English Language & Literature Teaching, Vol. 16, No. 2 Summer 2010

Investigating How Content-based ESL Instruction Compares with Regular Content-area Literacy Instruction

Seo Jung Park
(Pukyong National University)

Park, Seo Jung. (2010). Investigating how content-based ESL instruction compares with regular content-area literacy instruction. *English Language & Literature Teaching*, *16*(2), 113-128.

The purpose of this study is to explore how content-based ESL instruction compares with regular content-area literacy instruction. This qualitative study was conducted at two different elementary schools in the Midwest of the United States. Four teachers participated in this study: two ESL teachers and two regular classroom teachers. All four teachers were quite different from, and at the same time similar to, one another in terms of their perspectives in content-based instruction (CBI), teaching approaches and teaching materials. For the similarities between the two types of instruction, all teachers had done various kinds of groupwork and they tried to connect their lessons to the students' daily lives. All four teachers also emphasized the importance and difficulties of teaching vocabulary in CBI. On the other hand, ESL teachers and regular classroom teachers had different perspectives on content-based instruction. ESL teachers thought CBI was one of ESL programs and effective, but regular classroom teachers thought it was normal to teach in their classes. Besides, there were differences in the degree of difficulty of the content areas. The ESL class dealt with easier content than the regular same-grade classes. The teaching materials were different according to the two classroom settings. I maintain that although there were similarities between teaching ESL students and English-speaking students through the content areas, there were specific aspects that could be more effective for ESL students, and these need to be studied further.

[content-based ESL instruction/content-area literacy instruction]

I. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study is to explore how content-based ESL instruction compares with regular content-area literacy instruction. The primary focus of this research is on

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

content-based instruction. This investigation begins with brief definitions of the major terms, followed by the main reasons for choosing to investigate this topic, the significance of this study, and finally the research questions.

Researchers have defined content-based instruction as the integration of specific subjects with language skills (Brinton, Snow, & Wesche, 2003; Brown, 2007; Gordon, 2007). In this study, I consider content-based instruction as the integration of comprehensive English language instruction and content-area instruction for students, although I focus more on English language development. In this paper, I use the term *content-based ESL instruction* to refer to ESL classrooms and *content-area literacy instruction* to refer to regular classrooms. I consider the notion that *content-based instruction* includes both content-based ESL and regular content-area literacy instruction.

I chose this research topic for several reasons. First, the topic presented itself when I experienced the Korean educational situation firsthand. Currently in Korea, English education especially for young children has become an important issue, and among teachers, a large number of English teaching theories, methods, materials, and beliefs exist. For Koreans, content-based instruction is a relatively new approach. We generally learn the English language as a single subject, and learn it independently of other subjects. In contrast, in the United States, I found ESL and regular English literacy have been taught through the content areas. My interest was in probing the use of content-based instruction at a deep level— especially as it is used for Korean students—by conducting research within the U.S. educational environment.

Second, much less research is available on content-based ESL instruction than on regular content-area literacy instruction. Although there are similarities between teaching English language learners (ELLs) and English-speaking students through the content areas, there are critical differences, mainly because of the unique characteristics and learning challenges of ELLs. Garcia (1991) mentioned that ESL students basically have different instructional needs based on their ages, language backgrounds, and communities. I maintain that there are specific aspects of content-based ESL instruction that differ from regular content-area literacy instruction.

Third, I found that numerous research studies have focused on content-based ESL at the secondary and adult levels. One might think that it is hard for young ELLs to learn through content-based ESL instruction because of limitations in their English proficiency and cognitive development, but young ELLs need to learn English in the content areas. As time goes by, young students will read and write longer and more complex texts. Furthermore, content-based ESL instruction encourages young students to learn a new language by engaging in real interaction from the very first class, using the language as a real means of content-area learning. As Peregoy and Boyle (2005) recommended, teachers need to begin introducing purposeful content-area reading and writing in the earlier grades. Based on that

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

foundation, students will gradually be prepared for academic success in the later grades. Thus, I maintain that more research on content-based instruction for young ELLs needs to be conducted.

