and is suited to a current problem or topic in a socio-cultural context (Fetterman, 1989). A single case study design is recommended when the case represents a "typical case," or an "extreme or deviant case," (Patton, 1989, qtd. in

Seidman, 1991, p. 42). Case or subject selection is purposeful (Seidman, 1991). Validity in case study design is established by using multiple methods of inquiry, or triangulation: observation and participant-observation (Hymes, 1982; Merriam, 1988; Fetterman, 1989), interpretation (Geetz, 1976; Houlette, 1984; Hymes, 1982), description (Heath, 1982; Wolcott, 1982), artifacts and documents (Yin, 1989; Merriam, 1988), and interviews (Seidman, 1991; Yin, 1989).

The subject of this study was a Vietnamese male who had immigrated to the United States as a 17 year-old refugee unaccompanied minor. The subject had been in the United States approximately four years and had graduated from an American high school. At the time of the study, the subject was enrolled as a fulltime student in a two year college transfer degree program in computer science at a rural community college. The subject was attending college on grants and worked a few hours a week as a workstudy tutor for the mathematics department. He was in his sixth term of classes at the college and making progress toward his academic goal of completing his first two years of college and transferring to a four year institution.

The subject had taken two terms of ESL classes from the researcher when he first entered the college. The researcher also served as an informal academic advisor to the subject in conjunction with the college foreign student

advisor. As the college ESL instructor and an academic
advisor to ESL students, the researcher and the subject
were in regular contact prior to the commencement of the
study.

Observations were conducted over a two term, six
month, period of time during the 1992-1993 academic year.
The subject was observed in three different classes:
physics (with calculus), philosophy, and English
composition. In both physics and philosophy, the subject
was enrolled in the second and third terms of a three term
sequence. Throughout the sequences, the instructors were
the same in their respective classes. Only one instructor
taught the physics sequence; however, several other
instructors taught the philosophy sequence. The writing
courses were the first and second terms of a three class
series of required writing classes. Both writing classes
were taught by up to 20 different fulltime and part-time
instructors and offered year round, including summers. All
observations were with the consent and approval of both the
subject and the instructors. Other students in the classes
observed were unaware of the research.

Over the course of the research, the subject was asked
to supply journal entries about his thoughts and reactions
to his classes. He was also asked to keep a diary about
what he did with his time away from school. Complete
transcriptions of the subject's journal can be found in
Appendix 2, the diary in Appendix 3. The subject was

enrolled in classes which, for the most part, utilized lectures. Each instructor modified the lecture format to accommodate the particular academic specialty with varying degrees of success. Small groups were included in the lecture format with varying degrees of control and effectiveness by the philosophy and writing instructors. Throughout the observations, the amount, use, and variety of language to which the subject was exposed was extensive. The subject's adaptation, accommodation, and reaction to each class varied, as did his real and perceived success.

Classroom Formats

Writing

The Writing 121 class consisted of the instructor lecturing for brief periods of time and then individually engaging each student in a discussion of the student's topic for the next paper. These exchanges took place in the public forum of the class with other students listening, talking, or reading as the instructor moved from one student to another:

> The instructor starts around the room, calling on students individually about their topic for the narrative paper. . . . The subject is called upon next, and he still doesn't have a topic (not unlike the majority of students). He managed to keep the conversation going with the instructor by asking for more clarification of narration. . . . The instructor then continued circulating around the room asking students if they had come

> up with a topic yet. The subject volunteered a
> question about a description of the Senior Prom.
> The instructor played it down as "not fresh" and
> "everyone here knows about it." The subject
> continues to ponder about a topic. The class
> ends with the instructor saying, "Each of you
> has a unique view point. Try brainstorming.
> Brainstorming is good."
> (Writing 121 Observation notes, January 25)

Since the instructor stated that each person had a unique

point of view, it is interesting that he discouraged the

subject from writing about the senior prom. As a second

language learner and immigrant to the United States, the

subject's point of view may have been very different from

another student who had grown up with the cultural notion

of the prom. While the instructor stated that viewpoints

were unique, he did not necessarily practice this belief.

The message to the subject was that unique view points did

not really matter, the paper topic had to be acceptable to

the instructor.

While the subject was not successful in his attempt to

write about a topic in which he was interested, he was

successful in engaging the instructor in a public

discussion that ended in a draw for both involved parties.

The subject's techniques were very similar to those

employed by other students in the class. As observation

notes throughout the Writing 121 class illustrate, other

students in the class expressed confusion and frustration

about the instructor's assignments as well:

> Throughout the observations, she [a former
> reading student] asked me many times to clarify
> assignments or lectures made by the instructor. . . .
> Additionally, two male students stopped the
> researcher in the cafeteria one day to ask me to
> explain what the instructor had said.
> (Writing 121 Observation notes, January 11)
> At 3:57, a male student asked for more
> clarification of the writing.
> (Writing 121 Observation notes, February 8)
>
> Students were to have written out topic sentences
> and thesis statements to be handed in this class
> period. The subject thought the sentences and
> statements were to be discussed orally, not
> written, so he is unprepared. At 3:30 p.m. the
> subject is writing his definition topic as the
> instructor talks. At 3:40 the instructor begins
> calling on students to discuss their topics. . . .
> This class he [the instructor] is making more of
> an effort to discuss the topic one-on-one with
> each student, but the rest of the class is not
> engaged in the discussion. Students are reading,
> writing, and talking to one another as the
> instructor moves from student to student. The
> subject is carrying on a conversation with the
> female from Holland.
> (Writing 121 Observation notes, February 8)

The class seemed to combine public and private

performances. The public performance was in the form of a

one-on-one discussion on a weekly basis with the instructor

in front of the class, and the private performance was in

the actual weekly writing assignments which the instructor

graded privately. All students, regardless of age,

language ability, or gender were expected and required to

have open, public discussions with the instructor. Writing

assignments were graded and good ones anonymously read by

the instructor to the class.

Although this class was the first in a two or three

part sequence of writing classes, the instructor assumed

that the students knew the vocabulary of writing such as awk for awkward, agr for agreement, frag for fragment, and v tense for verb consistency (Writing 121 Observation notes, January 11). The instructor introduced words such as "persona", thesis and statement of purpose and used the words as though all students understood them. On February 8, the subject asked the instructor to explain some of the terms:

> Subject: I don't understand the difference between statement of purpose and thesis.
>
> Instructor: They're similar.

As this brief public exchange demonstrated, the subject tried to get much needed information so he could successfully complete the assignments, yet the instructor could not or would not comply. The subject continued to ponder the meaning of the vocabulary of the class and persisted in asking questions about an in-class writing which went unanswered:

> Instructor: Describe and analyze your habits and responses to each medium [television and reading]. Use examples of shows and types of shows you watch, and reading material and types of reading material you read to illustrate your essay's points. Questions?
>
> Subject: What do you mean?
>
> Instructor: (unintelligible)
>
> Subject: (unintelligible)

```
Instructor:  P---, you're forcing me to rethink
             and reword my assignment - this one's too
             succinct.
             (Writing 121 Observation notes, February 22)
```

Although the subject tried to understand what the
instructor wanted in the assignments, whenever he asked
questions in class the instructor was not able to supply
sufficient information to thwart frustration. The
instructor required that students use ample specific
examples in their own writing, but he himself was unable to
supply specific examples when requested to do so by a
student. Throughout the course the subject struggled to
understand and supply what the instructor wanted. The
successful completion of this class was very important to
the subject because without it, he would be unable to
finish his two year degree program and transfer to a four
year school. His frustration was expressed in the journal
written for this research towards the end of class:

> Wed, Feb 24
>
> I haven't learned anything from English class
> since it's new topic and I'am [sic] quite
> understand it so I'am [sic] kind of lost in the
> class even though I had prepared the material
> ahead.

Unfortunately, the subject correctly evaluated his writing
and his writing class experience. As an observer and guest
in the class, I was helpless to intervene; the most I could
do was serve as a tutor and proofreader for the subject as
he tried to understand the course material and deal with

his frustration. The subject's struggle to learn in an indifferent environment illustrates his ability to persevere. The subject was able to persist with his questions in a public situation when he asked for clarification and able to deal with the lack of competence on the part of the instructor to adequately explain concepts and expectations for written assignments. The subject successfully completed the class with a C and was able to enroll in Writing 122 the following term.

The subject seemed to be realistic about his grades and his goal of completing the required writing classes. He knew that in order to transfer to a four year institution he had to complete certain courses; two writing classes, Writing 121 and Writing 122, were the recommended classes. In an informal conversation in my office when I again asked if I could interview his roommates and family members, another student was present. The subject reiterated his position that I could not interview his roommates and family members, and when pressed, said that his family didn't think he was very smart. When I queried him about the definition of smart, he hesitated and mumbled something about his grades not being as good as his cousins'. I asked him if his cousins had 4.0 grade point averages, and he replied that they did. I also asked if his cousins had taken the required writing classes so they could receive a four year college degree, and he replied that they had not. The subject seemed to understand that

as long as he passed the required writing classes with a C or better and maintained A's and B's in classes pertaining to his major, he would be able to attain his goal of a four year degree. The subject appeared to be more concerned with his ultimate, long term goal of a Bachelor's degree than he was with the short term goal of perfect grades. It seems that the subject was able to separate himself from family and peer pressure when there was a conflict between what he knew he needed and what others thought he needed. After the subject had left, the student whom I was advising was incredulous. She looked at me and said, "That's incredible. He's helped me in the math lab, and he's one of the smartest people I know there. It's just too bad his English isn't better. I can't believe it!" This brief, informal discussion about grades was the most the subject discussed about his family. The fact that the subject was seen as smart by other students may have helped to bolster his view of himself and contributed to his determination to reach his goal of a four year degree.

The Writing 122 class proved to be very much like the Writing 121 class. The instructor, a Fulbright educational exchange professor from England, had a different teaching manner and a different accent from the Writing 121 instructor, and, in many ways, he was clearer in his expectations. He frequently used the overhead projector to demonstrate what students needed to know in order to be successful in class. For example, overhead projection

information was provided for a correct "Works Cited" page as this was a new topic for many of the students in the class. Other overhead projection sheets were also provided for grading and coding information specific to the instructor, for example p meant punctuation, ww meant wrong word, and sp meant spelling. Again, the subject had to adapt to individual instructional differences in grading and correcting techniques with little information before the first paper. Unlike Writing 121 where writing is discussed as a general topic, Writing 122 deals with argument and persuasion on controversial topics. This particular instructor had a theme such as euthanasia or immigration for the week or the day, depending on the topic. Again, as noted earlier, this instructor used many overheads and videos to give the students background information on the selected topic, but students were responsible for their own devices in figuring out a stance to take on a given topic and the style of argument and persuasion. The topics were discussed in a large group with students volunteering to contribute to the class discussion. Unless students volunteered comments or questions, they were never called upon or singled out by the instructor as they had been in Writing 121. The subject never volunteered any public comments or questions to the entire class during the observations. On one occasion, however, the subject wrote in his Journal as though he had actually spoken in class:

April 19, '93

> I had tough time justify my view and others
> about my reason to be here in this . . .
> country when we talked about immigrant in
> U.S.

I had observed the class on April 19, so I knew that the subject had not spoken. His journal entry could only refer to some inner conversation the subject was having. Unlike the previous writing class where the subject had been forced by the instructor to speak publicly, the Writing 122 instructor left the decision solely with the individual student.

The basic format for this writing class was lecture, visuals in the form of overheads, videos, and handouts (also on overheads) for each student, and small group discussion. The instructor functioned as a facilitator by briefly introducing the topic and medium for the topic and then asking questions to promote discussion. While the instructor was informal in mannerism (smiling, sitting on the table at the front of the room, and walking around the front of the room as he talked), there was an air of formality because of his tie and accent.

The instructor utilized small groups for rough draft discussions. Students formed small groups of three or four from among themselves to read and evaluate rough drafts of papers. The subject was only observed in one small group, but he wrote about another group in a journal entry:

Apr 30, '93

> We have our draft paper compare [sic]
> together. I realize that how bad my paper
> [sic] and my English skill compare [sic] to
> others. . . . My skills about English is
> needed more help badly [sic] in order to catch
> up with others.

From the subject's entry, it is apparent that he

participated in the small group practice of submitting the

current paper for others' comments and criticism. It is

also apparent that the group exchange demonstrated to the

subject that his English writing skills were lower than

those of the other group members. The peer editing may

have contributed to the subject's realistic analysis of his

English skills.

At the observation on May 10 I was able to witness a

small group discussion in which the subject participated:

> The subject joined one male and one female.
> The male passed his paper around first. His
> paper was pretty good on "How to Become a
> Millionaire." The female student didn't have
> anything to read. She's talking about other
> things and wondering where she put her voter's
> pamphlet. The subject passed his paper around.
> He [the subject] let them read his [paper], but
> with very little comment from the other students.
> The subject correctly responded to #4 with "there
> is no point." Both of the other students think
> that the subject's paper is "interesting." Now
> the other two students are talking to each other.
> The subject is shaking his foot and finally
> engaged me in a discussion of where to get a new
> computer memory program.
> (Writing 122 Observation notes)

While the small groups may have been effective with other

students, the group I witnessed was a failure, especially

so if students were to evaluate one another's papers. The female student was unprepared while the two male students were prepared; one paper was good and the other paper, that of the subject, was said by the male student to be "interesting", a polite word for incomprehensible. As in the Writing 121 class when the subject persisted in asking questions in a public forum, the subject did not shirk from sharing his paper in a public forum. The subject's small group did not discuss any elements of the two papers other than to comment that one was "good" and one was "interesting".

However, the small group work may have made it possible for the subject to realize that his writing was inadequate for college work and inferior to other students' writing as noted in his journal entry dated April 30:

> Apr 30, '93
>
> English: We have our draft paper compare
> [sic] together. I realize that [sic] how
> bad my paper and my English skill compare
> to others . . . . My skills about English
> is needed more help badly in order to catch
> up with others.

This was the first and only time the subject explicitly stated that his English skills needed to be improved. Perhaps the peer evaluation or lack of evaluation helped him realize that his written English skills needed more work. Perhaps it was this lack of response from the other students that had affected the subject when he made the

journal entry about his own writing on April 30:

> English: We have our draft paper compare [sic]
> together. I realize that how bad my paper [sic]
> and my English skill compare[sic] to others.
> . . . My skills about English is needed [sic]
> more help badly [sic] in order to catch up with
> others.

The intent of the instructor to use other students to
critique rough drafts and make students aware of writing
for the reader may have benefited the subject in unexpected
ways. By reading other students' papers, the subject was
made aware of his own mistakes.

Another device employed by this instructor was
individual appointments. Appointments were scheduled for
the fourth week of classes to discuss students' work to
that point. Classes were canceled the week of
appointments. As a courtesy, the instructor rescheduled
the subject's appointment so that I could attend. I
attended the conference as an observer, not a participant.
The instructor opened the conference with a reference to
the subject's most recent paper. The paper under
discussion was much better than any that the subject had
previously written, and the instructor was encouraging
about the subject's possibility for success. The subject
had borrowed papers from another student and had carefully
followed the instructions from another Writing 122 class.
As noted in the observation notes, the subject was
encouraged with his progress in writing, but the following

week learned that he could not pass the class. The subject agreed to change his registration from a grade to an audit, but after more consideration he ceased attending the class altogether so he could concentrate more on his other classes.

The subject had entered Writing 122 with the hopes of being able to complete the class the first time, but he was advised to audit/withdraw or fail. He was disappointed with having to take Writing 122 a second time. (Note: The subject enrolled in and completed Writing 122 in the fall of 1993. He carefully followed all written and oral instructions for the second class and received a C.) It is interesting to note that the subject audited from one instructor and then enrolled for a grade in a class taught by a different instructor.

Physics

The format for the physics class was a combination of lecture and lab. All references to the format of the physics classes are based on observations of the lecture portion of the course; no lab classes were observed. The physics class was the second term of a three term sequence. Observations in the physics classes were limited to a total of six over a two term period. The lecture classes were very informal with the students and the instructor being on a first name basis. Students wandered in and out of class,

read the paper, ate lunch, and chatted about physics, taxes, other classes, and weekends. Students tended to sit in small groups or clusters at the tables and often worked on problems from the homework assignments, before, during, and after class. Classes started on time and consisted of the instructor working homework problems on the board. Outside of occasional banter, the class worked problems, discussed the assigned homework, or prepared for exams the entire class period. The subject generally came to class with his homework prepared; however, he did not always carry his book because "it is so heavy." Since the physics class was in the subject's major, the instructor (and I) assumed that the subject understood the subject matter and concepts and possessed sufficient skills in mathematics to successfully complete the sequence. The subject had received a B the previous term.

Because classtime was spent working problems, there was limited interaction between students during classtime other than those sitting together. What interaction I observed throughout the two terms was limited to homework problems or brief exchanges about current events or other classes. Prior to the first observation, the subject had been helping other students with their homework in the study area outside the classroom. At the first observation on January 11, I was introduced to what would become a typical physics observation: I watched the subject who watched the instructor work problems on the board and

proofread a paper for the subject's writing class. As was
common for the subject he rarely took notes, so I was
surprised to see him erase a part of one of his problems:

> At the first observation I noticed the subject
> erasing half a page of a problem. When I asked
> what he was doing, he said that he had done
> 'half the problem right.'
> (Physics Observation notes, January 11)

Although the subject had helped other students, he had
done at least one of the problems incorrectly. It is
interesting that the subject chose to focus on the "right"
portion of the problem, not the wrong portion.

The subject did have some problems with physics,
however, as noted in the observation notes of January 25:
". . . the subject copied three of the complete problems
from the board." Diary excerpts written by the subject
shortly after this observation confirmed that he was having
problems with some of the concepts in physics, yet other
students continued to ask him for help with their homework:

> Monday 2/15
>
> I start a day with worrying about my Physics
> test. I study hard a day before though
> but test will be hard as my instructor told.
>   In test room I could [not ?] solved one
> problem since I did not know how to do it on
> home-work neither. But I feel very confident
> with the . . . answers.
> (Subject's Diary)

Although the subject felt confident about his answers, in
fact he discovered that he had not done well on the test:

Wednesday 2/17

> I go to school at 8:30 am and in Physic [sic]
> class I found out that I misunderstand the
> concepts of chapters 15 & 17 that leads to the
> ways I solve problems wrong but I thought they
> are right. I got 67% on the test. I leaving
> of the class with disappointment and confusion
> of the way I study. . . . At two o'clock I
> talk with a friend in piano class and try to
> study at the same time so I can relax after
> anxious of the test score and get ready for
> next class.
> (Subject's Diary)

It is obvious that the subject was very concerned and upset about his 67% grade on the physics exam. I had requested that the subject make a distinction between journal entries and diary entries so that I could distinguish between his reactions and thoughts about classes (journals) and his time management and study habits (diary), yet the diary entries about the physics exam are very much like his class reaction journal entries. The fact that the subject mentioned the physics exam in his diary entry both before and after the exam reveal that he was troubled before the exam and distressed with his grade after the exam. Outside of the two diary entries, the subject never again mentioned the 67% test score. He continued to study physics and managed to get a C for the class. Although the subject was disappointed that he received a C in physics, he registered for the final class of the physics sequence.

The format for the third and final term of the physics sequence was the same as the previous term. The students in the class had now spent an academic year together, and

although the class size dwindled slightly, no new students were introduced to upset the comraderie. The subject was observed three times during the month of May. The subject had overcome his disappointment of the previous term and come back with renewed interest and new knowledge as demonstrated by the class observations of May 2:

> . . . the instructor wrote one particularly
> long and complicated problem on the board.
> The subject, by whom I was sitting, waited
> patiently for the instructor to finish. . . .
> his [the subject's] rendition was much shorter
> and less complicated. After the instructor had
> finished the problem, the subject spoke: 'I
> have a quick question. Why don't you use sine
> or cosine?' (Speaking without raising his hand.)
> The instructor was still studying his own
> problem on the board.) . . . he [the instructor]
> responded, 'Yeh, sine would make the problem
> easier.'
> (Physics Observation notes, May 2)

After class I asked the subject how he had known the problem could be done a shorter way. He explained that he had a Vietnamese friend who was very good at mathematics and had helped him with the problems. The final term of the three term sequence, I observed that the subject was much more assertive. Throughout the observations, few questions had been asked by any students. The questions that were asked consisted of points of clarification on the homework assignments or formula explanations. The subject showed no reluctance to speak when he thought the problem could have been done more simply. Whether his confidence about speaking in class was a result of his receiving

tutoring from a Vietnamese friend or the exposure to the
public forum of the Writing 121 class is unknown. A
similar situation arose during the observation on May 17.
The class banter was more evident on this date and everyone
in the class seemed jovial. The board problems were very
complicated and several students asked questions about the
problems, including the subject. The instructor was so
caught up in the problem on the board the subject repeated
his question two times before finally being understood by
some of the other students. Several other students then
began to question the instructor's formula and mathematics.
The subject persisted as did other students until the
instructor stopped working and studied the problem on the
board. I was so intrigued by the support and enthusiasm
shown for the subject's question, that I forgot to take
notes (Physics Observation notes, May 17). The instructor
finally conceded that his problem was wrong and changed his
answer, without ever commenting to the subject or the
class. A similar situation happened with another student
at the same observation. The instructor was so absorbed in
his own calculations that he was unable or unwilling to
concentrate on what students were saying. No one seemed
offended by the instructor's non-response, and the jovial
nature of the class was not disturbed.

Like the Writing 121 Observations, the May 17 Physics
Observation demonstrated the subject's perseverance in
pursuing issues in a public forum. In the writing class

the subject had persisted in his questions to the instructor in order to clarify assignments, but in physics he persisted because he knew that the instructor had made a mistake. The subject had remedied his confusion about physics homework and problems from the previous term by studying more and differently with the help of a Vietnamese tutor/friend. His new-found knowledge and confidence in physics allowed him to get and hold the floor until others in class rallied around him. As an observer to the scene, the subject and other students did not seem offended by the instructor's non-response. It appeared that the calculations involved in these particular problems were so complicated that the instructor was lost deep in thought as he worked at the board. This instructor's non-response seemed different in intent from that of the Writing 121 instructor. In the case of the physics class, the instructor did not appear to be avoiding the challenge from the subject and other students, he was simply absorbed in thought.