This study is significant because researchers and teachers interested in ELL students first need to understand regular content-area literacy instruction. Based on this, they need to consider the characteristics of ELLs, and then they will be able to create more developed and effective content-based ESL instruction. Thus, the two types of content-based instruction need to be investigated by comparing them with each other.

Therefore, in this study I compare content-based ESL instruction with regular content-area literacy instruction in elementary classrooms. Here is a research question I used for my study: How does content-based ESL instruction compare with regular content-area literacy instruction?

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This section consists of two parts, a theoretical framework and current literature. First, I discuss the sociocultural conceptual framework for this research. I then present a review of the literature on research on content-based instruction.

1. Theoretical Framework

Recent theory has maintained that learning is a social activity. Ernest (1995) argued that social constructivism regards individuals and the realm of the social as deeply connected. Human beings are shaped both by their individual mental processes and through their interactions with others. Chaille (2008) maintained that students construct knowledge through the interaction between their own ideas and their experiences in the social world. Chaille noted that constructivism was improved on by Vygotsky's works and has been developed by other scholars using different emphases and perspectives. For example, Lave and Wenger's notion of community of practice can be included in constructivism.

Vygotsky (1981) explained that "it is through others that we develop into ourselves. . . . development does not proceed toward socialization but toward the conversion of social relations into mental function" (pp. 161–165). That is, Vygotsky emphasized the relationship between learning and the learner's social worlds. Vygotsky (1978) argued that children's mental processes are constructed through relationships with others, and these relationships provided a basis for Vygotsky's interest in the social formation of individuals. In addition, Vygotsky (1962) emphasized the importance of language in interacting with

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

other people. For Vygotsky, language is used to explore social situations and develop thoughts (Dimitriadis & Kamberelis, 2006; Williams & Burden, 1997).

Vygotsky's ideas of learning as socially constructed are reflected in the work of Lave and Wenger (1991). As Toohey (2000) explained, "Although Vygotsky's work attended to context in terms of macro-societal practices and groupings as well as dyads engaged in explicitly instructional processes, Lave and Wenger were concerned with what they called communities of practice" (p. 14).

Communities of practice in the work of Lave and Wenger (1991) are made up of the sets of relationships that are specific, local, and changing. The community includes wider parts, such as persons and their activities, practices, and resources, among others. Communities of practice are also the activities in which participants engage.

The concept of communities of practice can be applied to the classroom communities. Toohey (1998) argued that classroom plays an important role especially for second language learning. Classroom communities need to become powerful places for ELLs to participate actively, and the students need to be treated as valuable intellectual and cultural resources.

Educators in second language learning need to understand that, according to sociocultural theories, the students construct knowledge from their experiences in and actions on the environment and through their interactions in the social world. Park (2006) also argued that nice and safe environment is strongly recommended for successful language instruction including immersion program. Educators need to find ways of using and applying the sociocultural theories and choosing the appropriate methods particularly in ESL classrooms.

2. Research on Content-based Instruction

Here, I investigate the relationship between regular content-area literacy instruction and content-based ESL instruction based on ample reference to the literature. Not surprisingly, there are both similarities and differences between teaching ELLs and teaching English-speaking students through the content areas. Harper and de Jong (2004) acknowledged that there are basic commonalities between first and second language learning, although the authors focus more on the differences between them. Both first and second language acquisition are developmental in nature and imply constructive processes and social interaction. In addition, some instructional practices for native English speakers may be applied to ELLs. For example, Blachowicz, Fisher, Ogle, and Watts-Taffe (2006) noted that the principles of effective content-area vocabulary instruction also apply to ESL students' learning.

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

Hawkins (2001) examined two layers of content-area instruction for ELLs in grades K–5. She dealt first with content-area instruction apart from second language issues, and then on content instruction as it interacts with second language issues. She maintained that the first layer lays an essential foundation for the second layer.