At the final physics observation on May 24 the instructor demonstrated total internal reflection, optics, and lasers. This class the instructor lectured more than at other observations. He also demonstrated everything he was discussing. Students were given the opportunity to examine optical and medical fibers, and the instructor demonstrated polarization. Since the subject planned to major in computers and lasers, he was very comfortable with

the demonstrations and tried to briefly explain some of the demonstrations to me.

With the exception of the 67% test, the subject appeared very confident throughout the observations in the physics class. For the most part the subject came to class prepared and participated like any other student, following the homework problems on the board and asking questions if there were differences in how problems were worked. Basically, the subject acted in manner and dress like all the other male students in the class.

Philosophy

The final type of class format the subject experienced was straight lecture. The subject had chosen philosophy as his humanities sequence. The class was full with 30-35 students in regular attendance. The instructor was in the classroom prior to the start of class for students who wanted to ask her questions. Class started precisely on time with the instructor standing behind a podium and lecturing from written notes. She paused frequently throughout the lecture to answer questions, but questions were rarely asked. She also wrote words, names, definitions, new vocabulary, and abbreviations on the board. The instructor spoke clearly, in complete phrases or sentences. She used no slang and explained all vocabulary. Following are paraphrased examples of the

vocabulary and her explanations from two observations:

> January 11
>
> [Traditional is from the time of the Greeks
> to the 1900's or turn of the century]
> [presuppositions is a generic term - what you
> take for granted, don't question - we assume]
> Some principles are absolute. [Absolute means
> obligatory to all people at all times; these
> principles are binding.]
>
> January 25
>
> . . . Emotions are feelings. Principles
> require intellect. This is the difference
> between traditional philosophy and modern
> philosophy.
> . . . Utilitarianism is analogous to computer
> programming. You get out what you put in.

The lectures were full of vocabulary and information

necessary for philosophical discussions. When I observed

that the subject was not taking notes (and I was writing

furiously), I asked him about it after class. He replied,

"It too hard. I just listen and remember." Perhaps it was

the organized manner in which the instructor presented

information that helped the subject to remember the

lecture. The subject did, however, take notes twice during

the observations, and he always copied whatever the

instructor wrote on the board. Also, the instructor always

used common, practical, modern examples to provide proof of

what she was saying: an acorn becomes a tree (Philosophy

Observation notes, January 11); the televised Clinton/Bush

debate and child crime from a radio talk show (Philosophy

Observation notes, January 20); and the Energizer Bunny (Philosophy Observation notes, January 25).

In addition to the lectures, the instructor divided the class into pre-assigned small groups approximately four to six times per term. Unlike the small groups of the Writing 122 class, the philosophy class small groups were very structured. Students were assigned to a specific group, and each group was given a set of questions or issues to discuss. Discussions were timed, and the groups were expected to appoint a spokesperson to report back to the class as a whole at the end of the time limit. As in the Writing 122 class, the subject came prepared to participate in the small group discussion, other students did not. In the two observed small group discussions, the subject was the first to speak (Philosophy Observation notes, January 25 and February 22):

> The subject was the first person in the group
> to speak. He addressed female number one,
> "What do you think?" When she didn't respond, he
> mumbled something and referred the group to page
> 83 in the test. Male number two rephrased the
> question and all the males concurred with his
> paraphrase. The group was quiet as they all
> looked in their books. Female number one started
> talking to male two. The subject tried to
> communicate with the male via eye contact;
> everyone else in the group was looking in the
> book. Female two addressed me directly, "What
> do you think?" I replied, "I'm just an observer."
> She then directed the same question to male one.
> The subject jumped into the question with a direct
> quote on happiness from page 93 of the book. The
> instructor called, "Two minutes left."
>
> Female one, "Who's going to speak?" (looking
> at everyone in the group.) Male two shook his head

no; male three did not respond to anything that was
said; male one only spoke when spoken to, but did
not respond to this question. No one in the group
spoke; the subject studied his book. Female one
decided to be the spokesperson for the group. No
one but male one addressed the subject directly,
although female two often agreed with the subject
by nodding her head when he spoke.
(Philosophy Observation notes, January 25)

At the second small group observation:

Male two, female one and the subject are
talking quietly about moral truth. Subject,
"There is no moral truth." Male doesn't speak or
comment. Female one doesn't want to talk to the
class; male two asked my opinion, "Is that what
you got: What do you think?" I respond, "I'm
not in this class." He looks away and decides
that he will speak for the group for the class
presentation. The subject's group is very
confused and there is muffled laughter about
their lack of understanding. The instructor
then calls the entire class back together . . .
(Philosophy Observation notes, February 22)

The subject's questions and comments in both cases were
directly related to the material under discussion, yet the
other students did not respond. Twice the subject referred
his group to quotes from the class text to no avail.
Whether it was a poor group assignment or whether the other
students could not understand the subject's English is
unknown. The instructor moved through the reports rapidly
and paraphrased and clarified each group's contribution.
Everything about the class was highly organized and moved
smoothly and quickly. Exams were discussed with the class
prior to examination time, and students were given practice
questions if they so chose. Tests were a combination of

multiple choice and short essay answers. Even though the subject struggled with the format and language of the class, he received a B as his final grade.

Observations the second and final term of philosophy classes were very similar to the first term. Between the terms I had attended an English as a second language conference. I went to the first observation early to discuss one of the presentation topics (ESL high school graduates in college academic courses) with the philosophy instructor prior to the first class observation of spring term. Both she and I were concerned about the level of English skills necessary for minority student success. She expressed concern about the subject's language skills and his ability to successfully complete the course:

> As I talked with her, she said, "I'm so glad P---'s
> auditing because this term, especially,
> it's hard if they don't have a good command of
> the English language. The idioms and all, you
> know." (pause) "I realize we need to help these
> minorities, but really (voice trailing off as
> students come into the classroom and some sit
> in the front row.)
> (Philosophy Observation notes, April 19)

The subject registered for credit in the class, although the instructor recommended that he audit the class because of the language skills necessary to understand the readings, lectures, and discussions. As noted in the observation of May 3, the subject took notes during the lecture for the first time. Perhaps he was more comfortable with the vocabulary and concepts, or perhaps he

felt the need to study more this term; however, this is the

only notation of the subject's notes during the class. The

instructor continued to use lecture and controlled small

group discussions. The most remarkable comments about the

philosophy class come directly from the subject on several

different occasions:

April 21, '93

Phil: I did my homework practice at home, and
I think . . . comprehensive [sic] them all right.
But in the class my instructor explain them . . .
so broad make . . . me confuse with my thought.
However, I understand more the purpose of the
sentences she used that they are deeply [sic] in
meaning and good demonstration in general.
(Subject's Journal)

May 4, '93

Phil: I am not very good today. I make all
my judgements slowly. Therefore in my first
class, I have a hard time to catch up with . . .
the lecture. It's hard too. But I will think
about the lecture again sometimes in the odd times.
(Subject's Journal)

May 7, '93

Phil: I have a had [hard ?] time to get
concerntration [sic] during the lecture. It's
new and hard too. Therefore, I don't understand
the lecture a bit.
(Subject's Journal)

The subject was struggling to keep up with the lectures,

the concepts, and the principles involved in philosophy,

but he was not discouraged. To the contrary, the subject

was enthralled with the class and all that he was learning:

Fri May 14 '93

> Phil: This class is so helpful to me. It help
> [sic] me look the world with rational thoughts
> and I can uncover deep of arguments by logic.
> It is the only class I think Worthwhile [sic] to
> take since I have been in high school. In short,
> it is a bigest [sic] payoff of my effort.
> (Subject's Journal)

The subject continued to have problems in the class, but
his enthusiasm for the subject never waned. The subject's
grasp of the concepts of the philosophy class had carried
over into his interest for a writing topic in Writing 121
on February 8:

> . . . the second [topic] was 'What is right and
> what is wrong.' The instructor replied that the
> topic was too much, 'a philosophical manifest.'
> The subject persisted in pursuing his second
> topic. The instructor wants 'attitude.' The
> subject argues that the topic of right and wrong
> will have 'more examples.'
> (Writing 121 Observation Notes)

The subject tried to make connections between classes and
information, but some of his instructors did not cooperate
with his efforts.

The subject was fascinated with the language and the
method of language analysis that philosophy provided him.
The ability to look at language and the ideas that words
create continued to intrigue the subject, and he was able
to make cross-class connections as he did between
discussions of "double speak" from Writing 122 and
philosophy. In a Writing 122 discussion on May 3 involving
double speak examples from the military, business, and

bureaucracy (Appendix 4), the subject leaned over and whispered, "This would be a good example for philosophy." Once again the subject made connections between information in different classes, and whether or not the instructor recognized the connections, the subject was aware that information was not isolated nor class specific.

The subject really felt he benefited from philosophy and so stated in his journal. On May 14, the subject wrote:

> This class is so helpful to me . . .
> I can uncover deep of arguments by logic . . .
> It is the only class I think Worthwhile [sic]
> to take since I have been in high school. In
> short, it is a bigest [[sic] payoff of my efforts.

The difficulty of the class did little to deter the subject's enthusiasm. Although the subject struggled at times with the language analysis necessary for discussions of suppositions, presuppositions, premises and the like, he found the vocabulary and concepts applicable to everything in his life.

Extraneous Language and Classroom Culture

Physics

The physics class often started informally with students discussing whatever was in the news or on their

minds before the instructor arrived. The student snowflake example from the February 22 physics class is an example:

> Prior to the start of class, one of the male students in the front row got up and drew the following picture on the board:

```
┌──────┐              ┌──────┐
│  55  │              │  55  │   *
└──────┘              └──────┘
```

> Then he said to the class in general: "Do you know what the difference is between these two? This * is one, single snowflake. About 30 miles an hour in (city). I got stuck behind someone driving 30 miles an hour." The rest of the class laughed and the student sat down.

This simple drawing and irrelevant comments by one of the students relied on the listener's ability to understand that the student was probably on a freeway, that the speed limit on freeways is 55 miles per hour, and that people drive slower when it is snowing. The drawing and explanation led to a class discussion of people's driving habits. The instructor's entry into the room led to a second round of explanation by the student with the instructor also commenting on people's driving habits and then immediately switching to a discussion of an upcoming test. If the subject could not follow this rapid change in topic and language, he did not indicate it. He laughed right along with the rest of the class about people's driving habits. Also on this date, the instructor's discussion of wave speeds used the words relative and absolute. Since these words were often used in the

philosophy class, I wondered, but did not ask, if the subject saw them as meaning the same or different when used in different contexts. Since the subject did not appear to have vocabulary problems in physics, I could only assume that he understood the different ways the words were used.

On May 2, the physics instructor told a story from his own college days about how to teach concepts: "use wood or bicycle screws for boys and mayonnaise jars for girls to demonstrate a counter clockwise motion." The instructor's story of gender specific language that was acceptable when he was going to school carried with it other meanings: first, he was dating his own education and second, he intimated to this all male class that examples of directions and relationships between males and females in the society had changed. This was followed by a story of his Czech bicycle that had clockwise screws. Again, intentionally or unintentionally, the instructor relied on an anecdote to explain that assumptions about all screws turning the same were, in fact, false. While these examples are related to the field of physics by referential language and concepts, other language that day was not:

> . . . the instructor mentioned how 'classic' the problem was in advanced math, physics, and engineering exams:
>
> One student: Is this a red flag?
>
> Mr. S.: My lips are sealed.
> (Physics Observation notes, May 2)

Not knowing whether the subject had understood the
idiomatic use of "red flag", I commented to him that it
sounded like the information would be on the upcoming test;
he nodded. Here again, language was being used in a
culturally embedded manner. Red flags are associated with
attention and danger ahead such as in oversized load
warnings; "sealed lips" are associated with secrets
(children zip their lips and throw away the key) or
contents (as in a sealed envelope). With both idioms used
at the same time in the same context, I had no way of
knowing how much the subject had understood about what was
not being said. During preparation for the upcoming exam,
the subject asked me about a word he had written from his
philosophy class:

> . . . the subject took out his Philosophy 103
> notes for me to read. I wrote 'bias - N, biased -
> verb' on his notes because he miswrote one:
>
> Subject: I don't know what that mean.
>
> Researcher: What?
>
> Subject: That (pointing to the words)
>
> Researcher: (writing the words 'extreme
>   favoritism' on his notes and tapping him on
>   the arm to show him - he was following the
>   problem on the board) the key is extreme
>   (underlining extreme twice).
>
> Subject: Oh, I understand.
> (Physics Observation notes, May 2)

Because the subject was insistent about getting a correct
definition for these particular words, it appeared that if

he did not understand a word he would ask. Because the
subject did not ask me to explain any of the vocabulary
that had been used earlier in class, I assumed he had
understood the anecdotes and stories in the physics
lecture.

Again on May 17, the physics class started with a
student writing "No Sales TAX!" on the board. This led to
a brief discussion of an upcoming election with a sales tax
referendum. When the instructor entered, he joined the
discussion and drew an ohm diagram to explain economics and
the deficit situation. The student who had written on the
board assumed that everyone knew about the upcoming
election and understood the sales tax issue; the instructor
assumed that the class would understand the ohm diagram,
and he injected humor into the tax issue by connecting
physics, economics, and the deficit. As the discussion
ended and class began, a student toward the front commented
on the instructor's new haircut by asking if he had had
"his ears lowered." It was obvious that the haircut was
new and short, but again, the idiomatic phrase masked what
was really being said. The connection between having a
haircut and having one's ears lowered is culture specific.
It is not possible to lower one's ears nonsurgically. As
in other physics classes, the exchange between students and
instructor relied on cultural information. The subject
laughed with the other students, but did not ask about the
idiom.

A final language observation note for the physics class on May 24 involved a specific reference, "dead scientists" that the class used in unison when the instructor referred to [Etienne-Louis] Malus. After the class response, the instructor replied, "In physics we're always talking about dead, white scientists." The subject smiled and nodded as did other members of the class. This particular reference was used at the end of a three class sequence, and presumably, was coined earlier in the courses. Again, however, the jargon and jokes used in this class were topic and possibly class specific. The subject received a B in the final term, so his grasp of the language and the subject matter appeared to be high.

Philosophy

As mentioned earlier, the philosophy class was a lecture class. The instructor lectured at all observations and rarely used informal, idiomatic language; however, she often used examples from the newspaper or television to illustrate difficult theories or concepts to the class. Again, as with the students in the physics class, the instructor assumed that students were aware of what was happening in the world outside of school and were knowledgeable about references to people, places, and objects removed in time and space. For example on January 20 when she was trying to explain the meaning and

importance of presuppositions, she used an iceberg analogy
stating that the tip of the iceberg is the "verbal
statements" that people make and that the base of the
iceberg, the largest portion of it underwater and thus
unseen, represents the presuppositions that people have.
To more clearly illustrate the impact of presuppositions,
she used the example of the Clinton/Bush debates which had
recently been televised. Although the debates had focused
on the economy and character, the question or issue people
were interested in was, "Does character have any effect on
leadership?" As in the physics class, much was assumed.
First, the instructor assumed that all students understood
the iceberg analogy; second, she assumed that students were
aware that Clinton and Bush had had a debate and that there
were major differences, character being one; and third, she
assumed that everyone knew who Clinton and Bush were so
that the word "leadership" had special meaning.

At the third philosophy observation, January 25, after
the students had met in their assigned small groups and
were called back together, the instructor used the
Energizer Bunny to illustrate the difference between choice
and determined mechanism. Here, the assumption was made
that everyone in the class knew who the Energizer Bunny was
and what it did. The bunny is a mechanical device
programed to go on, and on, and on with no choice. When
not trying to explain philosophical concepts and
vocabulary, the instructor was very direct in her language

use. As she referred to question one on the student handout and talked about the words "responsible" and "driving," she said, "These don't fit -responsible equals ought and driving them equals determines." Again, she tried to explain the language simply by using synonyms, and she tried to explain concepts by using analogies.

Another good example of the direct language used by the philosophy instructor occurred on April 19. At this particular observation, she was preparing students for an upcoming exam and was trying to explain reasoning, "Deduction is from the general to the specific and induction is from the specific to the general. . . . Logic talks about the way our minds handle ideas." In these three cases her definitions are near those found in the dictionary. She did not confuse the class with extraneous talk, she simply gave definitions. Even the subject, confused by many of the new concepts, conceded that the instructor did indeed provide ample explanations and examples for all that he was learning:

> April 21, '93
>
> Phil: . . . me confuse with my thought.
> However, I understand more the purpose of
> the sentences she used that they are deeply
> [sic] in meaning and good demonstration in
> general.
> (Subject's Journal)
>
> April 23, '93
>
> Phil: There is nothing new in the leture [sic]
> today. . . . In one practice exercise, I have a
> problem of confusing the material. First of all,

I understand the argument well, but when the
instructor analizes [sic] it I totally lose. . .
(Subject's Journal)

Apr 28, '93

We have learned new method to test the theory.
It is very aboard [sic] but once you understand
the method well, there are many good examples in
daily [sic] to practice.
(Subject's Journal)

The lecture on fallacies on May 10 dealt with the way

language is used to control thought. The instructor

discussed the use of "is . . . ought" and asked, "Have you

ever thought about PC [politically correct] language?" As

she went on to discuss the word ought she stated:

"Headcounting never produces moral policy. Social

consensus doesn't make it morally right." To further

explain this statement she used Hitler and Watergate as

examples. She then tried unsuccessfully to lead the class

through an exercise on Walt Disney: Was he in it for the

money or for his own imagination? Can a man who cheats on

his wife make family movies? Is there a difference between

family movies and family values? Although most students

could relate to the examples, the examples were culturally

embedded, with the possible exception of Walt Disney.

Culture aside, the subject praised the class for the

knowledge he was gaining as he wrote in his journal:

Wed May 12 '93

Phil: I have learn [sic] a great way of
looking at argument to find its fallacies. . . .

Fri May 14 '93

This class is so helpful to me. It help [sic] me
look the world with rational thoughts and I can
uncover deep of [sic] arguments by logic. It is
the only class I think Worthwhile [sic] to take
since I have been in high school. . . .

In the subject's final journal entries, even though he was

frustrated and confused, he continued to think that he was

learning something in philosophy that would be useful to

him:

Mon [May] 17th '93

Phil: Today the class is so confusing, I have a
had [hard ?] time to catch up with the lecture. . .

Fri [May] 21th

Phil: We learn to evaluation [sic] the argument
to-day [sic]. It is sound easy but it is hard to
evaluate other views base [sic] on our own.
Because there is not absolute right, everything is
relevant.

Perhaps the reason the subject liked the class so well was

because of the way the instructor explained words and

concepts.

Writing 121

As expected, the most difficult class for the subject

was English composition. Unfortunately, the difficulty of

writing was compounded by the instructors from whom the

subject took writing classes. The first instructor had a

difficult time expressing himself, clarifying the

assignments, answering questions, and engaging students in

meaningful interaction:

> As he [the instructor] reads down his role
> sheet he mumbles to himself. He also laughs at
> his own talk and ideas. I, like the students,
> have a difficult time hearing and understanding
> him. He often mumbles to himself as if none of
> us are present. . . . Students are reading,
> writing, and talking to one another as the
> instructor moves from student to student. . . .
> At 3:57, a male student asks for more
> clarification of the writing assignment. (I
> also didn't understand) . . . The subject was the
> next student asked about his paper. He responded
> that he didn't know his topic yet.
> The instructor, "You were warned about his a
> week ago." The next few students didn't have
> topics either.
> (Writing 121 Observation notes, February 8).

Throughout the Writing 121 observations, the subject and

other students were unprepared for class. The instructor's

lack of exactness in lectures and assignments may have

contributed to the subject's and other students' confusion

and lack of preparation. There may have also been

confusion about the use of the word "discuss." To the

subject and other students, the word may have implied an

oral discussion about possible topics. Also because the

instructor engaged each and every student in individual

(oral) discussions about paper topics, the rest of the

class had classtime to fashion a topic that was acceptable

to the instructor.

On February 22 the class is referred to a reading from

The Harvest Reader for an upcoming comparison and contrast

paper. Again, with no direct instructions about the

reading from the instructor, the students begin to talk

among themselves as the instructor calls on each student in

turn:

> At 3:20, a male student asked if he could
> compare and contrast beer. The whole class
> laughs about his needing a study partner.
> The instructor commented about in the "old days"
> there was no Silver Bullet, no light, no dry.
> (Writing 121 Observation notes, February 22)

Once again classroom banter was focused on very culturally

specific concepts. The humor involved in needing a study

partner to help with a comparison and contrast paper is

subtle, yet important. Drinking beer and going to college

is very common. The boredom of students not engaged in a

one-on-one discussion with the instructor was briefly

broken. The instructor's comment about the "old days" may

have been his attempt to develop more rapport with the

class, even if only momentarily. The beer comment

discussion was the only instance I observed in which the

entire class participated. The instructor did not address

the appropriateness or inappropriateness of writing a

formal, academic paper on beer as a topic, yet the subject

as well as other students in the class struggled with topic

selection. The subject's ability to select a writing topic

was often a problem. His desire to write about his

interests were often thwarted by the instructor. The

subject's topic choices were often met with resistance:

> . . . The subject argues that the topic of
> right and wrong will have "more examples."
> The instructor didn't understand what the
> subject said, so the subject repeated himself.
> (Writing 121 Observation notes, February 8)

The subject knew that the instructor required concrete examples, yet the topics he chose did not meet with the instructor's approval. The subject had to balance between writing about something he knew and was interested in with the instructor's notion of topic acceptability. In the guessing game of trying to please the instructor, the subject was at a disadvantage. The subject tried to extrapolate information from conversations between the instructor and other students about what the instructor wanted, but the subject was limited by both language and experience. The subject, and other students in the class, had to determine what the instructor wanted without sufficient explanation. Unlike the philosophy class where there were explicit definitions for vocabulary, the writing instructor made inexplicable statements, and the subject and his classmates were left to ponder the meaning. The disappointment and frustration the subject was experiencing in his writing class was evident in his journal on February 24:

> I haven't learned anything from English class
> since it's new topic and I'am [sic] quite
> understand it so I'am [sic] kind of lost in
> the class even though I had prepared the
> material ahead.

Unlike the physics class where the subject could study harder and ask for help from other students and Vietnamese friends, and unlike the philosophy class which was difficult but interesting, in the writing class all efforts failed. The subject struggled finding topics that were acceptable to the instructor; the subject struggled to comprehend the lectures; and the subject struggled with the nature of writing itself as can be seen from his journal entries. In the end, the subject received a C for his frustration and his efforts. He was able to proceed to the second class in the sequence only to once again meet with frustration and failure.

Writing 122

In the second writing class, the subject made several discoveries. He learned that his own writing was poor when compared to other students:

> We have our draft paper compare [sic] together.
> I realize that how bad my paper and my English
> skill compare [sic] to others. My skills about
> English is needed more help badly in order to
> catch up with others
> (Subject's Journal, April 30).

This was the first and only time the subject commented about his own English skills. Whether or not the subject acted upon his own discovery is not known; however, a paper he wrote later for the class was enough better that the

instructor commented about his writing in a student conference.

Another discovery made by the subject in the Writing 122 class had to do with language. The instructor presented a lecture on the use and implications of double speak. Using examples from bureaucracy and the military, the instructor demonstrated the way in which people's thoughts are often manipulated by the choice of vocabulary. (See Appendix 4 for class handout.) As noted in the observation notes of May 3, the subject commented several times that he "didn't know that" as the instructor was explaining examples from the handout. As with the philosophy class, the chance to learn something new, no matter how difficult, excited the subject:

> May 4
>
> English: We learn new thing [sic] today about double-speak. It's [sic] may not [be] new to some others, but to me it is a first time I have seem [sic] doublespeaks [sic] are written out like an article. I hear people used [sic] them in the speechs [sic] before. Anyway, it is interesting class meeting. It was excited [sic] because the material fun and instructor makes jokes about it too.
> (Subject's Journal)

Although doublespeak is a difficult topic, the subject recognized that he had heard some of the examples before and also recognized that he was learning something new and useful. At the observation he also commented several times that "This would be a good example for philosophy." Here,

the subject was connecting information about logic, premises, and conclusions from the philosophy class with a discussion on the use of language in an English class. The final statement by the writing instructor on May 3 that "Language gets created to cover-up mistakes" may have triggered the subject's journal entry.

The subject discovered prejudice in a class discussion of population control and immigration. The two articles that led to the discussion were titled "Why all Americans Should Support a Moratorium on Immigration" and "Why We Need a Smaller U.S. Population and How We Can Achieve It." Visually, the subject was the only minority in the class. As a very heated discussion between students was taking place, the subject remained quiet. After class had ended and the subject and I left the room together I asked how he had felt about the class discussion that day. He was surprised that some members of the class had reacted so strongly to immigration and commented that he was glad he was a refugee and not an immigrant:

> Researcher: Does that make you different?
>
> Subject: In general no. Sometimes yes. Like
>   my cousin, she's an immigrant because of my
>   aunt, her mother. I care about education
>   and all she cares about is money.
>   (Writing 122 Observation notes, April 19)

Later that day he wrote in his journal:

April 19, '93

<u>Eng:</u> I had tough time [to] justify my view
and others about my reason to be here in this
country when talked [sic] about immigration
in U.S. There is nothing knew [sic] about the
lecture except I think I should be aware that
there are some people really discriminate
against other in racism. I did not know that
because people pretend to be nice to each
others [sic].

The subject's use of the word "justify" is unusual since he

did not speak during the entire class discussion. Perhaps

he was having a silent, verbal discussion or rebutting

remarks in his own mind as the class discussion was going

on around him. A week after the writing class discussion,

I introduced him to a Black student, and they talked about

racism and discrimination and how to recognize and deal

with it. It is interesting that the subject, whose spoken

English pronunciation obviously marked him as an immigrant

and second language learner, had not realized that others

did not distinguish between immigrants and refugees. He

saw himself as being different from his own cousin who had

been born here. In his own mind, he saw his refugee

classification as having a special, necessary status.

Although he said that he had come as a refugee for

political purposes, others looking at him would not know

and could not tell that his father's status and standing in

Vietnam had, in fact, made it impossible for him to achieve

his goal of an education and some modicum of financial

stability in the political structure in Vietnam.

The subject was exposed to many issues in the Writing 122 class. Although he remained silent in all observed class, his mind was churning. The open forum in which immigration was discussed jarred his security:

> April 19, '93
>
> Eng: I had a tough time justify my view and others about my reason to be here in this . . . country when we talked about immigrant in U.S. . . . I think I should be aware that there are some people really discriminate against other in . . . racism. I did not know that because people pretend to be nice to each others [sic]. (Subject's Journal)

The views expressed by classmates brought prejudice and discrimination into his consciousness. The subject's perceived reality about his refugee status being different from other immigrants' status was shattered by class discussions. His views on immigration were different from those of his classmates. His perceptions about himself and his classmates changed, and he no longer perceived himself as much a part of the classroom culture as he had previously.

In the end, the subject was advised by the instructor to drop the Writing 122 class. His pattern for eventual success a year later was the same as it had been for his Writing 121 class: register in the class for a grade, attend class regularly, learn as much as possible, do all assignments and, if all this fails, change to an audit and

register later for the same class from another
instructor.

Learner Characteristics and Strategies

Several characteristics about the subject became
apparent throughout the observations. First, the subject
exhibited persistence in many instances. He had signed a
self-advising form which meant that he was able to enroll
in classes against the advice of the counseling and testing
department at the college. The signed self-advising form
also meant that the subject was ineligible for any tutorial
help in classes for which he possessed inadequate language
skills such as reading or writing. In essence, the subject
had put his financial aide money in jeopardy if he were
unable to succeed in his classes. In his particular case,
the subject had been advised to take more English as a
second language classes and more reading classes before
taking the required college writing classes. The subject
registered in and passed three reading classes, one ESL
class, one remedial writing lab class, and the paragraph to
essay class before enrolling in Writing 121. In addition
to psychology, typing, music, health, tennis, and the
classes reported here, the subject had also availed himself
of skill building classes in college study skills. The
subject was extremely good at mathematics, testing into
differential calculus (final grade of C) his first term at

the college and following that course with integral calculus (final grade of B), and Calculus III (final grade of B). The vector calculus I class (final grade of A) was taken the term after the research ended. At the time of the research, the subject was working as a mathematics tutor in the mathematics laboratory. He also had taken eight computer classes, including Lotus, Unix, Pascal, and C languages by the end of the observations. He also managed to maintain his interest in school by taking classes towards his major and fulfilling the college requirements.

In all classes except the English as a second language class, the subject was with native English speakers. The subject was exposed to academic and non-academic written and oral English on a daily basis from instructors, classmates, and course materials. The subject's persistence and subsequent self-advising may have helped make it possible for him to succeed. Because the subject rejected some of the recommendations of the counseling department, he exposed himself to more native speakers. He also exposed himself to English that was slightly beyond his own ability, but the topics were ones that interested the subject so he was able to make steady progress toward his goal of transferring to a four year institution. In an unusual and unorthodox manner, the subject created a method for learning more English: he studied English. The subject studied English in the books he checked out of the library;

he studied English in remedial English classes and in ESL;
he studied English in his philosophy class; he studied the
different ways different teachers taught English; he
studied listening in lecture classes, reading in reading
classes, and writing in writing classes. By exposing
himself to a variety of academic language situations, the
subject learned more by learning more. In essence, the
subject learned how to work the system to his advantage and
studied English at the same time.

Another characteristic or strategy of the subject was
his risk taking. According to Beebe (1983) people who are
most successful are not those who take undue risk but
rather those who exhibit a moderately high risk taking
factor. The moderately high risk takers are more
successful more often because they understand what is to be
lost and what is to be gained in each risk taking
situation. Moderately high risk takers are not willing to
risk everything for little gain, but weigh and measure what
will be gained or lost with each risk. This is apparently
true for the subject also. Although he risked the loss of
a tutor in classes with reading and writing prerequisites,
he was not sure that a tutor would be needed. The subject
always took more credit hours than the 12 minimum required
by financial aid rules. By registering for 15 to 17 credit
hours, the subject was able to drop or audit classes in
which he could not succeed and still not be denied a tutor.
The same can be said for his risk of financial aid.

Financial aid rules apply to a year's worth of classes not those of an individual term, so the subject was only risking one term of financial aid at a time. If he were able to make up any classes he failed the following term, he would have lost nothing. However, the risk taking exhibited by the subject in classes is the most interesting. According to Beebe (1983) studies to date have focused on second language learners in sheltered classroom situations and involved ESL teacher/student exchanges. In the classes where the subject was observed, this was not the situation. The subject was a second language learner in a non-ESL class asking questions of a non-ESL instructor in front of native English speakers; the risk of ridicule and embarrassment to himself was great. The subject had to get and hold the floor by words or actions (such as a raised hand) then structure the question or comment so that it was pertinent to the discussion and intelligible to the listeners, and lastly discern the response of peers and authority figures. In the Writing 121 class, the subject's willingness to question the instructor about assignments, "What do you mean?" (Writing 121 Observation notes, February 22) and about explanations, "I don't understand the difference between . . ." (Writing 121 Observation notes, February 8) put the subject in a very tenuous position. Although the subject appeared to ask questions of clarification, at times the questions could have been construed as stalling techniques. The

Writing 121 instructor could have withdrawn the subject from the class based on the self-advising form that the subject had signed. The subject, after all, had been told by counseling and testing that he was not adequately prepared to take the class. On February 22, the subject risked even more censure by being publicly reprimanded by the instructor when asked about a paper for which he had no topic, "You were warned about this a week ago." The instructor's remark was directly addressed to the subject even though other students were not prepared to discuss their paper topics either.

The subject's participation in the small group discussions in the Writing 122 and philosophy classes demonstrate another aspect of risk taking-his willingness to risk his self-esteem in a face-to-face encounter. In both classes, the subject participated fully in the small group assignments. He came to class prepared. In the philosophy class he had read the assignments, and in the writing class he brought a paper to be critiqued. In the philosophy class he was the first to speak on both occasions (Philosophy Observation notes, January 25 and February 22) and on one occasion referred his group to the course text to validate his comments. In the writing class (Writing 122 Observation notes, May 10) he was prepared to discuss his paper with the other students in his group and did not hesitate to share with others what he had written. In both situations there was little to no response from the

other students in the groups. In the philosophy class students did not engage the subject in an exchange of ideas, although they did refer to the pages in the text he had suggested. In the Writing 122 class, the two students in the group did not offer suggestions to the subject but only commented that his paper was "interesting" and then proceeded to converse with each other leaving the subject out of their conversation. The subject's willingness to risk his self-esteem when others would be judging his personal performance indicates that, in some situations, he was a high risk taker.

The risk taking in the physics class was also different. Here, it is interesting to note that the subject did not question or comment during any observations the first term. Both recorded comments were made during the second term of observations after the subject had found himself a Vietnamese tutor/friend to help him with this class. Unlike the clarification questions in Writing 121, in both physics situations where the subject commented, his comments were a challenge to the instructor. In the first comment on May 2, the subject wanted to know why the instructor was doing the problem the long way instead of using a simpler process. In the second instance on May 17, the subject caught the instructor making a mistake and called his and the rest of the class' attention to it. In this latter case, the subject insisted and, eventually, so did other students in class that the instructor stop what

he was doing and correct the problem. In the physics class the subject was risking public embarrassment if his correction were wrong and possible public censure from the instructor.

The two final comments on risk taking involve the subject not as a student in an academic setting, but the subject as a refugee and a family member. His harrowing escape from Vietnam (Appendix 1) involved the ultimate risk taking situation-death. Only a high risk taker would cast his fate into the hands of unknown people on a dangerous journey full of unspeakable terrors. It is no wonder when one considers the refugee situation that the subject is a moderate to high risk taker in an educational setting, he had already survived a far greater risk.

What is surprising, however, is the reticence of the subject to have his aunt and family members interviewed for this research. When asked about interviewing family members, the subject declined by saying that his family knew nothing of this research, and they thought him stupid for not receiving straight A's. The subject's public self was willing to take self-imposed risks such as escaping and public speaking, but the subject's private self was not. Perhaps the subject only took risks in a controlled situation such as his self-advising and class comments; the ultimate decisions were his. In the family interview situation, the subject would have had no control over what others said or what I asked them. The subject most

definitely was a risk taker, but the situation and the forum both had an immeasurable impact on the risks he was willing to take.

The third characteristic noted throughout the observations was the subject's auditory skill. His ability to comprehend lectures such as in the philosophy class attest to his auditory or receptive language skills. Only once did the subject ask for vocabulary words or explanations, and that was for the word bias and biased (Physics Observation notes, May 2). On another occasion I had given him the word altruism for a paper in his writing class, but he never asked for a definition or explanation. In philosophy, the subject only took notes twice, April 19 and May 3, and relied on his memory the balance of the time. Basically, the subject was able to remember most of his lectures, but often got discouraged and confused:

> We have discussion on network today in class.
> Although I had had [sic] gone over material
> and did homework ahead before, but I confuse
> with the way my instructor analysic [[sic] the
> material.
> (Subject's Journal, April 19)

> I am not very good today. I make all my
> judgements slowly. Therefore in my first class,
> I have a hard time to catch up with . . . the
> lecture. It's hard too. But I will think about
> the lecture again sometimes in the odd times.
> (Subject's Journal, May 4)

> I have a had [sic] time to get concerntration
> [sic] during the lecture. It's new and hard too.
> Therefore, I don't understand the lecture a bit.
> (Subject's Journal, May 7)

The fact that the subject did as well as he did in his classes with no notes to refer to was amazing. The vocabulary and concepts with which he was deluged in philosophy and required to remember and recall later in test situations requires a well developed short term as well as long term memory, good auditory discrimination, and good syntactic analysis.

The fact that the subject had good auditory reception skills and a good memory, both short and long term, is most apparent in the observation and discussion involving doublespeak (Writing 122 Observation notes, May 3 and Subject's Journal, May 4). Throughout the lectures on this topic, the subject was fascinated with the words and the manipulation of thought that the words imposed. The subject remembered hearing some of the examples in speeches and was able to remember the contexts in which the words were used. Perhaps television is responsible for the subject's auditory memory. In a two week diary he was asked to keep, he mentions watching television 10 times. The only program he mentions specifically is the news:

> After dinner and clean up I watch news for half
> hour and shows.
> (Subject's Diary, 2/21)

> I watch TV and news until 7:30 pm.
> (Subject's Diary, 2/22)

> I also watch new eleven.
> (Subject's Diary, 2/24)

> I get home at five and watch news until . . .
> (Subject's Diary, 2/26)

The fact that he watched the news and was exposed to reporters' English may have contributed to his auditory memory. During the same time period, the subject mentioned reading a novel twice, in addition to references to studying and homework:

> I watch TV as my break for half of an hour
> after dinner. I study until bedtime at 12
> in the morning [midnight].
> (Subject's Diary, 2/15)
>
> I study and do homework on Physics . . .
> (Subject's Diary, 2/16)
>
> I also read all over chapter 19 in Physic
> [sic] but do no homework. . . . I go to
> bed at eleven o'clock. I read novel for an
> hour for fun.
> (Subject's Diary, 2/20)
>
> Then I read the next three hours on the
> chapter for computer class . . . I feel tired
> if I study any more, so I got to bed at 10:30 pm.
> (Subject's Diary, 2/22)
>
> I get home at eight . . . then reading [sic]
> a novel while waiting for TV show . . .
> (Subject's Diary, 2/24)

Whatever the cause, the subject's auditory memory may have made it possible for him to succeed in classes when other students, native English speakers, who were taking notes were struggling.

The subject also displayed good, or at least adequate, reading skills. His ability to read and comprehend the assigned readings in the philosophy class demonstrate that he was capable of reading college texts. The subject's English pronunciation is difficult to understanding, as

noted throughout the observations when instructors did not understand his comments or questions. Although he reads for school and pleasure, talks with friends and family in both Vietnamese and English, and watches television, his linguistic skills, especially phonetic and syntactic, are much stronger in the receptive areas. In the small group interactions, the subject's lack of sufficient or tolerable pronunciation skills may have hindered his communication or interaction with the other students. The discrepancy between the subject's receptive skills, listening and reading, and his productive skills, speaking and writing, are incongruous. The subject's ability to comprehend difficult written and spoken passages of a conceptual nature cannot be attributed to any particular learning strategy, yet it was a constant throughout the observations.

As can be seen from the subject's journal entries, he confused words and more particularly word forms. Sometimes he was aware of his mistakes such as "comedy" corrected to "company" (Subject's Journal, February 28) and "test" corrected to "answers" (Subject's Journal, February 15), but "a next day" is confused for "the next day" (Subject's Journal, February 17) and not corrected. It was the syntactic elements of the subject's writing that made it impossible for him to pass the writing classes the first time. Even though the subject's meaning and intent are understandable as in "The Little Adventure" (Appendix 1),

the writing mixes word forms and lacks clarity. The
subject's language abilities were limited to reception, not
production.

Another characteristic of or strategy employed by the
subject is that of connecting, or according to Chamot
(1984) elaboration. As mentioned above, the subject
connected words, ideas, concepts, and situations in many
different circumstances. He was able to connect the
discussion of doublespeak in his Writing 122 class with
speeches he had heard on television. He was also able to
connect the doublespeak phrases with his philosophy class
lectures on fallacies and "PC" language (Philosophy
Observation notes, May 10). He saw connections in his
Writing 121 class when the instructor said that each person
had a "unique viewpoint" (Writing 121 Observation notes,
January 25) and wanted to write about the prom. It appears
that the subject was always trying to connect what he was
learning in one class with what he was learning in another
class and combine that information with what he already
knew from reading novels, talking to friends, and watching
television. The anecdote about the subject and a friend
writing a program for a business over Christmas vacation is
another example of the subject applying information. The
greatest connection made by the subject throughout this
research, however, is expressed in his journal of May 14
regarding philosophy:

> This class is so helpful to me. It help [sic]
> me look the world with rational thoughts and I
> can uncover deep of [sic] arguments by logic. . . .
> the only class I think Worthwhile [sic] . . .
> In short, it a bigest [sic] payoff of my effort.

The subject had the ability to connect across time and space and, although discouraged and frustrated at times, postpone or delay gratification. Contrary to the pundits, the subject had the notion that he could apply the concepts learned in a college philosophy class to his daily life and that the class was worth the effort he had put into it.

A further characteristic of the subject was that of resistance to defeat. Some might refer to these qualities as a locus of control, others a form of learner responsibility, and others a strategy for learning, but these terms do not sufficiently describe the subject's ability to overcome impregnable obstacles. There is no question that the subject demonstrated responsibility for his own learning, nor is there any question that the subject operated from his own locus of control, especially when challenging instructors or authority figures such as he did with the Writing 121 instructor and the physics instructor. The subject, by fashioning his own English learning program of remedial English and reading classes, coupled with two study skills classes, was able to proceed steadily towards his goal of a two year transfer degree. He carefully and strategically prepared himself for the required writing classes by working within the college

approved system of registering, auditing, and withdrawing at appropriate times while not jeopardizing his financial aid or his grade point average. The subject mastered all the required courses necessary for his transfer degree and did so within the approved college system. The subject accomplished his goal within a seven full term and two parttime summer school timeframe. He chose not to fight the system, but to work within it and use it to his advantage. He may have been discouraged at times, but he was never defeated.

Prologue

Three months after the observations ended, the subject enrolled in his second Writing 122 class. He enrolled in the class taught by the instructor whose guidelines he had followed for his (observed) writing conference. He received a C. The class which the subject finally passed was taught by an instructor who used a point system and required weekly assignments. Assignments were to be written following very strict guidelines on format and content. In-class writing assignments and exams were also tightly structured. The subject reported that the instructor also advised the class that in-class exams would be over one of three assigned readings. For the final exam, the subject read and outlined all three readings. On the final, he received 4 points out of a possible 6 points.

Six months after the end of the observations, the subject transferred to a four year school which will require no additional English writing classes. In his first full term at the four year school, the subject made the Dean's List. He plans to graduate from there in two years.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION, RECOMMENDATIONS, CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to identify possible characteristics, experiences, and observable qualities and/or strategies which may contribute to second language learner success in a post secondary institution. As a result of this study, several characteristics, experiences, qualities, and/or strategies emerged. The results of this study have implications for several areas: (1) learner and learning strategies, (2) ESL teaching and learning, (3) college placement, and (4) affective characteristics and/or strategies.

Discussion

Learning Strategies

The subject displayed many of the learner behaviors and learning strategies that other studies have associated with good learners: he attended class regularly, planned to learn, organized his time, and understood his own learning style; he managed his own learning environment by asking clarification questions, finding a tutor, and interacting with class material; the subject was highly motivated to succeed, both instrumentally and integratively.

The subject used the strategies advocated by Chamot's (1984) Learning Strategy Definitions (Appendix 6). He used metacognitive strategies in several ways. He attended classes regularly; he planned to learn by organizing his time and preparing for classes; he accurately evaluated his own learning, as demonstrated in his diary and journal entries; and he understood his own learning style, auditory without the distraction of note-taking. He used social affective strategies by asking for clarification from instructors when necessary in both Writing 121 and Physics, and he was always prepared for small group discussions and was cooperative in speech and manner when in the small groups. The subject's self-talk and self-reinforcement are most evident in the Journal entry for Wednesday, February 17 after he had received 67% on a physics test. Again, his way of addressing this deficit is self-managed: the subject found his own tutor and alleviated his problems in physics. The third major learning strategy suggested by Chamot is cognitive strategies. Again, the subject demonstrated that he interacted with academic material in a variety of ways. He very clearly distinguishes between reading, studying, and doing homework as noted throughout his journal. Perhaps the most obvious display of the subject's learning strategy/strategies was the manner in which he approached his education in general. The subject arranged a comprehensive program for learning English while still taking classes that moved him toward his goal of a

two year transfer degree to a four year school. The
subject designed his own language learning program by
enrolling in study skills classes, reading classes, an ESL
class, remedial English classes, and psychology classes.
Throughout the subject's self-study of learning more to
learn more, he, in retrospect, exhibited many risk taking
behaviors (Beebe, 1983). He also demonstrated a
combination of integrative and instrumental motivation
(Gardner and Lambert, 1972); he wanted to become an
American citizen and to do what other students do and/or
know what other students know, for example wanting to write
about the prom in Writing 121.