When Hawkins (2001) first explained discipline-specific content instruction in general, she described some requirements for teachers: knowing their students well, offering students experiences that help them move to a deeper understanding, presenting an open-ended problem that engages students to learn new information, and scaffolding further learning in classroom interaction with shared experiences. These requirements apply to both ELLs and native English-speaking students. When Hawkins described content-area instruction, particularly for young ELLs, she maintained that teachers need to consider certain issues, including students' abilities to relate their experiences to those the teachers provide and their abilities to describe their experiences. She observed that these issues are important for both ELLs and native English-speaking students in content-area instruction. However, ELLs typically have quite different cultures from one another and may not be familiar with the context of the content. Hence, teachers need to be especially thoughtful in their choices of experiences at the beginning of the class and need to provide their ELLs with more time to approach the material.

It is not surprising that there are also critical differences between teaching ELLs and English-speaking students through the content areas, mainly because of the unique characteristics and learning challenges of ELLs. Garcia (1991), who described factors influencing the English reading performance of Spanish-speaking students, noted that ESL students have different instructional needs based on their ages, language backgrounds, and communities.

Harper and de Jong (2004) explained some misconceptions about teaching ELLs. Above all, they maintained that simple exposure to English and interactions with native English speakers will not result in English language learning. Thus, ELLs need to learn in specific contexts with academic language that is comprehensible, and teachers can provide ELLs with challenging learning opportunities, such as those that occur in content-based instruction. In regular content-area instruction, mainstream teachers usually do not recognize themselves as language teachers, and they may not place emphasis on the language demands of content instruction, as the content-based ESL teachers do.

Therefore, Harper and de Jong (2004) suggested some teaching implications for mainstream teachers working with ELLs in regular content classes. Specifically, the teachers need to know the similarities, and especially the differences, between the two languages and need to understand the process of second language development. The teachers should also learn to investigate the role of language and provide scaffolding and various opportunities for ELLs to develop their language. That is, the teachers need to

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

know their responsibilities regarding ELLs' language and academic development and their influences on the students' learning processes and success in school.

In this section, I first investigated the sociocultural framework, and then described the research focusing on the relationship between teaching ELLs and English-speaking students through the content areas. Using the theoretical framework and current literature presented above, I examined how content-based ESL compares with regular content-area literacy instruction.

III. METHOD

This study used qualitative methodology to investigate how content-based ESL instruction compares with regular content-area literacy instruction. I collected data in four different classrooms at two different schools in the Midwest of the United States. In this study, I used pseudonyms to protect the identities of the research schools and participants.

1. Contexts

This study was conducted in two different elementary schools, Cleveland School and Roosevelt School. Although both schools are located in the small county in the Midwest, each school belongs to different public school districts. In Cleveland School, I observed a second-grade and a third-grade ESL classroom. In Roosevelt School, I visited a second-grade and a third-grade regular classroom. Table 1 presents the observational settings in the study.

TABLE 1

Observational Settings

Classroom setting	School setting
Second-grade ESL	Cleveland School
Third-grade ESL	Cleveland school
Second-grade regular	Roosevelt School
Third-grade regular	Roosevelt School

Before beginning this study, I thought it best to conduct the research only one school because my research question was to compare content-based ESL instruction with content-area literacy instruction in the regular classroom. However, it was hard to find the participating teachers in one school since some teachers refused my request to observe

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

their classes. Hence, I visited two different schools. In the end, this result turned out to be great because I learned much more by experiencing two different school contexts.

Both Cleveland and Roosevelt schools provide systematic multicultural and multilingual programs, and there are 4 ESL teachers respectively. The multicultural directors in both schools are in charge of the programs. The ESL students in both schools learn English in a separate ESL classroom every school day. But the size of the program in Roosevelt School is smaller than the one in Cleveland School. The students enrolled in Cleveland School could speak more than 20 different languages, including Chinese, Arabic, and Korean.

2. Participants

Four teachers participated in this study: two ESL teachers in Cleveland School and two regular classroom teachers in Roosevelt School. Table 2 illustrates all the participants in the study.