Language Strategies

The subject's main learning strategy for learning
language was exposure. The subject correctly assumed that
more exposure to different types of English and different
instructors would help his language skill, but he
incorrectly assumed that exposure would be sufficient for
grammatical structures and lexical items. As expected, the
subject's greatest problem was required English writing.
Unfortunately his problems in English writing are not
unique to ESL students. Aside from the obvious language
problems of ESL students, the subject shared many of the
same concerns that have been documented by Chiseri-Strater
(1988, 1991) and McCarthy (1985) in their studies of

literacy or writing in university students-figuring out what the instructor wants. The fact that the subject was able to enroll in and pass difficult, cognitively demanding, conceptually based classes in math, computer science, psychology, and philosophy demonstrate his ability to function in context reduced situations, but his inability to pass required college level writing courses show that language competence and language proficiency are, indeed, different. The subject lacked proficiency in English, but he demonstrated competence in English because he was able to function in daily situations and most academic situations. He could read the texts and do the homework, but he was not proficient enough to write required academic prose. Although exposed to English on a daily basis, the subject did not learn English, he acquired basic language skills (Krashen, 1981, 1985; Krashen and Terrell, 1983; Cummins, 1984). The subject's dearth of exposure to formal structured ESL and English classes compared to his profuse exposure to natural spoken English may account for his lack of sufficient linguistic skills for the required writing classes. The subject neither acquired sufficient literacy skills nor learned English grammatical rules. Perhaps the subject's auditory skills were perfected because of his exposure to English, but his grammatical and pronunciation skills were not.

The subject constantly struggled to understand what the writing instructors wanted in their assignments. The

subject's frustration to find acceptable topics in the Writing 121 class was shared by other students. The instructor was vague in his instructions and rarely discussed specific requirements for the papers other than the public discussions about students' topics. The required handbook was referred to by the instructor, but he never used it in class to help the subject and other students with requisite academic writing skills such as types of sentences or comma rules. The instructor assumed that students knew the rules and his expectations, and the students assumed that they would be taught the rules of writing, and hence, how to write.

Since the subject was an ESL student, his writing problems were compounded. He lacked sufficient language proficiency in written English. His personal history of learning English was wrought with problems. His initial English instruction had been in a refugee camp with Vietnamese teachers. By his own admission he stopped attending classes and read books after reaching a certain level. After he immigrated to the U.S., he lived with his aunt and cousins and continued to speak Vietnamese at home. His high school ESL classes did not explicitly teach English, and students worked on homework from other classes much as a study hall. His two terms of college level ESL may have given him sufficient grammatical forms and sentence structures to be minimally successful in remedial English classes, but they were insufficient for required

college writing classes. The subject's lack of writing proficiency may have been a result of his own time constraints. He did not give himself sufficient time to work formally on his English syntactic skill.

Gass (1983) found that intermediate ESL students were able to distinguish grammatical sentences from ungrammatical sentences, but were unable to pinpoint what made the sentences ungrammatical: changes resulted in other ungrammatical sentences. Gass concluded that students were able to recognize errors and miscommunications based on some language universals long before they were able to produce grammatical, error free utterances of written sentences. A study by Kroll (1990) also found that students were unable to produce, correct, edit, and rewrite grammatical, error free compositions even when given ample time to do so. Essays written over a 10 to 14 day period of time were only slightly better syntactically than essays written with a 60 minute time constraint. The idea that ESL students can and will correct their written work if given sufficient time has not been proven. The willingness of ESL students to edit and revise written work appears to be hampered by language limitations in the second language. This is true of the subject in his Writing 122 class as well as in physics and philosophy. When he exchanged papers in the Writing 122 small group on April 30, 1993, (Subject's Journal, Appendix 2) he thought his paper was acceptable, but he learned that it was not. His comments

about the physics test on February 15 right after he had taken the test show that he was very confident with his answers (Subject's Diary, Appendix 3), but his 67% score on the physics test on February 17 (Subject's Diary, Appendix 3) show that he was very disappointed because he had not understood the homework. In philosophy he faithfully did his homework only to discover that he had misunderstood the concepts (Subject's Journal, April 21 and April 23, 1993, Appendix 2) although he was able to follow the exercises done in class. Perhaps what Gass (1983) discovered in ESL English writing is more a product or by-product of learning something new in general. Thinking one understands a concept is not the same as knowing a concept. Grammar is a cultural concept in much the same way as philosophy is a cultural concept.

The short term problems the subject experienced in physics, however, may be attributed to language, culture, or conceptual inadequacies. As noted in the literature, various theories currently in vogue attempt to explain the difference between language acquisition and language learning (Krashen, 1981, 1982, 1985; Krashen and Terrell, 1983) and the difference between BICS, context embedded language, and CALP, context reduced language (Cummins, 1984; Canale, 1984). Canale's (1984) criticism of Cummins' theory as being inadequate to encompass all language issues and Genesee's (1984) concern for the social situation and teacher expectation are relevant to this discussion. The

acquisition model of Krashen does not adequately explain the subject's lack of proficiency in written English.

Wald's (1984) belief that CALPS is a literacy issue closely tied to socio-linguistic issues of class and academic achievement, again, does not sufficiently address the subject's ability to function at high levels in cognitively demanding classes and fail in classes involving high degrees of literacy. Spolsky's (1984) notions of academic language being "the least tolerant and cooperative of any communication situation" (p. 43) may be most appropriate, if the communication situation is defined as formal, academic, written language.

Hymes (1971, 1972b) has appealed for a language theory which is more based in social contexts. His notion that an adequate language theory must encompass possibility, feasibility, appropriateness, and performance of language (1971, p. 12) comes closer to explaining the subject's inability to pass the required writing classes the first time. The subject's ability, or inability, in his first language was unknown although he had reported that he was literate in his first language. Friedlander's (1990) study may help to explain the subject's struggle with written English. Friedlander found that students' subject matter knowledge was directly related to the language in which the knowledge had been gained. However, when students were allowed to plan in their first language, Chinese, for writing in their second language, English, the level of

detail was much better. If first language planning contributes to success in second language writing, then the subject's writing may have been improved if he had been allowed or encouraged to plan in his first language. Unknown in Friedlander's study and in this study is the degree of first language competence and proficiency necessary for this transfer.

Although not specifically noted in the observation data because the subject never used a dictionary, the subject reported that he did not use a bilingual Vietnamese/English dictionary; he used a monolingual dictionary when necessary. Also, throughout the observations the subject spoke only English. When questioned about the language he used with his cousins and aunt, he replied that he spoke English or mixed languages with his cousins and spoke Vietnamese to his aunt. The fact that the subject used English regularly, without being aware of grammatical rules or structures, both at school and in the home may have negatively influenced his written English. Again, current second language acquisition theories do not adequately address the role or influence of first language proficiency on second language academic writing, especially in light of Friedlander's (1990) research.

Auditory Skills

The subject was able to remember and recall the context in which words had been used. The subject was able to encode language phonetically and store the context and conditions about the word to be retrieved later when he again heard the word. Throughout the study, the subject's auditory skill became apparent: he attended classes and listened. As noted, the subject took the college entrance test two times, scoring higher in math and reading the second time, but lower in writing. The tests, however, did not or could not account for the subject's auditory skills. When asked about taking notes, the subject responded that he couldn't concentrate if he tried to write, so he "just listen and remember." His ability to "just listen and remember" permeated across the disciplines. He just listened in philosophy, in physics, and in writing. He did, however, always write down on paper anything the teachers wrote on the board with the exception of physics. In physics it appeared that he always had the homework done before coming to class or he skipped the class entirely. He never missed writing or philosophy classes, and he rarely took notes. When asked how he could remember everything he had heard in a lecture, he just said, "I just do," and shrugged it off. The fact that he was able to receive B's and C's in philosophy and physics is evidence of his ability to remember pertinent details and gross

concepts. The subject's ability to become completely absorbed in the lectures is interesting in light of Thompson's (1987) discussion of memory.

The subject had an uncanny ability to store and then retrieve vast amounts of information, especially in the philosophy class. To aid his comprehension of the topic, he checked out books on philosophy from the college library and read about major philosophers and their theories. This may account for his ability to understand the lectures, but it does not account for his ability to recall and then apply the knowledge in a test situation. The subject was able to comprehend lectures on fallacies and presuppositions and then relate and apply that knowledge to a language analysis of what people say and how they say it.

He wanted to write about right and wrong in Writing 121, but was told it was too much of a philosophical manifest (Writing 121 Observation notes). He related the lecture on doublespeak in Writing 122 directly to what he was learning in philosophy about language (Writing 122 Observation notes, May 3). He constantly and consistently remembered and connected information that he had heard in one class with new and/or different information in another class. His ability to do this seemed instantaneous, so it appeared that he did not translate between English and Vietnamese.

One particular between-class conversation with the subject sums up his memory. I did not write this casual

conversation down because at the time it seemed inconsequential. Between classes one day he asked me for a word, and I laughed and said I would need more information than that. He explained that I knew the word because he had heard me use it once when I was talking. He then went on to describe the topic, setting, and approximate time I had used the word. He knew approximately what the word meant, but he could not provide me with the beginning letter or sound. I started going through vocabulary that I thought applied to his meaning and finally hit upon the word. He knew it immediately when he heard it, but he did not technically know the word. I had to spell it for him so he could use it in a paper. This innocuous conversation has played over and over in my mind since then. The subject was able to remember and recall the context in which this particular word had been used. He was able to recognize it by some form of auditory phonetic coding, but he did not really know the word in any sense that could be tested. Gardner (1991) has hinted at the ability of adult second language learners to remember information presented orally, distinguish between sounds, and then retrieve the information later (p. 9). The placement tests that the subject had taken before entering the community college did not and could not determine his auditory ability.

<u>Learner Characteristics</u>

Several personal characteristics became obvious throughout the study. First the subject was very motivated to do well in the community college and transfer to a four year school. He wanted a degree in computer science, but he also wanted to learn more than just computers. He wanted an education in humanities. The subject studied English by learning about different aspects of English such as reading, study skills, grammar, and writing. He studied two languages, English and Japanese. He studied the nature of man by taking classes in psychology and philosophy, and he studied art by taking piano. The subject studied to acquire knowledge, not to earn grades, as evidenced by his refusal to allow me to interview his aunt and cousins because his cousins had better grades.

Second, the subject, while not gregarious, was extroverted yet reserved. Brown (1980, 1981) believes that extroversion, valued in Western cultures, may lead to more emphasis on oral rather than aural language skills in language classrooms and suggests that introversion may be more closely related to empathy and intuitive understanding (1980, p. 110). Brown further suggests that "extroversion may be a factor in the speaking of a foreign language, but not in aural and reading comprehension, nor in writing" (1980, p. 111). The subject only spoke in class when the occasion so warranted. In philosophy he spoke in the small

group, even though some students in the group ignored him and his comments. In Writing 121 he asked the instructor clarification questions about assignments and vocabulary. In Writing 122 he participated in small group discussions about his paper, although he was not observed speaking in class. In physics he challenged the authority of the instructor by calling attention to mistakes the instructor had made.

Third, the subject displayed perseverance in many instances. He designed his own method of learning English and learning about English by working within the system—register in remedial classes and pass them, register in required college classes, change to audit or drop the class, re-register the following term with another instructor and pass the class. He persevered in the philosophy class by registering for a grade when the instructor had advised him to audit because of idiomatic language. To carry the degree of perseverance demonstrated by the subject one step further in regards to his ultimate goal of a four year degree, he transferred to a four year school that does not require a research paper for science majors. The subject was acutely aware that his English writing skills might inhibit his ability to receive his degree.

Fourth, the subject appeared to be a global learner, who, when instructors could not or would not comply with his needs, created his own global learning atmosphere by

connecting information in one class with information learned in another class.

Fifth, the subject understood his own learning style. He knew that taking notes in classes would distract him from remembering what was said. The possibility exists that the subject used his auditory skills because he had problems with English writing; however, his auditory skills extended to the setting and context in which words were used. The subject may have used visual clues to recall auditory information, but the data indicate that listening was his preferred and strongest learning modality. He clearly indicated in his journal and diary that he understood the difference between reading, studying, and doing homework. He relaxed by reading or watching television and monitored his school and social time as indicated in his journal and diary. The subject also appeared to understand and apply his own learning strategies: attend class, do assignments ahead of time, pay attention in class, and get outside help when necessary.

Sixth, the subject had a positive attitude toward learning. In physics when he had missed part of the homework assignment, he said that he had done "half the problem right" (Physics Observation notes, January 11). In philosophy when he was struggling to understand the application of the lecture material, his frustration did not overwhelm him, but instead led him to conclude that

philosophy was the most useful class he had taken
(Subject's Journal, Fri, 21th [sic], Appendix 2). Although
positive toward learning, the subject was also realistic
about learning as noted in his journal comments about
English throughout the month of May. He knew when he was
not learning, as well as when he was learning, frustration
and confusion aside.

Seventh, the subject took risks, was flexible, and
demonstrated a high tolerance level for ambiguity. The
subject took a risk whenever he spoke in class or small
groups. He took risks by enrolling in classes that he had
been advised not to take and, as in the writing classes,
had to audit or drop. He demonstrated flexibility by
adjusting his topics in Writing 121 to appease the
instructor, and most importantly, he demonstrated
flexibility by adjusting his timeline for transferring to a
four year school by taking each of the required writing
classes twice, from different teachers. The subject's
tolerance level for ambiguity is most explicit in his
journal and diary entries for philosophy. As he struggled
to overcome frustration because he could not understand why
he could do the problems in class but not at home, he
continued to show a willingness to continue trying to
comprehend the lectures. In the end it paid off, and he
felt that philosophy was his most useful class.

And eighth, the subject came from a family that
regarded education as a key to success. The subject's

father had known several languages and encouraged his children to learn other languages. The father had also taught in a university, so the usefulness of an advanced degree was evident to the subject. As Gardner and Lambert (1972) discovered, attitudes about language and other cultures are established in the home. Perhaps the father's influence on the subject is strongly embedded in memory, even though the father died when the subject was quite young.

Recommendations

The subject's ability to listen, remember, and connect across disciplines and time raises questions about in ESL teaching and learning. In ESL, language is broken into four skill areas: listening, reading, speaking, and writing. Listening and reading have traditionally been called passive or receptive skills and speaking and writing active or productive skills. As observations and comments indicate, listening was not a passive skill for the subject. Listening, necessary in all college classes, was actively exploited by the subject. Unfortunately, to the casual observer, the subject would appear to not be paying attention because he was not actively involved in notetaking. As he had so stated, note taking distracted him, and he was unable to fully concentrate on the lectures. His apparent ability to comprehend directly from

spoken English without translation to his first language
appears to require a great deal of concentration. For the
subject, listening was an active and interactive skill with
the productive aspect appearing in a different form,
possibly in a different class.

The discrepancy between the subject's auditory ability
and the subject's pronunciation was vast. His inability to
adequately monitor his pronunciation made it extremely
difficult for others to understand him. The most obvious
situation arose in the physics class when the instructor
had made a mistake on the board (Physics Observation notes,
May 17), and the subject tried to call his attention to it.
I was sitting next to the subject and could not understand
him. Perhaps his auditory skill has contributed to his
lack of comprehensible pronunciation. If the subject is a
global learner, he may not pay attention to the phonemes
and allophones necessary for clear pronunciation. First
language interference may account for some of the errors
the subject made in speech and writing. He may have heard
the word as a single unit of sound (Vietnamese is
monosyllabic) and lost individual elements that distinguish
one sound from another or one word from another. This may
also account for his confusion of written forms for words
that are similar in speech. For example on Wednesday, 2/17
(Subject's Diary, Appendix 3), he confused "net" with
"next"; again on Saturday, 2/20 (Appendix 3) the subject
appeared to confuse the word "my" with "mind." The

implication for teachers is that if students continually mispronounce words incorrectly, the real word may not be known or it may be confused with another, similar sounding word.

While the subject's auditory ability may be unique to him, the six months of three different types of classes illustrated that listening ability and skills need to be encouraged and taught regularly in ESL classes. The college classes in which the subject was enrolled were lecture format. Students listened to lectures with sporadic questions directed to the class from the instructor. Questions from the instructors were of two basic types: rhetorical questions, not really to be answered but for confirmation of information, and open questions, the instructor pausing to take any and all questions from the class. In the observed classes, questions and comments directed to the instructor from the students tended to be for clarification. If ESL, and foreign students studying in the United States, students do not understand the nature of the discourse community in academic settings, then they will miss the opportunity to ask for clarification. ESL students need to understand the global nature of lecture formats and use the open question option for asking specific questions about the lecture or references to homework and assignments. The ability to phrase and re-phrase questions to the instructor also needs to be addressed in ESL classes.

The subject in this study was very aware of his own learning style and learning strategies, although he appeared to apply them unconsciously for the most part. Chamot (1984), O'Malley and Chamot (1990), and Oxford (1990) have all advocated for the inclusion of learning strategy training in foreign language training. Reid (1987) and Stebbins (1995) have indicated that learning strategies may be cultural. If this is true, then teachers need to teach language learners adaptive techniques for monitoring their own learning in different cultural settings. Thompson (1987) has excellent suggestions for teaching memory enhancing techniques which could be applicable in all learning situations. ESL/EFL students need to be made aware of different techniques and strategies that can be used in different learning situations and with different proficiency levels. Students need to be taught adaptation and flexibility to fit any and all learning situations, and they need to be realistic about their own language skills and potential.

Finally, as indicated by Gass (1983) and Kroll (1990), ESL/EFL students' ability to recognize and edit their own errors in written English are limited by their own proficiency levels and intuitive knowledge about errors and English. Recognizing errors or ungrammatical sentences does not mean that students can repair them. Explicit writing instruction may be more helpful for ESL/EFL students than process writing instruction because of the

students' lack of competence and proficiency in English.
Whether the errors are caused by interference from the
first language or inadequate linguistic competence in the
second language, ESL/EFL students may be able to recognize
errors but not correct them.

Conclusions

Hypothesis One

Listening skills and memory/recall, or auditory
memory, appear to be essential to the subject's academic
success.

Hypothesis Two

General information about learning styles and
strategies may be less useful than specific strategy
application in academic situations for this subject.

Hypothesis Three

Explicit, structured writing instruction may be more
useful than process writing for this subject.

Recommendations for Further Research

The purpose of this study was to identify possible
characteristics, experiences, and observable qualities

and/or strategies which may contribute to second language
learner success in a post secondary institution. The study
accomplished its goal; however, several additional research
issues and questions were raised:

1)   The role of listening and memory in relation to
      academic success for second language learners
      needs to be explored. The impression that
      listening is a passive skill may be erroneous.
      What skills can be taught or enhanced to promote
      active and interactive listening and
      memory/recall as a means to academic achievement
      for second language learners?

2)   The use and role of learning strategies, learner
      strategies, and learning style in second language
      learner academic success is unclear. What is the
      relationship between an individual, a culture,
      learning strategies, and learning style? What
      effect does a second language and culture have?

3)   The English proficiency and competence necessary
      for ESL students to pass required college writing
      classes is vague. How much and what type of
      language instruction is necessary for second
      language learners to achieve proficiency in
      written academic discourse?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abraham, R. G. (1985). Field independence-dependence and
     the teaching of grammar. TESOL Quarterly, 19, 689-
     701.

Abraham, R. G., Vann, R. J. (1987). Strategies of two
     language learners: A case study. In A. Wenden & J.
     Rubin (Eds.), Learner strategies in language learning
     (pp. 85-102). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

August, D. L. (1987). Effects of peer tutoring on the
     second language acquisition of Mexican American
     children in elementary school. TESOL Quarterly, 21,
     717-736.

Beebe, L. M. (1983). Risk-taking and the language
     learner. In H. W. Seliger & M. H. Long (Eds.),
     Classroom oriented research in second language
     acquisition (pp. 39-66). Rowley: Newbury House.

Bousquet, G. (1987). Living in a state of limbo: A case
     study of Vietnamese refugees in Hong Kong camps. In
     S. M. Morgan & E. Colson (Eds.), People in upheaval
     (pp. 34-53). New York: Center for Migration Studies.

Brodkey, L. (1987). Writing ethnographic narratives.
     Written Communication, 4, 25-50.

Brown, H. D. (1980). Principles of language learning and
     teaching. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Brown, H. D. (1981). Affective factors in second language
     learning. In J. E. Alatis, H. B. Altman, & P. M.
     Alatis (Eds.), The second language classroom:
     Directions for the 1980's (pp. 111-129). New York:
     Oxford University Press.

Byers, P. & Byers, H. (1972). Nonverbal communication and
     the education of children. In C. B. Cazden, V. P.
     John, & D. Hymes (Eds.), Functions of language in the
     classroom (pp. 3-31). New York: Teachers College
     Press.

Cafferty, P. S. J. & Rivera-Martinez, C. (1981). The
     politics of language: The dilemma of bilingual
     education for Puerto Ricans. Boulder, CO: Westview
     Press.

Canale, M. (1984). On some theoretical frameworks for language proficiency. In C. Rivera (Ed.), Language proficiency and academic achievement (pp. 28-39). Clevedon, Avon, England: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Canale, M. (1987). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In J. C. Richards & R. W. Schmidt (Eds.), Language and communication (pp. 2-27). New York: Longman.

Cazden, C. B. (1971). The hunt for independent variables. In R. Huxley & E. Ingram (Eds.), Language acquisition: Models and methods (pp. 41-47). London: Academic Press.

Cazden, C. (1982). Four comments. In P. Gilmore & A. A. Glattorn (Eds.), Children in and out of school (pp. 209-226). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Chamot, A. U. (1984, March). A study of learning strategies in foreign language instruction. Presentation at the 18th Annual TESOL Convention, Houston, TX.

Chiseri-Strater, E. (1988). Academic discourse: An ethnography of the public and private literacies of university students. (Doctoral dissertation, University of New Hampshire, 1988). University Microfilms International Dissertation Services, 8907438.

Chiseri-Strater, E. (1991). Academic Literacies. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers, Heinemann.

Cobb, A. K. & Hagemaster, J. N. (1987). Ten criteria for evaluating qualitatiave research proposals. Journal of Nursing Education, 26(4), 138-143.

Cohen, A. D., & Cavalcanti, M. C. (1990). Feedback on compositions: Teacher and student verbal reports. In B. Kroll (Ed.), Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom (pp. 155-177). New York: Cambridge.

Collier, V. P. (1987). Age and rate of acquisition of second language for academic purposes. TESOL Quarterly, 21, 617-641.

Colson, E. (1987). Introduction: Migrants and their hosts. In S. M. Morgan & E. Colson (Eds.), People in upheaval (pp. 1-16). New York: Center for Migration Studies.

Condon, J. (1985). With respect to the Japanese: A guide for Americans. Yarmouth, ME: Interctultural Press.

Cortes, C. E. (1986). The education of language minority students: A contextual interaction model. In S. Kagan & M. McGroarty (Eds.), Beyond language: Social and cultural factors in schooling language minority students (pp. 3-33). Los Angeles: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center, California State University.