TABLE 2

Participants

School	Teacher	Grade level	Classroom	Educational background	Length of time teaching
Cleveland	Michelle	Second	ESL	B.A., M.A., ESL endorsement	9 years in ESL
	Angela	Third	ESL	B.A., M.A., and Ph.D. in linguistics	23 years in ESL
Roosevelt	Charlotte	Second	Regular	B.A., M.A.	13 years in elementary classrooms
	Heather	Third	Regular	B.A., M.A.	30 years in elementary classrooms

3. Data Collection

Three types of data were collected in 2007: classroom observations, interviews, and written materials including handouts and classroom artifacts. For the classroom observations, I visited each class a total of eight times and stayed in the class for about 1 hour per observation. During the observations, I focused on the topic and content of the

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

instruction, the teacher's instructional styles, her feedback to the students, the teacher's tasks, activities, assignments, and so on.

I conducted one semi-structured interview with each teacher at the end of the observation. I sent the interview questions to the teachers in advance, and I also gave them a hard copy of the interview questions at the beginning of the interview. The interviews were audio-taped. In addition, I conducted informal interviews with each teacher when necessary.

In addition to the observations and interviews, I collected part of written materials as my data sources. I looked for teaching materials, including handouts and classroom artifacts.

For data analysis, I took detailed field notes and described the artifacts. Then, I created a few categories with emerging themes according to my research question, based on transcriptions and my field notes of observations and written materials. In terms of validity in the study, I collected and analyzed data from various sources. Besides, I made time for member checking with each teacher who was willing to give me additional time.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this section, I examine how the two types of instruction in content-area English literacy are similar, and how they are different. Although all four teachers had different perspectives and used different approaches, I found meaningful commonalities between teaching content-based ESL and providing instruction in regular content-area literacy. It might be thought that there are not significant differences between teaching content-area English literacy to English-speaking students and to ESL students. For example, Blachowicz, Fisher, Ogle, and Watts-Taffe (2006) noted that the principles of effective content-area vocabulary instruction also apply to ESL students' learning. However, I maintain that there are specific approaches in teaching content-area English literacy that might be especially effective for ELLs because of their characteristics and challenges in learning English.

1. Similarities between the Two Types of Content-based Instruction

I found that there were meaningful commonalities in teaching content-area English literacy, regardless of the classroom setting. In all four classrooms, the students sat in their assigned groups. All four teachers tried to do various kinds of groupwork in class. For example, the students in Michelle's second-grade ESL class read a small book called *Life of an Earthworm* in groups, and they played the game "Growth Spurt" in science class in their groups. Angela, the third-grade ESL teacher, made use of appropriate and well-

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

organized grouping instruction. Angela often made different groups: In the book club activity, she formed three groups of students whose abilities were similar. She also formed groups that were composed of students with different abilities. Thus, the students were able to help and learn from one another in the group.

In Charlotte's regular second-grade classroom, the 20 students were divided into 5 groups, and most class activities involved groups. When the students made their own materials, for example, "My World" in social studies class, the students in each group helped one another. The regular third-grade classroom teacher, Heather, often changed the class groupings based on the subject and the accompanying activities. In particular, she made good use of small reading groups made up of a few students with similar abilities. One of Heather's biggest class activities was a theater play acted out by three groups.

All four teachers agreed that they had done various kinds of groupwork and that the students could learn from other students in their groups. Vygotsky (1978) maintained that children's mental processes are constructed through relationships with others. He emphasized the social construction of learning and focused on the importance of understanding the individual as part of a social and historical context, in this case in the classroom communities present within schools.

From the communities of practice perspective, in my study there were several communities in each classroom composed of students with various needs, in addition to the official community made up of the teacher and the students. In the four classes, I found that the major parts of learning were constituted through relationships in groups and in class through discussion. When students had the opportunity to work together, they were more likely to be actively participated through discussion. Kim and Lim (2009) argued that in group works students became more engaged and enjoyed performing a task in front of the group members. According to Robb (2004), discussion can be a meaningful tool for thinking and understanding, and discussion is also a good way for learners to participate as well as to comprehend. These social interactions, such as discussion in groupwork, have benefits for students' learning. The interaction enables students to connect new information to their lives and to the lives of others, to become aware of their thoughts, and in the process, to make new information their own.