Cummins, J. (1984). Wanted: A theoretical framework for relating language proficiency to academic achievement among bilingual students. In C. Rivera (Ed.), Language proficiency and academic achievement (pp. 2-19). Clevedon, Avon, England: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Cummins, J. (1989). Empowering minority students. Sacramento, CA: California Association for Bilingual Education.

Dunn, R., Dunn, K. & Price, G.E. (1985). Learning Style Inventory (LSI). Lawrence, KS: Price Systems, Inc.

Eisenhart, M. A. (1988). The ethnographic research tradition and mathematics education research. Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, 100-112.

Ely, C. M. (1995). Tolerance of ambiguity and the teaching of ESL. In J. M. Reid (Ed.), Learning styles in the ESL/EFL classroom (pp. 87-95). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Fetterman, D. M. (1989). Ethnography step by step. Applied Social Research Methods Series, 17. Newbury Park: Sage.

Field, M. L. & Aebersol. J. A. (March, 1990). Cultural attitudes towards reading: Implications for teachers of ESL/bilingual readers. Journal of Reading, 406-410.

Fraser, B. (1987). The domain of pragmatics. In J. C. Richards & R. W. Schmidt (Eds.), Language and communication (pp. 29-59). New York: Longman.

Friedlander, A. (1990). Composing in English: Effects of a first language on writing in English as a second language. In B. Kroll (Ed.), Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom (pp. 109-125). New York: Cambridge.

Gardner, R. C. (1991). Second-language learning in adults: Correlates of proficiency. Applied Language Learning, 2(1), 1-28.

Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1972). Attitudes and motivation in second-language learning. Rowley: Newbury House.

Gass, S. (1983). The development of L2 intuitions. TESOL Quarterly, 17. 273-291.

Geertz, C. (1976). From the native's point of view: On the nature of anthropological understanding. In K. H. Basso & H. A. Selby (Eds.), Meaning in anthropology (pp. 221-237). Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Genesee, F. (1984). On Cummins' theoretical framework. In C. Rivera (Ed.), Language proficiency and academic achievement (pp. 20-27). Clevedon, Avon, England: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Gilmore, P. & Smith, D. M. (1982). A restrospective discussion of the state of the art in ethnography in education. In P. Gilmore & A. A. Glatthorn (Eds.), Children in and out of school, 2, (pp. 3-18). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Glaser, B. G. & Strauss, A. L. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory. Chicago: Aldine Publishing.

Gradman, H. L. & Hanania, E. (1991). Language learning background factors and ESL proficiency. The Modern Language Journal, 75, 39-51.

Gumperz, J. J. (1972). Introduction. In J. J. Gumperz & Dell Hymes (Eds.), Directions in Sociolinguistics. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Gumperz, J. J. & Cook-Gumperz, J. (1982). Introduction: Language and the communication of social identity. In J. J. Gumperz (Ed.), Language and social identity (pp. 1-21). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Haines, D. W. (1985). Refugees and the refugee program. In D. W. Haines (Ed.), Refugees in the United States (pp. 3-16). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Heath, S. B. (1982). Ethnography in education: Defining the essentials. In P. Gilmore & A. A. Glatthorn (Eds.), <u>Children in and out of school, 2,</u> (pp. 33-55). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Heath, S. B. (1983). <u>Ways with words</u>. New York: Cambridge.

Heath, S. B. (1986). Sociocultural contexts of language development. In S. Kagan & M. McGroarty (Eds.), <u>Beyond language: Social and cultural factors in schooling language minority students</u> (pp. 143-186). Los Angeles: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center, California State University.

Hernandez, H. (1989). <u>Multicultural education, a teacher's guide to content and process</u>. Columbus, OH: Merrill Publishing.

Horwitz, E. K. (1990). Attending to the affective domain in the foreign language classroom. In S. Sieloff Magnan (Ed.), <u>Shifting the instructional focus to the learner</u> (pp. 15-33). Middlebury, VT: Northeast Conference.

Houlette, F. (1984). Linguistics, empirical research, and evaluating composition. <u>Journal of Advanced Composition, V,</u> 107-114.

Hymes, D. (1971). Competence and performance in linguistic theory. In R. Huxley & E. Ingram (Eds.), <u>Language acquisition: Models and methods</u> (pp. 3-28). London: Academic Press.

Hymes, D. (1972a). Introduction. In C. B. Cazden, V. P. John, & D. Hymes (Eds.), <u>Functions of language in the classroom</u> (pp. XI-LIV). New York: Teachers College Press.

Hymes, D. (1972b). Models of the interaction of language and social life. In J. J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), <u>Directions in social linguistics</u> (pp. 35-71). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Hymes, D. (1982). What is ethnography? In P. Gilmore & A. A. Glatthorn (Eds.), <u>Children in and out of school, 2,</u> (pp. 21-32). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Jupp, T. C., Roberts, C. & Cook-Gumperz, J. (1982). Language and disadvantage: The hidden process. In J. J. Gumperz (Ed.), <u>Language and social identity</u> (pp. 232-266). New York: Cambridge.

King, R. A. (1974). The teacher as a participant-observer: A case study. In G. D. Spindler (Ed.), <u>Education and cultural process</u> (pp. 399-410). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Kleine, M. (1990). Beyond triangulation: Ethnography, writing, and rhetoric. <u>Journal of Advanced Composition,</u> <u>10</u>(1), 117-125.

Krashen, S. D. (1981). Effective second language acquisition: Insights from research. In J. E. Alatis, H. B. Altman, & P. M. Alatis (Eds.), <u>The second language classroom: Directions for the 1980's</u> (pp. 95-109). New York: Oxford University Press.

Krashen S. D. (1982). <u>Principles and practice in second language acquisition</u>. New York: Pergamon Press.

Krashen, S. D. (1985). <u>Inquiries and insights</u>. Hayward, CA: Alemany Press.

Krashen, S. D. & Terrell, T. D. (1983). <u>The natural approach</u>. Hayward, CA: Alemany Press.

Kroll, B. (1990). What does time buy? ESL student performance on home versus class compositions. In B. Kroll (Ed.), <u>Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom</u> (pp. 140-154). New York: Cambridge.

Lincoln, Y. S. & Guba, E. G. (1985). <u>Naturalistic inquiry</u>. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

McCarthy, L. P. (1985). A stranger in strange lands: A college student writing across the curriculum. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1985). <u>University Microfilms International,</u> 8515414.

McDermott, R. P. (1974). Achieving school failure: An anthropological approach to illiteracy and social stratification. In G. D. Spindler (Ed.), <u>Education and cultural process</u> (pp. 82-118). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

McDermott, R. P. & Hood, L. (1982). Institutionalized psychology and the ethnography of schooling. In P. Gilmore & A. A. Glatthorn (Eds.), <u>Children in and out of school,</u> <u>2,</u> (pp. 232-249). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Mehan, H. (1982). The structure of classroom events and their consequences for student performance. In P. Gilmore & A. A. Glatthorn (Eds.), <u>Children in and out of school, 2,</u> (pp. 59-87). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Merriam, S. B. (1988). <u>Case study research in education, a qualitative approach</u>. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Nelson, G. L. (1995). Cultural differences in learning styles. In J. M. Reid (Ed.), <u>Learning styles in the ESL/EFL classroom</u> (pp. 3-18). New York: Heinle & Heinle.

Ogbu, J. U. (1978). <u>Minority education and caste</u>. New York: Academic Press.

Ogbu, J. U. (1989). The individual in collective adaptation: A framework for focusing on academic underperformance and dropping out among involuntary minorities. In L. Weis, E. Farrar, & H. G. Petrie (Eds.), <u>Dropouts from school: Issues, dilemmas, and solutions</u> (pp. 181-204). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Ogbu, J. U. (1990). Minority status and literacy in comparative perspective. <u>Daedalus, Spring,</u> 141-168.

Ogbu, J. U. & Matute-Bianchi, M. E. (1986). Understanding sociocultural factors: Knowledge, identity, and school adjustment. In S. Kagan & M. McGroarty (Eds.), <u>Beyond language: Social and cultural factors in schooling language minority students</u> (pp. 73-142). Los Angeles: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center, California State University.

O'Malley, M. J. & Chamot, A. U. (1990). <u>Learning strategies in second language acquisition</u> (2nd printing). New York: Cambridge.

Oxford, R. L. (1990). Language learning strategies and beyond: A look at strategies in the context of styles. In S. Sieloff Magnan (Ed.), <u>Shifting the instructional focus to the learner</u> (pp. 35-55). Middlebury, VT: Northeast Conference.

Oxford, R. L., & Cohen, A. D. (1992). Language learning strategies: Crucial issues of concept and classification. <u>Applied Language Learning, 3</u> (1 & 2), 1-35.

Pershkin, A. (1982). The researcher and subjectivity: Reflections on an ethnography of school and community. In G. D. Spindler (Ed.), <u>Doing the ethnography of schooling: Educational anthropology in action</u> (pp.48-67). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Philips, S. U. (1972). Participant structures and communicative competence: Warm Springs children in community and classroom. C. B. Cazden, V. P. John, & D. Hymes (Eds.), <u>Functions of language in the classroom</u> (pp. 370-394). New York: Teachers College Press.

Politzer, R. L. & McGroarty, M. (1985). An exploratory study oflearning behaviors and their relationship to gains in linguistic and communicative competence. <u>TESOL Quarterly, 19,</u> 103-124.

Reid, J. M. (1987). The learning style preferences of ESL students. <u>TESOL Quarterly, 21,</u> 87-111.

Reid, J. M. (Ed.). (1995). <u>Learning styles in the ESL/EFL classroom</u>. New York: Heinle & Heinle.

Rivers, W. M. & Melvin, B. J. (1981). Language learners as individuals: Discovering their needs, wants, and learning styles. In J. E. Alatis, H. B. Altman, & P. M. Alatis (Eds.), <u>The second language classroom: Directions for the 1980's</u> (pp. 79-93). New York: Oxford University Press.

Robb, T., Ross, S. & Shortreed, I. (1986). Salience of feedback on error and its effect on EFL writing quality. <u>TESOL Quarterly, 20,</u> 83-95.

Rossi-Le, L. (1995). Learning styles and strategies in adult immigrant ESL students. In J. M. Reid (Ed.), <u>Learning Styles in the ESL/EFL classroom</u> (pp. 118-125). New York: Heinle & Heinle.

Salzman, M. (1986). <u>Iron and silk</u>. New York: Random House.

Saville-Troike, M. (1984). What *really* matters in second language learning for academic achievement? <u>TESOL Quarterly, 2,</u> 199-219.

Schinke-Llano, L. A. (1983). Foreigner talk in content classrooms. In H. W. Seliger & M. H. Long (Eds.), <u>Classroom oriented research in second language acquisition</u> (pp. 146-165). Rowley: Newbury House.

Schneider, D. M. (1976). Notes toward a theory of culture. In K. H. Basso & H. A. Selby (Eds.), <u>Meaning in anthropology</u> (pp. 197-220). Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Schumann, J. H. (1978). Second language acquisition: The pidginization hypothesis. In E. M. Hatch (Ed.), <u>Second language acquisition</u> (pp. 256-271). Rowley: Newbury House.

Scollon, R. & Scollon, S. B. K. (1987). Face in interethnic communication. In J. C. Richards & R. W. Schmidt (Eds.), <u>Language and communication</u> (pp. 156-188). New York: Longman.

Seidman, I. E. (1991). <u>Interviewing as qualitative research</u>. New York: Teachers College Press.

Seliger, H. W. (1982). On the possible role of the right hemisphere in second language acquisition. <u>TESOL Quarterly, 16,</u> 307-314.

Seliger, H. W. (1983). Learner interaction in the classroom and its effect on language acquisition. In H. W. Seliger & M. H. Long (Eds.), <u>Classroom oriented research in second language acquisition</u> (pp. 246-267). Rowley: Newbury House.

Shultz, J. J., Florio, S., & Erickson, F. (1982). Where's the floor? Aspects of the cultural organization of social relationships in communication at home and in school. In P. Gilmore & A. A. Glatthorn (Eds.), <u>Children in and out of school, 2,</u> (pp. 88-123). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Sinclair, R. L. & Ghory, W. J. (1987). Becoming Marginal. In H. T. Trueba (Ed.), <u>Success or failure? Learning and the language minority student</u> (pp. 169-185). New York: Newbury House/Cambridge.

Spindler, G. D. (1974). Why have minority groups in North America been disadvantaged by their schools? In G. D. Spindler (Ed.), <u>Educational and cultural process</u> (pp. 69-81). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Spindler, G. & Spindler, L. (1982). Roger Harker and Schonhausen: From the familiar to the strange and back again. In G. D. Spindler (Ed.), <u>Doing the ethnography of schooling: Educational anthropology in action</u> (pp. 20-46). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Spolsky, B. (1969). Attitudinal aspects of second language learning. Language Learning, 19, 271-285.

Spolsky, B. (1984). A note on the dangers of terminological innovation. In C. Rivera (Ed.), Language proficiency and academic achievement (pp. 41-43). Clevedon, Avon, England: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Stebbins, C. (1995). Culture-specific perceptual-learning-style preferences of postsecondary students of English as a second language. In J. M. Reid (Ed.), Learning styles in the ESL/EFL classroom (pp. 108-117). New York: Heinle & Heinle.

Stevick. E. W. (1976). Memory, meaning & method. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1990). Basics of qualitative research. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Suarez-Orozco, M. M. (1987). Transformations in perception of self and social environment in Mexican immigrants. In S. M. Morgan & E. Colson (Eds.), People in upheaval (pp. 129-143). New York: Center for Migration Studies.

Sue, S. & Padilla, A. (1986). Ethnic minority issues in the United States: Challenges for the educational system. In S. Kagan & M. McGroarty (Eds.), Beyond language: Social and cultural factors in schooling language minority students (pp. 35-72). Los Angeles: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center, California State University.

Thompson, I. (1987). Memory in language learning. In A. Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds.), Learner strategies in language learning (pp. 43-56). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Troike, R. C. (1984). SCALP: Social and cultural aspects of language proficiency. In C. Rivera (Ed.), Language proficiency and academic achievement (pp. 44-54). Clevedon, Avon, England: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Vann, R. J., Meyer, D. E., & Lorenz, F. O. (1984). Error gravity: A study of faculty opinion of ESL errors. TESOL Quarterly, 18, 427-440.

Wald, B. (1984). A sociolinguistic perspective on Cummins' current framework for relating language proficiency to academic achievement. In C. Rivera (Ed.), Language proficiency and academic achievement (pp. 55-70). Clevedon, Avon, England: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Walker C. P. & Elias, D. (1987). Writing conference talk: Factors associated with high- and low-rated writing conferences. Research in the Teaching of English, 21, 266-285.

Wells, S. E. (1990). At-risk youth, identification, programs, and recommendations. Englewood, CO: Teacher Ideas Press.

Wolcott, H. F. (1982). Mirror, models, and monitors: Educator adaptations of the ethnographic innovation. In G. D. Spindler (Ed.), Doing the ethnography of schooling: Educational anthropology in action (pp. 68-95). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Wolfson, N. (1987). Rules of speaking. In J. C. Richards & R. W. Schmidt (Eds.), Language and communication (pp. 61-87). New York: Longman.

Yin, R. K. (1989). Case study research, design and methods (rev. ed.). Applied Social Research Methods Series, 5. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Zamel, V. (1985). Responding to student writing. TESOL Quarterly, 19, 79-101.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1

THE LITTLE ADVENTURE.

... A chilly wind blowing through a plastic craggy blanket wakes me up. I open my eyes to the undulation waves, and realize I am still on a boat. I only hear the slap of waves beating the sides of the boat. Others still lay under their plastic blanket. Far in the rear the steersman anxiously handles a helm controls of the floating boat to nowhere. I get up and wander, but only un-ending sea waves twinkle in the morning sun shine. To the rear, Thai coast is still far in the distance. Taking a long breath of fresh beautiful morning air, I feel disappointed. I am so disappointed to see the Thai - Malaysian border about six miles away. All of our effort to pass to Malaysia last night had failed. We should be in Malaysia's land by now.

Unfortunately, the engine broke down an hour after the Thai coast guard pulled us from their northern coast. They towed us almost to the Malaysian border, and they left us alone. Now, our boat was floating north due to the winter wind of the China Sea. I could not imagine what was going to happen in the coming days, and when we would be in the land of promises. The land of promise was just about six miles away, but no one was sure we could make it safely.

The voice of the steersman disturbed the deadly quiet boat, "What are we gonna do now?" He shouted to the captain in the side engine room, "Do you have any plan?" He asked again. "Let see if we can fix the engine." The captain and two mechanics discuss the

boat's engine. The wind blows on north and pushes us with it on the way. The captain suggests that we should land and ask for some help; otherwise, we will be blown north out the open ocean. There is no other choice, and I begin to worry whether the new coast where we are going to land is safe for us from land-robbers.

The boat moves slowly toward the coast. Now the wind blows slowly and regularly. People on board awaken after exhausted night. They use the wood on the floor for paddles. While rowing, they dream of normal morning activities such as a bath and a cup of coffee. The sound of humor and the noise of paddles breaking through the water is exciting after a rough night. Far a head, people scurry on the shore run back and forth, like ants they see us. We row in our minds fluttering about unexpected things may that happen to us as we land. Through a conversation with a mechanic, I know that we do not have the right tools to fix the engine, so we need some helps.

As the distance gets shorter between us and the coast, we can see the people more clearly, and crowd of people gathers along the coast. People on the beach are about two hundreds feet ahead. When I see the wave of greeting I feel relief at least they may be nice people. After two hours of rowing, we finally get to the coast about two hundred feet away.

We stop and anchor the boat fifty feet from the shore. I am excited to see people waiting on the beach. The captain prepares with two mechanics to swim to the beach. He carries a few gold pieces and jewelry to trade the needed. The captain suggests that

everyone else get inside the cabin to avoid any unexpected happenings. I help the men depart at the rear of the boat. I watch them swim tour the shore in my frustration of hope. Suddenly, in the middle of the crowd somebody shouted in Thai and tries to break through the crowd of people. I look carefully and see a police officer. The black cap is jumping up and down trying to cut through the crowd from the behind. As he breaks out of the crowd, the officer in a white uniformed shirt and black pants, shouts very loudly and angrily at us. Even though, I cant understand Thai, common sense tells me something is not going as smoothly as expected. "What is he saying, Captain?" I cry down to them in the water in Vietnamese. Although I know that none of the men understands what the officer is yelling, I am sure that the language is Thai and not English, since I do not know any foreign languages. My curiosity makes me just wondered about it. Suddenly, two shoots of gun shots cut through my thoughts. I look up and see the officer is standing at the edge of water. He is raising his right hand up and points the gun up to the sky. I hear some screams far down the beach and somebody cries out from the cabin. I yell down to the cabin that it looks like warning shoots (This is, a guess since only seen it in movies.) The men in the water stop for a moment to discuss something then they continue on. I glance at the officer. He slowly lowers his hand and points the gun down to the men in the water. I yell out as loud as I can to call them back to the boat. Again I glance at him, and this time the gun is aimed directly at me. I look behind me to see if there

is some one else. There is no one else in direction. I could die,
and I have no place to hide. The cabin is too far. I am scared
My body seems paralyzed. My heart almost beats through of my
chest. Instantly, my head is drenched in sweat. Quickly, I have
to call the men back. "Swim back, the police's going to shoot me,"
I cry to them. They quickly respond my call. The captain climbs
up on the boat and the first thing he orders is to row back out to
the ocean.

We all try to row as fast as we can. The officer becomes and
smaller at the edge of the water. I take a long sigh of relief,
but the officer is still in my mind. Only in the movies on
television I have seen hand gun or a situation like this. I can
not belief either now. I know death is awful and scary in the
movies but in real life it is much more. As I look back, he now is
becoming smaller, but I can see his strange hostile walk back and
forth on the beach. I wanted to row faster out to the sea away
from the unwelcome place. I just wonder about his hostility.

The Malaysian border, our promise land, is farther and farther
in the distance. I must calm down to prepare for other unexpected
things. I smile at one more long unwanted day waiting for us. I
keep rowing...

...On that same day, after pulling back three miles away from
the shore, we stop (?), and the leader and mechanists try to find
the ways to get to Malaysia's border. Suddenly, far from the water
line appear a fast moving thing. It is hard to recognize, I could
only see the white water was push by the subject and shining

against the sun light.   It move so fast that in a short moment later I could see it getting bigger and closer our direction.   A sound from that engine's boat attracts everyone attention. "It's a ship guard." somebody shouted.   When I can recognize it, it was like the other two.   I wonder if it was one of the other two ship which towed us to here.   There is a little fear in me if one of those two ship coming back.   But it wasn't.

It cruises around us and heads to the shores.   After a while in the shore, it comes in back out our boat.   When it is side by side with the boat, the leader and the guards by english.   They also give us several 20-liter can of fresh water to us.   The leader translate into Vietnamese that the ship guard will have some mechanist come out to fix our boat but our mechanist wants to prepare themselves.   They ask for some equipments to place the broken thing (I do not know what it is.)

While waiting for engine gets fix, some people on another group use water to wash their face and hands then "tan" in a burning sun.   There also some arguments down in the cabinets, but little controls now on the boat.   About an hour and half later since the ship guard came, the mechanist get the things they need, and our boat were towed down to the south again ...

... "Wake up, come on, wake up quickly" some one rocks me back and forth very hard.   I exhuastedly open my eyes; I see a stranger still holds his hand on my arms, "get up and help push the boat" he continues.   I notice that the engine's sound is running but the boat leans on one side without moving.   I raise my head, and I feel

like I am on a hill with my head up. I realize that the boat is
stuck on something. I jumped down after several men, and the water
is only to my chest high (about 4 feet). I wander around wonder
why is is so knee-deeped but I could only see a little sight of a dark
mount about a mile away. I move to a back of the boat to help the
men; I was astonish with what I see. Around my body in water was
surrounding with many tiny blue stars as I move. They are so
bright that I could see my whole body and my foot in dark of the
night. I stop the stars disappear, then I move they bright around
me again. It is like I was worn a coat with fashion of star-cut
on. Then I look around I see it happens to everyone. "What is
this?" I wonder, "come on, who care" somebody yells out from the
water. "What is that? look wonderful, can I jump down?" my brother
asks from the top of the boat but I did not let him. I went back
to sleep with wonders after pushing the boat out from that

APPENDIX 2

SUBJECT'S JOURNALS

April 19 - May 21, 1993

The following were transcribed exactly as written.

April 19, '93

Phil: We have discussion on network today in class. Although I had had [sic] gone over material and did homework ahead before, but I confuse with the way my instructor analysic [sic] the material. I try to find the relationship of my thoughts to material and hers to material and compare the difference between them. Then I had it work [sic] I understand the material in both ways (my is crossed out) mine and instructor's.

Eng: I had tough time justify my view and others about my reason to be here in this (contry is crossed out) country when we talked about immigrant in U.S. There is nothing knew [sic] about the lecture except I think I should be aware that there are some people really discriminate against other in (racial is crossed out) racism. I did not know that because people pretend to be nice to each others [sic].

April 21 '93

Phil: I did my homework practice at home, and I think I (under is crossed out) comprehensive them all right. But in the class my instructor explain them (in is crossed out) so broad make (my is crossed out) me confuse [sic] with my

thought [sic]. However, I understand more the purpose of the sentences she used that they are deeply [sic] in meaning and good demonstration in general.

April 23, 93

Phil: There is nothing new in the leture [sic] today. We have a review for midterm test on Monday. In one practice exercise, I have a problem of confusing the material. First of all, I understand the argument well, but when the instructor (analysics it is crossed out) analizes [sic] it I totally lose [sic]. Well, I will [sic] in about the whole thing sometimes in my odd times.

Apr 28, '93

Phil: We have learned [a] new method to test the theory. It is very aboard [sic] but once you understand the method well, there are many good examples in daily [sic] to practice.

English: We don't have any things new today in class.

Apr 30, '93

Phil: No class.

English: We have our draft paper compare [sic] together. I realize that how bad my paper [sic] and my English skill compare [sic] to others. (mine skills is crossed out) My skills about English is needed more help badly [sic] in order to catch up with others. *

* This is in reference to last Friday's class where students met in small groups to read and discuss rough drafts. See notes of 5/2.

May 4, '93

Phil: I am not very good today. I make all my judgements slowly. Therefore in my first class, I have a hard time to catch up with (my instr is crossed out) the lecture. It's hard too. But I will think about the lecture again sometimes in the odd times.

English: We learn (th is crossed out) new thing today about double-speak. It's [sic] may not new to some others, but to me it is a [sic] first time I have seem [sic] doublespeaks [sic] are written out like an article. I heard people used [sic] them in the speechs [sic] before. Anyway, it is interesting class meeting. It was excited [sic] because the material fun and instructor makes jokes about it too.

May 7, '93

Phil: I have a had [sic] time to get concerntration [sic] during the lecture. It's new and hard too. Therefore, I don't understand the lecture a bit.

[May] Mon 17th '93

Phil: Today the class is so confusing, I have a had [sic] time to catch up with the lecture. But I think I am alone.

Mon May 10, '93

Engl: I was bored, I did not learn anything out of the class.

Wed May 12'93

    Phil: I have learn [sic] a great way (to is crossed out) of looking at argument to find its fallacies. (Norm is crossed out) Normally, it is hard to (th is crossed out) tell the claim is truth [sic] without this way, hominem.

Fri May 14 '93

    Phil: This class is so helpful to me. It help [sic] me look the world with rational thoughts and I can uncover deep of arguments by logic. It (is the kind of cla is crossed out) is the only class I think Worthwhile [sic] to take since I have been in high school. In short, it is a bigest [sic] payoff of my effort.

    Engl: I did not prepare for today's class because I forgot (assigment is crossed out) the assignment. When the instructor, Mr. W----, asked how everyone felt about the assignment Theme 4, I was the only [sic] one said the first part of the assignment is hard and another part is easy. The rest of the class responded opposite. Since then, I always concern [sic] with my paper rather than the lecture Mr. W--prepesented [sic].

[May] Mon 17th '93

    Phil: Today the class is so confusing, I have a had [sic] time to catch up with the lecture. But I think I am [not ?] alone.

    Engl: No class

[May] Wed 19th

Phil: In the whole class time today we are just reviewing the questions.

Engl: The instructor gave us the new assignment, no lecture.

[May] Fri 21th [sic]

Phil: We learn to evaluation [sic] the argument today [sic]. It is the last method to look at the argument. It is [sic] sound easy but it is hard to evaluate other (viewers is crossed out) views base [sic] on our own. Because there is no absolute right, everything is relevant.

Eng: We just have discussion about the technique of cause and effect for (asing is crossed out) asignment [sic].

APPENDIX 3

SUBJECT'S DIARY

February 15-28, 1993

The following were transcribed exactly as written.

Monday 2/15

I start a [sic] day with worrying about my Physics test. I study hard a [sic] day before though but test will be hard as my instructor told.

In test room I could solved [sic] one problem since I did not know how to do it on home-work [sic] neither. But I feel very confident with the (test is crossed out) answers.

NO English class today so I go to practice piano for an hour, then I go to computer class and try to do program assignment.

I get home at 8:00 pm. The first thing I do is eat dinner. Every-one [sic] already (eat is crossed out) ate so I enjoy my supper lonely [sic]. I watch TV as my break for half of an hour after dinner. I study until bedtime at 12 in the morning [midnight].

Tuesday 2/16

Waking up late, I rush to school and get there at (night is crossed out) 9:00 am. I work until noon and eat lunch half of an hour. At Physics lab I did not done [sic] anything since everything slow for an hour. We, group of five, finish the lab experiment at 2:30 pm. On the way go

[sic] to Computer class I have a great conversation with one of my lab groups [sic] about school.

At 4:30 pm I practice piano for hafl [sic] of hour then I go to computer lab try to done [sic] the program assigment [sic]. I get home at 9:30 pm. I study and do homework on Physics for (an is crossed out) one (hafl is crossed out) half hour and got to bed at 12:30 am.

Wendesday [sic] 2/17

I got to school at 8:30 am and in Physic [sic] class I found out that I misunderstood the concepts of chapters 15 & 17 that leads to the ways I solve problems wrong but I thought they are right. I got 67% on the test. I leaving [sic] of the class with disappointment and confusion of the way I study.

I have writing in class today in English class but I do not prepare much for the class. At two o'clock I talk with a friend in piano class and try to study at the same time so I can relax after the anxious [sic] of the test score and get ready for next class.

I got out of the English (piano is crossed out) class at 4:40 pm and practice piano until the class time of Piano [sic] at 5:00 pm. After 7:00 pm I do computer assignment until nine. The program finally works but I do not have time to write down the comment and algorithm [sic] when the lab is closed so I have to come back a [sic] next day to turn it in.

Thus [sic] 2/18

Today is no school in the morning, but I have to get up at 8:00 am and study a little bit and try to fix finish [sic] the program. I make about ten phone calls which I have not done since weeks about business and dental appoinment [sic]. I watch news at noon for an hour then I leave home heading to where I used to work and get my x-ray film and then I head to O--- for consult [sic] with surgeons there but I could [not ?] do it so I have to leave and go to school, since I have class at 3:00 pm. After class I go to student fire [fireside student lounge] and sleep for an hour then I practice piano for an hour I got home at eight and watch [sic] television until 11 pm and sleep.

Fri 2/19

No school today due to snowing [sic] outside. All day I have to fix my car since I [sic] did not start. I light the fire, watch TV, and no study have done in the day.

Saturday 2/20

I woke up at ten after try [sic] to eat breafast [sic] watch new (then is crossed out) I go to library at 3:00 pm. There I check out book [sic] and read them for researching my paper. I also read all over chapter 19 in Physic [sic] but do no homework. I do not write the draft since I have in my [mind ?] changing to another topic.

I go home at 8 o'clock and reading [sic] my book for my new topic but after a while the new topics [sic] is

boring so I go back [sic] the old one. I go to bed at eleven o'clock. I read novel for an hour for fun.

Sunday 2/21

After breakfast I clean up my house since every-one [sic] else left home so it is easy for my [sic] and not bother anyone. I feel free and sit down [sic] begin to write the first draft for my paper at noon. It took my [sic] three hours to write the paper. I stop and have dinner with my cousine [sic] and her boy friend for (hafl is crossed out) half hour. After dinner and clean up I watch news for half hour and shows. At 8:30 pm I feel so dragged out so sleep early for getting up early tomorow [sic]. If I study I won't study much.

Monday Fed [sic]/22

I got [sic] school at 10 to nine and write the journal of last week in my memory which I try to remember and memorized them until now.

In ["Phylo" crossed out] Philosophy class I have group discuss [sic] but every-body in the group does not do thinking well since (after is crossed out) getting back a long week end, four days.

I read (the is crossed out) new complicated (new is crossed out) assignment of computer program, after Philosophy class. It takes me the whole hour to read over it and little time left to finish my dairy [sic] writing left over last week.

I practice piano lesson since 4:30-6:00 pm, but I do not feel it is enough. I leave school at six and get home thirdty [sic] minutes later. I have dinner with my family right away since it dinning [sic] time. I watch TV and news until 7:30 pm. Then I read the next three hours on the chapter for computer class {text-book}. I feel tired if I study any more, so I go to bed at 10:30 pm.

Tuesday Feb/23

I wake up at 6:40 am and finish reading the rest of chapter I left last night. I finish it at 7:30 and leaving [sic] my bed and get ready for school. I get [sic] school at nine and work in the Math Lab. I writing labs [sic] report when no one askes [sic] me question or needs help. I study during work hour most of the time.

I go to Physics Lab at two, after half hour talked [sic] with friend. In Lab, I have not spoken much to anybody, since everyone is busy to do their works [sic].

At three I have Midterm II in Computer class. I have not study for it at all. Since material covers [sic] on the test must know by heart. After, I get out I go to piano lab to practice some lessons. I get home at six, eat dinner with my folks and watch TV for a while. I study for four hours after that on Physics, (Phylo is crossed out) Philosophy, English. I just read all of them but do no homework. I sleep at ten thirdty [sic], since I'am [sic] tire [sic] with study.

Wed. Feb 24

I go to class regularly but I do not study between the class as usual, instead talking with friends. I haven't learned anything from English class since it's new topic and I'am [sic] quite understand it so I'am [sic] kind of lost in the class even though I had prepared the material ahead.

I get home at eight and have supper alone then reading [sic] a novel while waiting for TV show coming [sic] up next half hour. (After the show I do one problem in Physic then I go to bed at is crossed out) I also watch news eleven. Then I do one problem in Physic [sic] then I go to bed at 12:00 because I'am [sic] lazy to study.

Thur Feb 25, '93

I get to school at 8:00 am and work there. It's slow day. I waste a lot of time, for four hours, I just get about two hundred words on lab report. I have lunch alone today. but [sic] I listen to music for twenty minutes to waste time. I talk with friend after that. Then I practice piano for half hour. I talk with friends (until is crossed out) around about [sic] half of hour until the next class at three. When I am out of the class I work on the program (untl is crossed out) 8:00 am. I got home have dinner alone again then I study for four hours. I go to bed at 12 o'clock.

Friday Feb 26, '93

I get to school at 9:00 am. I look for a queit [sic] place to read text books (when is crossed out) while I am waiting for the classes. I get home at five and watch news until (the rest of the line is blank)

Saturday

I watch TV most of the day and no study.

Sunday

I go to temple for fun a little bit. But I do [not ?] have any (comedy is crossed out) company, so I leave early and go home write my term paper until the evening then I watch TV most of the night.

APPENDIX 4

SELECTED CLASS OBSERVATION NOTES

Physics

The instructor for this class was a full time
instructor. He and the researcher had met previously, but
had only a passing acquaintance. The first observations
were conducted during the second term of a three term
sequence. Most students enrolled in this class were
majoring in engineering or math. All of the students were
advanced in math and science. There were 20 male students
and one female student in attendance winter term. In
addition to the subject, two other male Asian students were
enrolled in the class. (One student was a Chinese-
Cambodian unaccompanied minor who was known to the
researcher. The background and ethnicity of the other was
unknown.) The instructor was a white male approximately
35-40 years old with a Master's degree in Physics and
mathematics.

The class was very informal and many students were on
a first name basis with the instructor, Mr. S.. The
physical layout of the room consisted of lab equipment
along the west wall with long tables facing north, toward
the board on the wall. Chairs were on the south side of
the tables so that all students had a view of the board.
Each row of tables could accommodate eight students. The

instructor stood behind a counter with his back to the board. The lecture class was scheduled for Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, and the labs for Tuesday and Thursday. Observations were held during the Monday class. Some students wandered in and out as class began. Students tended to sit in groups (perhaps established from the previous term); some students read the newspaper, some discussed weekend plans and other classes, and other students worked on homework. There appeared to be a great spirit of comaraderie among the students regarding homework. Students compared notes and homework problems before, during, and after class. The subject reported that one problem could take an hour or more and cover several pages of notes and solutions. The focus of the class at each observation was problems from the homework assignment sheet or upcoming test preparation. The instructor asked for questions about the homework at the beginning of each class and worked these problems on the board. Some students used the boardwork for clarification, others for verification, and still others for their homework.

January 11

At the first observation, I noticed the subject erasing half a page of a problem. When I asked what he was doing, he said that he had done "half the problem right." The class is quiet with no students asking questions;

everyone is absorbed with the problems being done on the board. The entire class was spent watching the subject watch the instructor do homework problems on the board.

February 22

In reference to the informality of the class, just prior to the start of class, one of the male students in the front row got up and drew the following picture on the board:

| 55 | | 55 | * |

Then he said to the class in general:

> Do you know what the difference is between
> these two? This * is one, single snowflake.
> About 30 miles an hour in Portland. I got stuck
> behind someone driving 30 miles an hour.

The rest of the class laughed and the student sat down. When the instructor came in, he asked about the picture on the board, and the student went through the story again. The instructor joined the others joking about the driving habits of people in snow, and class began with the instructor writing a test schedule and additional homework assignments on the board.

The subject didn't bring his text to class this observation (common in this class). When I asked him about this, he simply stated that he didn't like carrying it

because "it so heavy." The lecture on this day involved velocity, time, and distance. The instructor made a specific reference to a page in the book and joked about "part of the price of the book is the multicolor print on this page." The class laughed. The instructor went on to say "wave speeds are relative qualities, not absolutes." I wonder if the subject understands the different uses of some of the same words (such as absolute, qualities, relative and others) used in his philosophy class. There is no response from the subject about the vocabulary or flicker of noncomprehension about the physics lecture. The instructor wrote a new formula for "impedance" on the board; everyone in the class copied it. About 45 minutes after the class had started, the subject asked about my father. Two students left class early.

The class was filled with informal conversation, joking, and general chitchat about the text book and drivers in snow sprinkled in with formulas and problems from the text. This physics class, as it turns out, does not deal just with the language of science and math. Students must adjust their vocabulary from one class to another and switch quickly between a casual, joking remark to serious subject matter which may be on a test.

May 2

Although my impression about physics being a class with less language dependent discussion and thought than philosophy, the class on May 2 was filled with language - academic, personal, and idiomatic. The main focus of the class was to review for an upcoming exam. The instructor related a story about his own physics class at Portland State University in 1967: use wood or bicycle screws for boys and mayonnaise jars for girls to demonstrate a counter clockwise motion. As he was writing the problem on the board he related a story about how when he was a child his father had given him a bicycle; however, the bicycle had been made in Czechoslovakia and the screws moved clockwise. There was much classroom banter about his parents not being pro-union and how their choice of a Czech bicycle was to not negatively influence his future. (I didn't understand this last comment, but apparently others in the class did.) After the instructor had finished the problem, the class erupted in laughter because he had done the problem wrong. The class determined that his parents were to blame because his bicycle had been backwards.

As the class moved on to other problems from the homework, the instructor wrote one particularly long and complicated problem on the board. The subject, by whom I was sitting, waited patiently for the instructor to finish. I looked at his paper and noticed that, although he had

worked the problem, his rendition was much shorter and less complicated. After the instructor had finished the problem, the subject spoke:

> Subject: I have a quick question. Why
> don't you use sine or cosine? (Speaking
> without raising his hand. The instructor
> was still studying his own problem on
> the board.)

After the instructor studied his own problem on the board, he responded:

> Mr. S: Yeh, sine would make the problem easier.

After class I asked the subject how he had figured out a shorter way to do the problem. He responded that a Vietnamese friend of his was very good at math and had helped him work the problem. I believe the test score of 67% from the previous term is still bothering him. He had received his first C in physics.

There was more class banter when the instructor mentioned how "classic" the problem was in advanced math, physics, and engineering exams:

> One student: Is this a red flag?

> Mr. S.: My lips are sealed.

I turned to the subject:

> Researcher: Whenever he says 'classic' it sounds
> like it'll be on the test.

> Subject: Yeh, it combines lots of different
> formulas.

As the instructor and the rest of the class worked on other sample problems for the upcoming exam, the subject took out his Philosophy 103 notes for me to read. I wrote "bias = N, biased = verb" on his notes because he miswrote one:

Subject: I don't know what that mean.

Researcher: What?

Subject: That (pointing to the words)

Researcher: (writing the words 'extreme favoritism' on his notes and tapping him on the arm to show him -he was following the problem on the board) The key is extreme (underlining extreme twice).

Subject: Oh, I understand.

The instructor continued working problems on the board and talked as he wrote, "Physicists hate mathematics. Physicists avoid complexity with symmetry." Some students followed what the instructor was writing on the board and others continued to read, write, or talk about related and unrelated topics. The movement and noise and other distractions don't seem to bother anyone, including the instructor.

The instructor passed out a paper entitled "The Equivalence of Electricity and Magnetism" and informed the class, "This won't be on the test, but I wrote this up to help you. I don't want to see any of these in the trash." Again, the class laughed. The paper was a summary of a chapter that had not been assigned. As discussion focused on the handout instead of the upcoming test, the instructor

said, "Albert Einstein to the rescue," thus ending a
physics class immersed in informal and idiomatic language.
As the subject and I left class together, I remarked about
how I had enjoyed the class and asked the subject if most
of the classes had as many personal and light-hearted
comments and why. He replied, "Yeh, I think because it
[physics] so hard, you know, it's a hard class."

May 17

Again, at the fifth observation (May 17), a student
wrote "No Sales TAX!" on the board before class started.
(The state was approaching a vote on a sales tax within the
month, and everyone in the state had an opinion on it.
Part of the rationale for the sales tax was to support
education, so students and the public in general were well
aware of the upcoming election.) This started a slow class
debate about taxes in general and the sales tax in
particular, when the instructor entered,

> Mr. S.: What? No sales tax? Well, everyone
>   has a right to their opinion" (voice trailing
>   as he studied the writing on the board).

This was followed with various members of the class
commenting on taxes and the deficit, to which the
instructor replied,

> Mr. S.: Well, it's possible to use an ohm diagram
>   (which he draws on the board) to explain

economics" (he adds 'deficit' to the model
and everyone laughs).

The comments about taxes and deficits trail off and the
class commences with the students sitting towards the front
commenting to the instructor about his new, short haircut.
One student asked him if he had had "his ears lowered."
Again, the atmosphere for the class was a jovial one with
light banter for the first few minutes. The lecture and
problems at this observation had begun the Friday prior,
and the lecture was a continuation. The first problem on
the board was a very complicated one, with much explanation
by the instructor and many questions by various students.
As it evolved, the problem was so long and so complicated
that the instructor himself made several errors and had to
go back and rework and re-explain his errors and
corrections. During this particular problem, the subject
asked a question about the problem on the board. I was
sitting next to him and could barely understand his English
pronunciation and none of his content question. The
instructor didn't understand him, so the subject repeated
himself twice before finally being understood by some of
the other students. Apparently he had corrected the
instructor regarding the formulas used and the math
rendered.

Although the instructor never really understood the
question the subject was posing, other students in the
class did and took up the subject's position, especially

the Chinese-Cambodian. The class persisted supporting the subject's comments until the instructor stopped working on the problem and stepped back from the board to study his own work. The instructor, after reworking some of the problem on his own calculator, conceded to the subject's correction and began to re-work the problem. The instructor never verbally acknowledged the subject's correction, but Mr. S. did rework portions of the problem. I was so fascinated with the subject's willingness to pursue his question with awkward and flawed English and the other students' responses to his question, that I forgot to write his question to the instructor. My field notes simply reflect that this exchange took place and that the subject persisted, by altering and rewording his question to the instructor and "hanging in there" in the words of Carole Urzua, until other students, agreeing with the subject, captured the attention of the instructor.

On the next problem, a similar situation occurred with another student. Again, the problem was very complex and the instructor was taking great care to work methodically from the right side of the board to the left side of the board. One student asked, "Is that resonance?" The student repeated the exact question three times before another student in a group at another table answered, "yeh," and that group giggled. The instructor, completely absorbed in the calculations, continued to work the problem in silence. After five minutes, the instructor looked back at the class

from the board and answered, "Yes, it's called resonance."
He had never acknowledged the question. The class ended
with the instructor working his way back across the board,
from left to right, to complete the problem.

Researcher Comment

Although the subject was asked to keep a journal on
his thoughts and reactions to classes, he did not supply
any journal notes on his physics class. He seemed to be
very comfortable with the third and final term of the class
and did not report the remorse for any exam that he had for
the second term. As noted in the subject's diary entry of
Wednesday, February 17, the 67% on the physics test did
disappoint him because he had studied hard but had
misunderstood the concepts. It is interesting to note that
the subject felt he had done well on the test when he left
the exam as he recorded in his diary on Monday, February
15. Perhaps the 67% test score served as a wake-up call to
the subject, and he took the necessary steps to
alleviate future problems.

May 24

For the sixth and final observation, the class began
two minutes late. On this particular day six students were
late to class. As usual, the class started with a problem
being written on the board. After one problem, the

instructor began a demonstration with a laser to demonstrate total internal reflection. He passed out optical fibers and medical fibers so students could see and touch what is currently being used as and in fiber optics. The instructor demonstrated with a prism in a beaker and a laser focused to see "total internal reflection." He then gave the class (orally), ". . .. the buzz words: reflection, refraction, polarization," which everyone seemed to understand, including the subject. The instructor drew a diagram on the board to describe polarization and demonstrate the "destructive interference between reflected and refracted light." He then used an overhead projector to demonstrate polarization by applying layers of polarized screens. The demonstration was very dramatic and effective. At one point during the demonstration the instructor referred to Malus, and the class responded with, "Dead scientists." The instructor laughed and said, "In physics we're always talking about dead, white scientists." The class was very interesting and enjoyable, but the lights were off a good portion of the observation making note taking difficult.