Second similarity was that all four teachers connected their lessons to the students' daily lives. I learned an interesting fact: The four teachers agreed that they often encountered some content that was difficult to teach to the students. To help their students understand, they all tried to connect the lessons to the students' everyday lives.

For example, Michelle's struggles with teaching content-based ESL were related to presenting difficult vocabulary and content. In addition to using hands-on experiences, Michelle often connected the content to the students' daily lives. When the class learned about the 50 states in the United States, the students started by discussing the town in

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

which they currently lived. She prepared a handout and the class talked about the town where they lived, the capital, and important cities near this town. In addition, when the class discussed the U.S. states, they focused more on the state in which the students lived. When the class dealt with other states, Michelle asked students their experiences in those particular states, such as their travels and acquaintances living there.

When the third-grade ESL teacher, Angela taught harvest time in ancient Egypt, she related the topic to harvest time in the area the students lived. The students discussed the types of fruit presently grown in the United States, which Angela tried to relate to ancient agriculture. Additionally, the students began discussing their own religions when they learned about the religion of the ancient Egyptians.

When Charlotte taught the American flag to her regular class of second-grade students, members of the class started to talk about their previous week's experiences on Memorial Day. When the class learned about words for places (e.g. continent, country, state, county, city, and street) in social studies class, they talked about their lives and their experiences, such as their travels to other cities, counties, states, and countries. The students then talked about friends and relatives who did not live near them and their experiences with pen pals and key pals.

Heather, the regular third-grade teacher, used a few authentic literacy activities which were related to students' real lives. She mentioned that authentic literacy activities connect students' learning to their daily lives. These activities help students respond to the real world. For instance, after Earth Day Heather's class made Earth Day posters. At first, the teacher asked the students to write down ideas that they might draw for an Earth Day poster and then explain how their ideas were related to Earth Day. One boy in her class explained how he saved and protected the earth by writing that he planted many flowers and trees around his house. After the activity, Heather collected the students' posters and said the posters would be exhibited in the hallway to announce the importance of Earth Day to other students in the school.

Spencer and Guillaume (2006) described a learning cycle of instruction that is embedded in real-life contexts. The authors noted that effective learning can be achieved through successive processes and that these processes need to be related to real-world contexts. Brown (2001) explained that when language becomes the medium used to deliver content that is relevant and of interest to students, then the students will intrinsically have concern. As Robb (2003) explained, students can translate new information into comprehension through this connection to their daily lives. Additionally, students can be motivated to learn difficult content when the topics are related to their lives. That is, in content-based classrooms, students will become intrinsically motivated and empowered when instruction applies to real life.

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

Third commonality between the two types of instruction was related to vocabulary teaching. All the teachers emphasized the importance and difficulties of teaching content-area vocabulary. All four teachers used more integrated and connected vocabulary instruction than direct instruction. In content-area classes, students need to understand the main concepts and vocabulary before anything else. Michelle tried to introduce vocabulary when she taught each new unit. When the class read the book *Life of an Earthworm*, Michelle started by teaching the vocabulary for the main concepts and often confirmed the meanings of the words while reading. After reading, she checked the main concepts and vocabulary through a handout. Angela made use of the context when teaching vocabulary. In reading the social studies book *Mummies, Pyramids, and Pharaohs*, she asked students to read the page in the book where the word appeared and then she helped them to infer the meaning. Charlotte taught difficult vocabulary words by using visual aids. Charlotte made good use of relevant pictures to help the students understand meanings. Similar to Angela, Heather used context clues in a book to teach vocabulary. When the class read a science book titled *Fossils Tell of Long Ago* and encountered difficult vocabulary words, she read the related sentences in the book and helped them to infer the meanings. Like this, all four teachers emphasized vocabulary in content-based instruction and they spent a long time in teaching important key words.