<u>Researcher Comment</u>

Again, as mentioned earlier, this observation took place at the end of a three term sequence. The students had been with the same instructor for nine months and,

apparently, the reference to "dead scientists" had been formulated earlier in the year.

Only once during these observations did I look at the problems in the subject's physics text book. I was struck by what I perceived to be the cultural aspects of the problems and wondered about the subject's ability to relate his formulas to the words of the story problems. On one occasion I asked him if he, like the instructor kept stressing in class, drew out the story problems from the homework to help him visualize what the problem was really asking. He responded that sometimes he did and other times he didn't need to because he understood it. When I asked him who had taught him or where he had learned the concepts for certain types of problems, for example fulcrum and pulleys, he simply replied, "I know." Throughout the observations, I never saw the subject copy the pictures the instructor had drawn on the board, nor did I see any drawings he had made on his homework worksheets.

Philosophy

The instructor for this class was an older female who taught philosophy part-time. The researcher and instructor had not met prior to the observations. Since philosophy is a required course for many different types of majors, the class was made-up of students in transfer degree programs.

The classes could be taken in any sequence, but the subject
was taking them in sequence.

The classroom was an interior room without windows.
The one-arm desk seats all faced the board on the west
wall. The instructor stood behind a lectern with her back
to the board. She informed me at the first observation
that she allowed a class overload of up to ten students (25
is the usual class size), so I might have to give up my
seat to a student if the need arose. There were 35 seats
in the room.

The instructor was always in class early to write on
the board and be available to students who wanted to talk
to her. Class always started on time, 10:00 a.m. and met
three times a week for 50 minutes each session. Each
lecture started where the last lecture had ended. Students
were free to ask questions through the lectures, but this
rarely happened. The instructor paused periodically and
asked if any students had any questions. Comments by
students were controlled by the instructor in that she
insisted that any question or comment be directly related
to the topic under discussion. Whenever possible the
instructor used examples from the students' daily lives or
from examples in the news to illustrate concepts.
Discussion group assignments were made by the instructor,
and each student knew to which small group s/he belonged.
I do not know when or how the instructor assigned these
discussion groups. The subject was the only Asian in the

class. The philosophy class was observed eleven times over a two term period of time.

Because the subject stated several times, orally and in writing, that philosophy was his favorite class, more detailed information about the class lectures are included in the observation notes. The language and vocabulary presented in philosophy were at times overwhelming for the subject, the class, and the researcher. Because the focus for winter term was ethics, the instructor's lectures dealt with new ideas and vocabulary so that students could effectively discuss ethics.

January 11

At the first observation, the subject arrived just prior to the start of class and sat in one of only two available seats. He chose the seat in the second row from the front; the other seat was in the last row in the back. Following are the board notes and lecture notes. Everything in quotes was written on the board, and everything within brackets is a paraphrase of the instructor's explanation:

"Traditional ethical presuppositions"

[Traditional is from the time of the Greeks to the 1900's or turn of the century]

[presuppositions is a generic term - what you take for granted, don't question - we assume]

"1.) It is legit [sic] to ask for <u>reasons</u> for

moral J" [J is for judgements, reason means
intellectual, without feeling]

"2.) Every moral J [judgement] has an underlying
reason/principle." [principles are intellectual
operations]

"3.) Some principles are absolute."
[Absolute means obligatory to all people
at all times; these principles are binding.
Total relativity doesn't function in the
realm of ethics. Just the fact you believe
something is right doesn't mean it's right.
Science reports what is, philosophy is a
judgement of beliefs.]

"4.) Free will and the R/W [right/wrong]
distinction are necessary to human nature."
[People are born free moral agents, this is innate
and this isn't culturally determined - essence of
human nature that will be developed over time.
This denies biological programming. Behaviors can
and ought to be distinguished and judged; they
aren't just events.]

[Current/modern philosophy disputes #3
and #4.] (Students have a handout from which she
is lecturing.)

[Number 3 is often based on the Ten Commandments;
society is based on a web of trust.]

"ARISTOTLE" [studied under Plato in Athens; taught
Alexander the Great. Scientific order developed
by Aristotle; literary criticism; logic]

"METAPHYSICS" [A view of reality as a
whole.] "potential actual" [All life
is born with whatever it is contained in it;
actual means fully developed. A small acorn
grows to be a giant oak tree. All of life is
goal oriented -dynamic view of life.] "man's act. =
full rationality" [Man's actuality is to become
fully rational, body and emotions are to
be controlled by the mind/intellect.]

When the subject and I left class, I asked him why he

didn't take notes when the instructor was lecturing,

Subject: "It too hard. I just listen and remember."

He had to leave to meet with another instructor to arrange a workstudy position, so I wasn't able to pursue his ability to remember all that had been said.

January 20

The second observation the instructor discussed presuppositions and their conclusion. For her example she used Marx, physical world only, and Christianity, physical and spiritual worlds. She also talked about Jeremy Bentham, medieval (religious) and Twentieth Century (secular) philosophies and their mixture in the 1800's. The lecture was mixed with referrals to readings from the assigned text and reference to a handout on "Presuppositional Evaluation." The instructor stressed that one's world/reality view or "set of glasses" determines how one reads and interprets data. People's conclusions are their presuppositions manifest. She also used an iceberg metaphor to help explain how one manifests one's own world view: the tip of the iceberg is the "verbal statements" and the base, or that which is not seen are the "presuppositions." To bring the lecture and example closer to the students' world, she used the televised debates between Clinton and Bush; although the debates were focused on the economy and character, the real question was: "Does character have any effect on leadership?" Class ended with the following written on the board:

FORMULA - <u>what idea</u> - is already believed?
is taken for granted?
is assumed?
underlies?
produces?

<u>January 25</u>

The third observation was group work. As noted
previously, the groups were assigned by the instructor on a
day I was not present. The instructor asked the class to
break into their groups and the class then divided into six
groups. The subject was in a group of six, which I joined.
The subject's group consisted of two females, three males,
and the subject. Each group was assigned one question from
a handout on Bentham and told that consensus had to be
reached in ten minutes and that each group needed a
spokesperson to present their response to the class as a
whole. The subject's group was assigned the following
question:

1.   Does Bentham's first paragraph have a
      contradiction running through it? 'Nature
      has placed mankind under the governance
      of two sovereign matters, <u>pain</u> and <u>pleasure</u>.
      It is for them alone to point out what we ought
      to do, as well as to determine what we shall do.
      On the one hand the standard of right and wrong,
      on the other the chain of causes and effects,
      are fastened to their throne.'

Each X below represents the seating arrangement for the
group to which the subject was assigned. The class had
been told to pull their seats into a circle:

```
        X (subject)              X (female 2)

                                     X (male 1)

                                        X (male 3 - late to
                                           class)

                                 X (male 2)

        X (researcher)       X (female 1)
```

The subject was the first person in the group to
speak. He addressed female number one, "What do you
think?" When she didn't respond, he mumbled something and
referred the group to page 83 in the text. Male number two
rephrased the question (quoted above) and all the males
concurred with his paraphrase. The group was quiet as they
all looked in their books. Female number one started
talking to male two. The subject tried to communicate with
the male via eye contact; everyone else in the group was
looking in the book. Female two addressed me directly,
"What do you think?" I replied, "I'm just an observer."
She then directed the same question to male one. The
subject jumped into the question with a direct quote on
happiness from page 93 of the book. The instructor called,
"Two minutes left."

Female one, "Who's going to speak?" (looking at
everyone in the group. Male two shook his head no; male
three did not respond to anything that was said; male one
only spoke when spoken to, but did not respond to this
question. No one in the group spoke; the subject studied
his book. Female one decided to be the spokesperson for

the group. No one but male one addressed the subject directly, although female two often agreed with what the subject said by nodding her head.

The instructor then brought the class back together and made a homework assignment for the following class meeting. Each group member was to come with his/her own list of presuppositions and then each group choose one to present to the class. For the group assignment at hand, she decided to summarize what each group spokesperson said and suggested to the class that they take notes on her summary. Following is a mixture of paraphrasing and quotes from the instructor's summaries. Direct quotes from the instructor are so marked:

> Scholars and you, Question 1 is contradictory because ought presupposes choices, free will and determines presupposes no choice. Take the Energizer Bunny as an example of choice versus determined mechanism. Ought is only used when there is a true choice. "These words and presuppositions are the basis of ethics and standards. This is what philosophers always come back to. I was recently listening to a radio talk show on child crime. The commentator said, 'These children need to be held responsible, but at the same time we need to find out what's driving them.' These don't fit -responsible equals ought and driving them equals determines."
>
> Regarding Question 4: There is a difference between emotions and principle. An emotion may flow from or be a by-product of a principle. "Emotions are feelings. Principles require intellect. This is the difference between traditional philosophy and modern philosophy."
>
> Regarding Question 7: Utilitarianism is analogous to computer programming. "You get out what you put in. If you like this you have a high view of human life. People are basically

good -optimistic. This is a natural law
view." The negative to individual happiness and
majority view.

Class ended on that note.

February 22

Once again, the class is divided into small groups for
discussion purposes. The subject was already in class when
I arrived, and he gave me a Writing 121 paper to read. He
told me that he had used the paper the previous term in a
writing class that he ended up auditing.

The topic of the class was presuppositions in
"totality." The class began with the following written on
the board:

A.J. AYER

ANTI-META: - David Hume (18th cen) -
               all factual ideas are from sense
               impressions
             - positivism (1920-40)
             - only the sciences produce
               knowledge

EMOTIVISM: - ethical concepts never
               refer to sense impressions
             - a moral assertion is never
               factual (knowledge)

The class was divided into the preassigned small groups.
The subject's group was as follows:

X (male 1)   X (female 1)

                    X (male 2)

    X (subject)   X (researcher)

Male two, female one and the subject are talking quietly
about moral truth. Subject, "There is no moral truth."
Male one doesn't speak or comment. Female one doesn't want
to talk to the class; male two asked my opinion, "Is that
what you got? What do you think?" I respond, "I'm not in
this class." He looks away and decides that he will speak
for the group for the class presentation. The subject's
group is very confused and there is muffled laughter about
their lack of understanding. The instructor then calls the
entire class back together and gives a homework assignment
for a paper due on March 10th. She discusses the
assignment with no response from the class. The following
is a direct quote from the lecture:

> I refer you to Significant Question
> Number 5. Number three is probably the only
> one with a right/wrong answer. Points will
> be taken off for missing the point, second,
> inconsistency from question to question,
> for example consequences are the only thing
> versus consequences are relative. Third,
> and last, don't give societal answer. What
> do you believe? Some of the questions are
> not debatable. Don't forget second part, on
> free will and determinism. Be sure to illustrate,
> don't argue. Add February 26 and March 1 to class
> schedule. I thought I would be out of town.

Now referring to what was written on the board, the
instructor gave some background information on David Hume

and A. J. Ayers. The lecture is paraphrased as follows:

> Antimetaphysical, all facts are backed up by
> sensory impressions. To say there is a God can't
> be fact because the senses don't back up -the same
> is true for There is no God. Positivism is from
> European Vienna Circle. If you believe in sensory
> impressions you are limited to the sciences, no
> religion, et cetera. Emotivism is the ethical
> concept from Positivism, for example wrongness
> can't be weighed and measured.

(The instructor is very animated today. She is smiling and her eyes are twinkling as she tells stories of her own professors when she was a college student. The class is listening, unanimated and unresponsive. Very few students are even looking at her as she speaks.) The instructor calls on Group Six for their report:

> Group spokesperson: There are no absolutes.
>
> Another student in class responds: If there are
>   no absolutes, then nothing can be right.
>
> Instructor: You erase the meaning of right
>   and wrong if there are no absolutes, if
>   everything is relative. Knowledge is gone
>   without true or false, morality without right
>   or wrong.

The exchange and comments of the two students are directed at the instructor, but the instructor's comment is directed at the class. Still, few students are paying attention by looking at the instructor or taking notes. The subject is drawing pictures on his notebook. Five minutes before the class ends, students begin packing their notebooks and backpacks. The class is restless today - noisy and

unresponsive. Before the class is over, all but five
students are packed and ready to bolt for the door.

April 19

On the first day of observation for spring term, I
arrived at the class early so that I could speak with the
instructor. I wanted to tell her about a presentation I
had heard about ESL students and problems in academic
classes:

> Instructor: I'm so glad P---(the subject)'s
> auditing because this term, especially,
> it's hard if they don't have a good command
> of the English language. The idioms and all,
> you know. (pause) I realize we need to help
> these minorities, but really . . . (voice
> trailing off as students come into the class
> room and some sit in the front row).

The topic for spring term is Critical Reasoning. Class
began with an explanation of the upcoming midterm
examination. The test will include brief answers to some
questions and the balance of the test is to cover analysis
for arguments. Students will have to define the concept
being presented, then draw diagrams showing the connections
between different premises and the conclusions drawn from
those premises. Orally the instructor explains reasoning
(paraphrasing is in brackets, all other are direct quotes):

> Deduction is from the specific to the
> general and induction is from the general
> to the specific. [In inductive reasoning
> there are gaps in the information or premises.

       There is a gap between what you have and
       what you need.] Most of our lives are
       lived here. We make a little leap to what
       we believe.

(On the board she writes:)

   '   if P are T C <u>may</u> be F   [If premises are true,
          conclusion may be false.]

       She commented: Never absolutely positive.
          But, this is logically probable. Logic
          talks about the way our minds handle ideas.

She demonstrated the way one tests for deductive versus

inductive reasoning by writing the following on the board:

       1. Assume P [premises] are T [true]
       2. Are the P [premises] sufficient to draw
           the conclusion with certainty?

       If yes, then it was arrived at deductively.
       If no, then it was arrived at inductively.

Referring back to the upcoming midterm,

       Instructor: Clarify in context. Be able to
           find the premises and number [of premises]
           in order. Premise to premise relationship.
           Premise to conclusion relationship. Practice
           runs are due Wednesday.

(This final sentence referred to a handout the instructor

had given the students to practice for the upcoming exam.

She offered to go over each student's practice sheets on

premises and conclusions prior to the exam.) The

instructor then did a premise and conclusion example from a

handout the students had received earlier. The example was

one taken from an advertisement for a cereal and related

nutrition to good taste, arriving at the conclusion that

nutrition tasted good and was good for you. All students, including the subject, wrote everything the instructor wrote on the board and tried to make sense of the example and her abbreviations. At the conclusion of class, the subject informed me he was skipping physics and that he would see me in writing.

The week before the philosophy midterm, the subject kept a journal about his thoughts regarding philosophy. (See Appendix 2.)

May 3

The following week, the students were subdued as they received back their midterms. (I had called the subject at home the night before to see if he would be attending all his classes the day I planned to observe. He was very concerned and emphatic that I read his paper for Writing 122. I gave him the word "altruism". (I don't know if he went back to the library or not.) As the instructor discusses the grades on the midterm and takes questions from the class, I read the subject's paper for Writing 122. Trying to read his paper and trying to take notes from the philosophy class is not easy. I feel pressure to do a good job on the proofreading of his writing paper, but I am also concerned about the discussion of the test going on around me. A couple male students, who had not spoken previously, are arguing about certain answers on the test. The

instructor is holding her ground saying that just because
many students missed the question does not mean that the
question is a bad one. I notice that the subject had done
those particular questions correctly. He had received a C
on the test, and the males arguing had received D's. (I
could see all three papers from where I sat.) As the
instructor tried to explain how she uses a curve to
establish grades:

> Instructor: I have a fairly flexible curve.
>   However, if the highest grade is 75% that
>   is not an A, it's C work. I have set up a
>   curve. In other words there are more C's
>   than B's, and so on.

She then proceeded to draw her modified curve on the
board:

> Instructor: This is more generous. If 25% of
>   the class doesn't get A's and B's, I
>   arbitrarily up all the grades to get that.
>   This [referring to her modified curve on the
>   board] is only a guideline. Forty percent of
>   all my students in any given year get A's and
>   B's. You guys are good. Thirty-five percent
>   got A's and B's. Sixty-five percent got C's
>   and D's -no one failed.

The discussion about the test and questions about grades
lasted for twenty minutes.

After the test discussion ended, the instructor
referred the class to page 19 in the text and started going
through a handout on bias. As I continue to proofread the
subject's writing paper, I notice that he is taking notes.
I need to see them because he rarely takes notes in this

class. (I write in my notes: "I've been correcting P--'s WR 122 paper on volunteering. Actually, this paper is better than others he's done. There are only a few places where it is incoherent because of structure.") Because I was busy proofreading his writing paper, I have few philosophy class notes.

Researcher Comment

After class I looked at the subject's philosophy notes. The subject's notes related directly to the class and instructor discussion of bias in statements. He took notes on different paper and really used abbreviations. His notes on this look like a native speaker's - abbreviations and elimination of articles. While good note-taking skills, it may carry over to formal writing and hurt him.

This was my first (and only) mention of his taking any notes in the philosophy class. I don't know if he had been influenced by reading my notes and seeing all my abbreviations or whether the instructor's extensive use of abbreviations had influenced him. His notes were good and they were for his personal use.

<u>May 10</u>

At the following observation the instructor began to lecture immediately by referring to a large handout the class had received previously:

> Instructor: Turn to page twenty-two. This is
>   called the Odhomonim, towards the man or
>   the person. This has never been translated
>   into English. You don't refute arguments by
>   attacking the person. You hear this all the
>   time in politics. Bracket the ideas and put
>   them over here (gesture toward one side of the
>   board). Don't confuse the idea with the person.

(I had trouble following this section of the lecture because I didn't have a copy of the handout. She referred the class to numbers seven and eight for a brief discussion of antecedents and fallacies.) She referred the class to the "is . . . ought" statements:

> Instructor: This is the worst kind of fallacy.
>   Have you ever thought about PC language?
>   There's a moral judgement of it which might
>   offend people, but just because it bothers
>   some [voice trails off]. Sometimes people
>   don't want to hear truth, but it may do them
>   good regardless of whether they like it or not.

The instructor continued to discuss the word ought:

> Headcounting never produces moral policy.
> Social consensus does make it morally right.

For examples of this last statement, the instructor used Hitler and Watergate. Later, referring to another question on the handout, the instructor used Walt Disney as her

example. She tried to lead the class through the exercise
by giving background on Disney as a person: Was he in it
only for the money or for his own imagination? Since it
was known that he cheated on his wife, is it possible for a
bad man to make good movies? What about the difference
between family movies and family values?

Again, prior to the end of class, students begin
rustling papers and books. Some of the students have all
their materials put away as the instructor continues to
lecture. After class, the subject informed me that he
wasn't going to physics because he wasn't prepared. He
said that he would probably attend only one day this week.

Writing 121

Observations for the Writing 121 class were on Monday
afternoons. The class was one and one-half hours long, two
days per week. Unbeknownst until arrangements were made
for the observations, the instructor and I had gone to
college together and had taken a literature class together.
We had also begun teaching part-time at the community
college at the same time, although we rarely saw one
another after the first two years. I had become a full-
time instructor, but he had continued to teach on a part-
time basis. He also taught part-time at another community
college in the metropolitan area. The instructor told me

at the first observation that he had spent some time
overseas teaching English in Asia.

The writing class was held on the second floor of a
remodeled building. The classroom was an outside room, but
the only window was a 12 inch floor to ceiling slit in the
back wall onto the roof of the building. Students sat at
tables facing the blackboard on the south wall. Each table
could accommodate four students. The instructor stood
behind a lectern on a table with his back to the board.
Any student entering late had to pass the instructor and
walk up an aisle between the rows of tables.

Unknown to the researcher at the beginning of this
study, the subject had attempted a Writing 121 class the
previous term. As reported by the subject, he had
originally registered for a grade, but after several weeks,
the instructor advised him to drop the class or fail. The
subject had elected, instead, to change his registration to
an audit and attend the class to listen to the lecture and
see how the class was taught. The subject also reported
that he had learned "a lot from her." He had asked other
students which instructor was "easy" and had been given two
or three names. The class in which he finally registered
(the Writing 121 class in which he was observed) was
convenient to his other class schedule, and the instructor
had been on his list of "easy" instructors.

The class was held late in the afternoon and had a
small number of students, a total of 15. The regular size

for this class is 25 students. There were two required texts for this class, <u>The Little Brown Handbook</u> and <u>The Harvest Reader.</u> The subject was observed five times in this class. The subject always sat in the last row of tables in this class. As is common practice in all writing classes at the college, the first class meeting involved an in-class writing so the instructor could determine if the students had been appropriately placed in Writing 121.

At the first observation, I recognized one of the female students. She had been in two of my classes a year or two prior. Throughout the observations, she asked me many times to clarify assignments or lectures made by the instructor. She also asked me to proofread some of her papers and to explain the instructor's corrections because she couldn't read his writing. Additionally, two male students stopped me in the cafeteria one day to ask me to explain what the instructor had said in class.

<u>January 11</u>

The first observation took place the second week of classes. Although the subject's books and backpack were at his seat, the subject arrived five minutes after the lecture had begun. At the first observation, the instructor was reviewing common mistakes made by the students on their first in-class writing. A sampling of what he wrote on the board follows:

Parallel structure
diction = word choice
chronology

Everybody ought to do their own thing.   /   agr

AWK
TRANS

I went downtown, I bought beer.   / Run-on, comma
                                         splice

I loved her, however, I left her.
            ;

I went to the circus I saw an elephant.   / fused
                                            sentence

Not ignorance of words or math or the like, but
ignorance of people.   /   frag

v tense
  cons   [verb tense consistency]

diction

The instructor made an assignment for the first

major paper assignment, which was due January 25:

Instructor: January 25. One thousand words.
      Narrative of personal experience or
      observation. A story in order to make a
      point. Thesis is a significant insight,
      about human nature or about self.

He then wrote on the board:

SO WHAT? EXPLICIT thesis or IMPLICIT thesis

Instructor: All readers should get the same
      message. Narratives have plot, character,
      chronology plus the point. Make descriptions
      concrete, the reader needs to see it and hear
      it.

<u>January 25</u>

Again at the second observation, the subject was late to class. He arrived eight minutes late and didn't bring his text book, "too heavy." There was discussion of the actual assignment among the instructor and several students sitting at the front of the room. As the discussion continues, the subject is silently reading a handout in his notebook on "parallelism." Today there are 15 students. Some are reading, some taking notes, some just sitting. The class is unresponsive except for two male students in the second row. I don't know if they are arguing with the instructor as a stalling technique or to get clarification. The instructor switches to a discussion of "persona, the writer and his or her response."

The instructor starts around the room, calling on students individually about their topic for the narrative paper. I lean over and ask the subject if he has a topic. He shakes his head no. The female next to the subject is called on. Her topic is her first impression of the United States (she's from Holland). The subject is called upon next, and he still doesn't have a topic (not unlike the majority of students). He managed to keep the conversation going with the instructor by asking for more clarification of narration. The instructor begins lecturing about description:

> Instructor: Description is sensory. Judgement
> grows out of experience and observation.
> Use 'so what' analysis-why are you writing
> what you're writing? Why do you remember it?

The instructor then continued circulating around the room asking students if they had come up with a topic yet. The subject volunteered a question about a description of the Senior Prom. The instructor played it down as "not fresh" and "everyone here knows about it." The subject continues to ponder about a topic. The class ends with the instructor saying, "Each of you has a unique view point. Try brainstorming. Brainstorming is good."

As the subject and I left class together, I asked him what he knew about a Senior Prom. He replied, "Not much. I just hear about it." I asked him if he had gone, and he replied, "No." The subject asked me if I had gone to the Senior Prom and could I help him with a topic. I replied, "Yes," to both questions. I suggested the subject write on his journey to the United States; he rejected it. I suggested he write about some incident from his childhood; he rejected it. I suggested he write about the leaves changing color in the fall; he suggested writing about the first time he saw snow.

February 8

At the observation I learned that the instructor had missed the previous class. The description paper is due

today, and students are also to have their definition
proposal ready to discuss. The subject was ten minutes
late. The instructor read several student papers from the
in-class writing of the previous week. Students had been
given pictures from magazines to describe. The subject
received a C on this impromptu paper. The instructor
assigned two readings from The Harvest Reader for the
following class.

Students were to have written out topic sentences and
thesis statements to be handed in this class period. The
subject thought the sentences and statements were to be
discussed orally, not written, so he is unprepared. At
3:30 p.m. the subject is writing his definition topic as
the instructor talks. At 3:40 the instructor begins
calling on students one-on-one to discuss their topics. As
he reads down his role sheet he mumbles to himself. He
also laughs at his own talk and ideas. I, like the
students, have a difficult time hearing and understanding
him. He often mumbles to himself as if none of us are
present. This class he is making more of an effort to
discuss the topic one-on-one with each student, but the
rest of the class is not engaged in the discussion.
Students are reading, writing, and talking to one another
as the instructor moves from student to student. The
subject is carrying on a conversation with the female from
Holland. She had been absent on the previous Monday and
the instructor was gone on Wednesday. She didn't know

about and hadn't done the assignment. At 3:57, a male student asks for more clarification of the writing assignment. (I also didn't understand.) Students are to write one to five [sentences?] for each of the rhetorical patterns to date: definition, example, and division and classification. The instructor will then tell them which has the most possibility for a paper. Another male student says, "Carpe diem, seize the day." The instructor adds, "Sed memento mori, but remember death."

At 4:05 p.m. the instructor asked the subject for his topic. The subject said that his first choice was attitude and the second was "What is right and what is wrong." The instructor replied that the topic was too much, "a philosophical manifest." The subject persisted in pursuing his second topic. The instructor wants "attitude." The subject argues that the topic of right and wrong will have "more examples." The instructor didn't understand what the subject said, so the subject repeated himself:

Subject: I don't understand the difference between statement of purpose and thesis.

Instructor: They're similar.

Class ends at 4:10.

February 22

At the last observation for this class, the subject and I met prior to class so I could go over his paper

again. Just before class started, we talked about his piano class and how many hours of practice one should put in. I told the subject that I had taken eight years of piano when I was living at home, many years ago. The instructor was five minutes late to class. The instructor referred the class to an essay in <u>The Harvest Reader</u> entitled "Tools of Torture" by Phyllis Rose for as upcoming comparison and contrast paper. By 3:10 the instructor is once again going from student to student asking students about their next paper. At 3:20, a male student asked if he could compare and contrast beer. The whole class laughs about his needing a study partner. The instructor commented about in the "old days" there was "no Silver Bullet, no light, no dry." The subject was the next student asked about his paper. He responded that he didn't know his topic yet. The instructor, "You were warned about this a week ago." The next few students didn't have topics either.

At 3:25 the instructor has students pre-write on the topic "Television and Reading" from <u>The Harvest Reader</u>,

> Instructor: Describe and analyze your habits and
>   responses to each medium. Use examples of
>   shows and types of shows you watch, and
>   reading material and types of reading material
>   you read to illustrate your essay's points.
>   Questions?
>
> Subject: What do you mean?
>
> Instructor: (unintelligible)
>
> Subject: (unintelligible)

> Instructor: P----, you're forcing me to rethink and
> reword my assignment -this one's too succinct.

The balance of the class will be taken up with the
student's writing in class. I leave at 3:40 p.m.

Researcher Comment

My last observation for the Writing 121 class was
February 22, but the subject and I continued to be in touch
by telephone. The subject completed the class without a
proofreader. It was necessary for the subject to receive a
C or better in order to enroll in the Writing 122. He
received the C and registered for Writing 122 the following
term.

During the summer of 1993, the Writing 121 instructor
died unexpectedly.

Writing 122

Writing 122 focuses on writing argument and
persuasion. I had never met the instructor for this class
as he was a Fulbright exchange instructor/professor from
England, and I was on sabbatical. The head of the English
department introduced us prior to the observations. The
subject was observed in the final term of the exchange
instructor's year-long exchange program. The exchange
instructor dressed more formally than other male English
instructors at the college. He wore a long-sleeved shirt

with a tie. He had an informal mannerism and gestured and smiled frequently. The class was held in the new English and math building. The classroom had large windows on the north wall with the chalkboard on the south wall. Students sat in side arm, moveable desks. The instructor walked back and forth in front of the board as he talked. There were between 23 to 25 students enrolled in the class.

April 19

Seventeen students are present. In my absence the previous week, the instructor had made individual appointments with students. I arrived at the class early and the instructor asked me out into the hall to discuss the subject. The instructor told me, "P---- has been asked to drop or audit the class." I asked if there were any way the subject could continue and receive a passing grade, to which he replied, "No, not at this time." The instructor had discussed this with the subject and the subject told him (as relayed to me by the instructor) that most ESL classes didn't meet his needs. The subject had told the instructor he would register in ESL when I returned to teach the class, after my sabbatical. The instructor and I decided to ask the subject to reschedule his individual appointment to later in the term so I could attend the conference.

Class began with the announcement that the rest of the classes for that week would be canceled because of the individual appointments. The instructor also reminded students to, "Come with viewpoint of own strengths and weaknesses and realistic views of what you can do." Again, the instructor discussed how to do a "Works Cited" page correctly. The subject arrived in class 15 minutes late. Even though the subject arrived late in class and missed the discussion on the "Works Cited" page, he's not taking notes. He's reading his paper and shuffling papers. The lecture changes from formatting to the topic of the day: population control and immigration. The instructor hands out copies of an article entitled "Why All Americans Should Support A Moratorium on Immigration."

> Instructor: Is the population of the United States too large?
>
> Class (somewhat in unison): Yes
>
> No

A discussion followed on the meaning of urban. The instructor handed out an article on a moratorium on immigration:

> Instructor: What's a moratorium?
>
> General class response: a stop

The instructor reads the article and asks students to consider the arguments.

Instructor: What's your immediate response?

Several students: What is fair?

Instructor: I don't know what it means. This
         is the first time that question's been
         asked. Perhaps it was on the second page
         of the advertisement. Take two to three
         minutes to evaluate the strengths and the
         inadequacies of these arguments.

The class lapses into silence as students read and write

their responses. The subject is writing as are some of the

other students I can see. Some students are just sitting.

(My own thought is that the subject should have a more

emotional reaction than some of the other students. He is

the only {visually noticeable} minority in the class.)

There is an open class discussion about U.S. history and

immigration. Several students comment on Mexico and

Mexicans from their history class. Other students comment

on natural resources.

The second article to read is "Why We Need A Smaller

U.S. Population And How We Can Achieve It." After a silent

reading, the class reacts much more violently to this

article. There are issues of money versus the number of

children. This was a real button for most of the class:

     A student: They're trying to put regulation on
            people's freedom.

This was followed by a very heated discussion among

students, student to student with the instructor remaining

quiet. He finally spoke:

        Instructor: Would you give money to the first
            organization?

    Class: probably

    Instructor: The second?

    Class: No

    Instructor: How good are you at looking at
            someone's argument? Do you react rationally
            or emotionally? Most of us react emotionally -
            we feel not think. We go for presentation,
            not the facts.

Class ended. Students left still talking about the

articles and immigration.

Reflection about the Observation

    This was the first time I felt the compulsion to write

my thoughts about the observation immediately after it had

taken place. I was concerned throughout the observation

about the subject and what was going through his head as

other students freely spoke about their thoughts and

feelings on immigration and population. However, I believe

firmly in freedom of speech and feel that students should

be free to speak their mind, within limits. I wondered how

many students were aware of the subject's presence in the

class and also wondered if any cared. The atmosphere and

hostility in the class really bothered me. As the subject

and I left class, I asked him how he had felt about the

discussion. He expressed surprise that people felt so

strongly about immigration. He added that he was glad he

wasn't an immigrant. He actually saw himself in a
different classification because he came to the United
States as a refugee. He expressed that he had come for
political reasons:

> Researcher: Does that make you different?
>
> Subject: In general no. Sometimes yes. Like
>   my cousin, she's an immigrant because of my
>   aunt, her mother. I care about education
>   and all she cares about is money.

The conversation ended on that statement.

The subject was obviously upset about the class
discussion on immigration and wrote about his thoughts in
his journal of April 19. (See Appendix 2.)

May 3

The class opened with the instructor asking a question
about the Friday class:

> Instructor: Did you find it helpful?
>
> 2 Students: Yes
>
> 2 Students: No

The rest of the class was silent. I have no idea what the
class is talking about. I need to discuss this with the
subject. The instructor is now talking about a quiz on
"Doublespeak." I'm sure that the subject will have trouble
with this since many of the native speakers are also
expressing concern.

The instructor is now putting up an overhead on Doublespeak. The first example is from the military. The second overhead involves business and bureaucracy. (See Appendix 5 for examples of the handouts.)

> Subject (whispering to me): This would be a good
> example for philosophy.

The third overhead is a Canadian article and the fourth a U.S. governmental article. The instructor is telling the class that doublespeak "clutters our thinking, makes us cynical."

> Instructor: Does it [doublespeak] matter?
>
> A student: It must work because they keep doing it.
>
> Instructor: Language is our primary form of
> communication. (He refers back to the handout
> that all the students have.) Is there a serious
> point beneath the surface?
>
> A student: Satire.

The instructor then related the story of how, when the Audi 5000 had problems with the accelerator sticking and after several people had been killed because of it, the manufacturers referred to the problem in the media as "pedal misapplication." He closed the class with, "Language gets created to cover-up mistakes."

Researcher Comment

The subject found the discussion on doublespeak very interesting. He commented several times that he "didn't know that" when words were explained. He truly enjoyed the classes on doublespeak and so noted in his journal of May 4. (See Appendix 2.)

May 10

The class on May 10 centered around students using a self-evaluation survey on their own writing and discussing their own and other students' papers in small groups. Students self-analyzed for five minutes then joined a group to discuss their thoughts and ideas. The subject joined one male and one female. The male passed his paper around first. His paper was pretty good on "How to Become a Millionaire." The female student didn't have anything to read. She's talking about other things and wondering where she put her voter's pamphlet. The subject passed his paper around. He let them read his, but with very little comment from the other students. The subject correctly responded to #4 with "there is no point." Both of the other students think that the subject's paper is "interesting." Now the other two students are talking to each other. The subject is shaking his foot and finally engaged me in a discussion of where to get a new computer memory program. The

instructor called the class back together and put examples on the overhead to illustrate a narrative example.

> Instructor: Narrative draws you into the scheme.
> Language is a tool to control.

The class ends on that note.

This was the last observation for the writing class as the subject decided to drop the course and concentrate on his other classes.

APPENDIX 5

SOME EXAMPLES OF DOUBLESPEAK

The examples of doublespeak listed here have not been made up: each one has been used more than once.

<u>DOUBLESPEAK</u>   <u>TRANSLATION</u>

Advertising

	DOUBLESPEAK		TRANSLATION
1.	genuine imitation leather	1.	fake leather
2.	faux jewels	2.	fake jewels
3.	action toys	3.	boys' dolls
4.	entry systems	4.	doors
5.	vegetarian leather	5.	vinyl
6.	digital fever computer	6.	thermometer
7.	chronologically gifted	7.	old people
8.	call ahead seating	8.	reservations
9.	social expression product	9.	greeting card
10.	antigravity panties	10.	girdle
11.	hydro blastforce cup	11.	plunger
12.	home plaque removal instrument	12.	toothbrush

Business

	DOUBLESPEAK		TRANSLATION
13.	for your convenience	13.	for our convenience
14.	encore telecast	14.	re-run
15.	pre-owned	15.	used
16.	experienced car	16.	used car
17.	negative deficit	17.	profit
18.	revenue excesses	18.	profit
19.	released	19.	fired
20.	non-retained	20.	fired
21.	dehired	21.	fired
22.	selected out	22.	fired
23.	eliminate redundancies in the human resources area	23.	fire employees
24.	enhance the efficiency of operations	24.	fire employees
25.	rationalization of marketing efforts	25.	fire employees
26.	take appropriate cost reduction actions	26.	fire employees
27.	senior congregate living community	27.	retirement home
28.	single use	28.	disposable
29.	safety-related occurrence	29.	accident
30.	environmentally stabilized	30.	polluted

31.	initiate a pro-active action	31.	recall defective product
32.	fourth quarter equity retreat	32.	stock market crash
33.	environmental technician	33.	janitor
34.	unauthorized withdrawal	34.	bank robbery
35.	strategic misrepresentation	35.	lie
36.	price enhancement	36.	raise prices
37.	value oriented retailing	37.	discounting
38.	advisory marketing representative	38.	salesperson
39.	sales plan was too aggressive	39.	business is bad
40.	marketing consultant	40.	salesperson
41.	production houses	41.	tract houses
42.	nonperforming assets	42.	bad loans
43.	renewed appliance	43.	used refrigerator
44.	invest in	44.	buy, or spend
45.	coach (on an airplane)	45.	second-class
46.	space planning	46.	overbooking airplane reservations
47.	volume variances from plan	47.	strikes
48.	vertical transportation corps	48.	elevator operators
49.	automotive internist	49.	car mechanic
50.	change of equipment	50.	airplane broke down
51.	supplemental inflatable restraint system	51.	air bags
52.	inventory shrinkage	52.	employee theft
53.	job action	53.	strike
54.	net profit revenue deficiencies	54.	lose money
55.	negative contributions to profits	55.	lose money
56.	upward adjustments	56.	price hikes
57.	energetic disassembly	57.	explosion
58.	rapid oxidation	58.	fire
59.	access controller	59.	doorman
60.	social expression products	60.	greeting cards
61.	executive protection people	61.	bodyguards

Education

62.	pupil station	62.	school desk
63.	movement experiences	63.	sports
64.	learning process	64.	teaching
65.	adjusted behavior	65.	learning
66.	human kinetics	66.	gym
67.	applied life studies	67.	gym
68.	human resources and family studies	68.	home economics
69.	learning resources center	69.	library
70.	feedback	70.	test
71.	interact with print	71.	read
72.	engage in negative attention-getting	72.	misbehave
73.	learning facilitator	73.	teacher

Government

74.	sub-standard housing	74.	slum, ghetto
75.	low income	75.	poverty
76.	disadvantages	76.	poor, black, Hispanic, or ignorant
77.	inner city	77.	slum, ghetto
78.	fiscal underachievers	78.	poor people
79.	substance abuser	79.	drug addict or alcoholic
80.	urban transportation specialist	80.	cab driver, bus driver
81.	correctional facility	81.	prison
82.	individual behavior adjustment unit	82.	solitary confinement
83.	advance downward adjustments	83.	budget cuts
84.	inoperative statement	84.	lie
85.	Internal Revenue Service	85.	tax collector
86.	resource development park	86.	dump
87.	inappropriate	87.	unlawful
88.	district work period	88.	Congressional recess
89.	nonlegislative period	89.	Congressional recess
90.	inhalation hazard	90.	poison gas
91.	post-consumer secondary materials	91.	garbage
92.	misspeak	92.	lie
93.	shortfall	93.	mistake in planning
94.	mislead	94.	lie
95.	secure facility	95.	jail
96.	reutilization marketing yard	96.	junk yard
97.	candidate lacks a positive reference input	97.	public doesn't like him
98.	deep-chilled chickens	98.	frozen chickens
99.	resource recovery facility	99.	trash incinerator
100.	receipts strengthening	100.	tax increase
101.	use fee	101.	tax
102.	receipts proposals	102.	tax
103.	tax base broadening	103.	tax increase
104.	revenue enhancement	104.	tax increase
105.	member of a career offender cartel	105.	gangster, Mafia
106.	period of accelerated negative growth	106.	recession
107.	deaccession	107.	sell
108.	pavement deficiency	108.	pothole
109.	economically nonaffluent	109.	poor
110.	unlawful or arbitrary deprivation of life	110.	killing
111.	poorly buffered precipitation	111.	acid rain
112.	incomplete success	112.	failure
113.	controlled flight into terrain	113.	crash

Medical

114.	terminal living	114.	dying
115.	negative patient care outcome	115.	death
116.	therapeutic misadventure	116.	malpractice
117.	terminal episode	117.	death
118.	substantive negative outcome	118.	death
119.	discomfort	119.	pain
120.	diagnostic misadventure of a magnitude	120.	malpractice

Military

121.	front-leaning rest position	121.	push up
122.	incursion	122.	invasion
123.	protective reaction strike	123.	bombing
124.	service the target	124.	kill the enemy
125.	pre-emptive counterattack	125.	our side starts a war
126.	deliberate, unprovoked act of aggression	126.	other side starts a war
127.	eliminate with extreme prejudice	127.	kill
128.	resources control program	128.	poisoning
129.	incontinent ordnance	129.	bombs that fall on schools, etc.
130.	engage the enemy on all sides	130.	to be ambushed
131.	tactical redeployment	131.	retreat
132.	confrontation management	132.	riot control
133.	civil disorder	133.	riot
134.	destabilize a government	134.	illegally overthrow a legitimate government
135.	Defense Department	135.	War Department
136.	neutralize	136.	kill
137.	radiation enhancement device	137.	neutron bomb
138.	payload	138.	bomb load
139.	defoliation	139.	poison the vegetation
140.	nuclear warhead	140.	atomic bomb
141.	threat platforms	141.	ships and planes
142.	effective delivery	142.	bombs fell on targets
143.	predawn vertical insertion	143.	invasion
144.	strategic weapon	144.	atomic bomb
145.	tactical weapon	145.	atomic bomb
146.	ultimate high intensity warfare	146.	nuclear war
147.	violent peace	147.	war
148.	ballistically-induced aperture in the sub-cutaneous environment	148.	bullet hole
149.	collateral damage	149.	civilian casualties
150.	aluminum transfer cases	150.	temporary coffins

APPENDIX 6

LEARNING STRATEGY DEFINITIONS

A.   Metacognitive Strategies

Metacognitive strategies involve thinking about the learning process, planning for learning, monitoring the learning task, and evaluating how well one has learned.

1.	Advance Organization	Previewing the main ideas and concepts of the material to be learned, often by skimming the text for the organizing principle.
2.	Organizational Planning	Planning the parts, sequence, main ideas, or language functions to be expressed orally or in writing.
3.	Directed Attention	Deciding in advance to attend in general to a learning task and to ignore irrelevant distractors.
4.	Selective Attention	Deciding in advance to attend to specific aspects of input, often by scanning for key words, concepts, and/or linguistic markers.
5.	Self-monitoring	Checking one's comprehension during listening or reading, or checking the accuracy and/or appropriateness of one's oral or written production while it is taking place.
6.	Self-evaluation	Judging how well one has accomplished a learning activity after it has been completed.

| 7. | Self-management | Understanding the conditions that help one learn and arranging for the presence of those conditions. |

B. Social Affective Strategies

Social and affective strategies involve interacting with another person to assist learning, or using affective control to assist a learning task.

| 1. | Questioning for Clarification | Eliciting from a teacher or peer additional explanation, rephrasing, examples, or verification. |

| 2. | Cooperation | Working together with peers to solve a problem, pool information, check a learning task, model a language activity, or get feedback on oral or written performance. |

| 3. | Self-talk | Reducing anxiety by using mental techniques that make one feel competent to do the learning task. |

| 4. | Self-reinforcement | Providing personal motivation by arranging rewards for oneself when a language learning activity has been completed successfully. |

C. Cognitive Strategies

Cognitive strategies involve interacting with the material to be learned, manipulating the material mentally or physically, or applying a specific technique to a learning task.

| 1. | Repetition | Imitating a language model exactly, including oral practice, silent practice, and copying. |

2.	Rehearsal	Rehearsing the language needed, with attention to meaning, for an oral or written task.
3.	Resourcing	Using reference materials such as dictionaries, encyclopedias, or textbooks.
4.	Translation	Using another language as a base for understanding and/or producing the target language.
5.	Grouping	Classifying words, terminology, or concepts according to their attributes.
6.	Substitution	Using synonyms, paraphrases, and/or gestures to replace unknown or unavailable words or phrases.
7.	Note-taking	Writing down key words and concepts in abbreviated verbal, graphic, or numerical form.
8.	Summarizing	Making a mental or written summary of information gained through listening or reading.
9.	Deduction/Induction	Applying rules to understand or produce the second language, or making up rules based on language analysis.
10.	Imagery	Using visual images (either mental or actual) to understand, remember, or produce language.
11.	Auditory Representation	Playing back in one's mind the sound of a word, phrase, or longer language sequence.

12.	Contextualization	Assisting comprehension or recall by placing a word or phrase in a meaningful language sequence or situational context.
13.	Elaboration	Relating new information to prior knowledge, relating different parts of new information to each other, or making meaningful personal associations to the new information.
14.	Transfer	Using previous linguistic knowledge or skills to assist comprehension or production.
15.	Inferencing	Using contextual information to guess meanings, predict outcomes, or complete missing parts.

Handout from TESOL 1984 presentation, Houston, Texas

A STUDY OF LEARNING STRATEGIES
IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION

Anna Uhl Chamot, Project Director
Interstate Research Associates
Rosslyn, Virginia 22209