2. Differences between the Two Types of Content-based Instruction

In comparing content-based ESL with regular content-area literacy instruction, I recognized several important differences. One of the main differences was in each teacher's perspective on content-based ESL or content-area literacy instruction. Michelle and Angela thought content-based ESL was one of various ESL teaching programs, and both of them felt that this mode of instruction was effective. Michelle was confident of the effectiveness of content-based ESL and convinced of its benefits. During the interview, Michelle often expressed her attitude toward content-based ESL in statements such as "I just think it's much more successful," "I really like content-based [ESL]." and "It has turned out all right." She enjoyed teaching using this mode of instruction and remarked, "I really enjoy it. And I saw how well it did work." Angela also admitted that content-based ESL was a good technique among the various ESL approaches, although she felt there were some difficulties in teaching with this approach. Additionally, these perspectives had an impact on their teaching practices. Michelle and Angela tried to maintain a balance between the content areas and English language arts through content-based ESL instruction. Thus, there was a strong connection between the content areas and English literacy instruction in their classes.

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

In contrast, Charlotte and Heather thought it was normal to teach content-area literacy in their classes. The teachers mentioned that it is not surprising they tried to integrate literacy and the content areas. However, in practice the teachers often focused more on certain content areas. For instance, Charlotte tried to offer her students various opportunities to learn more about the content areas and to provide a foundation when learning the content. Since she emphasized only content areas, there was not a strong connection between the content areas and literacy instruction in her class.

Second, there were differences in the degree of difficulty of the content areas. Before beginning this study, I thought that ESL students might simply have a language barrier but that this did not mean they were cognitively inferior or less intelligent. However, I found that the ESL class dealt with a little easier content than the regular same-grade classes except in mathematics. Additionally, in terms of vocabulary, the teachers of the two regular classes taught relatively more difficult words than those in the ESL classes. I now realize that if the content itself is too hard, the ESL students might have more difficulty in developing their English skills.

For instance, Michelle and Charlotte, the second-grade ESL and regular classroom teachers, both taught geography in social studies. Michelle's class studied with simple maps that showed Lincoln Park in Chicago, and they learned to use a grid. When the class learned about the map of the United States, they learned what states were north, west, east, and south of other states and their boundaries. However, Charlotte's regular classroom dealt with geography from a wider perspective. When the class learned how to read land forms on the maps, they dealt with complicated, real maps. They also learned about the various symbols on the maps. Furthermore, they studied about the world and about the continent encompassing the states in the United States.

However, when it came to the subject of math, Heather mentioned that ESL students, especially Asian students, were very good at math, regardless of their English fluency. I found that when Angela taught about fractions, her ESL students studied with complicated numbers, and it was not an easy class.

Third, there were also differences in wait times. For instance, when Angela, the third-grade ESL teacher, wrote several words, their definitions, and a one-paragraph summary on the overhead projector when teaching about ancient Egypt, she waited for quite a long time for the students to write these items down. Both ESL teachers, Michelle and Angela, always reserved enough time to allow their students to follow when they asked questions and wrote something on the board or the projector.

In contrast, when Charlotte and Heather wrote something on the board, their students wrote it down directly in their notes. I did not feel there was a long enough wait time to copy something in both classes. In particular, when Heather taught the probabilities unit in math, the class talked about various answers. Heather wrote a total of more than 20

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

sentences on her projector, even though she wrote them sentence by sentence. Most students wrote fast, and Heather waited a relatively short time for the students to write them down.

Lincoln and Beller (2004) also suggested that ESL teachers need to increase their wait time. The authors explained that ESL students may translate from English to their first language and vice versa, and then translate their responses back to English again, and that their language processing can be slow at first. Therefore, ESL teachers need to give students extra time to formulate their responses.

In addition, there were differences in their teaching materials. Both Michelle and Angela basically followed the district curriculum and used textbooks. However, their teaching approaches and materials seemed to be more flexible. Michelle and Angela used a wide array of their own materials. In particular, their main teaching materials came from books that they made during their years of teaching. Michelle and Angela made them from various resources and modified and rewrote them for their own teaching materials.

Unlike these two ESL teachers, one of the main teaching materials for Charlotte and Heather was their textbooks. Charlotte generally tried to follow the state guidelines, and she made good use of the textbook. Heather also used the textbook for each subject, as well as the teacher's guidebook. Heather mentioned the timeline set by the school district of the city. During my observations in these two regular classes, I did not see concrete hands-on experiences, which require much more time. I found that the teachers of both regular classes often gave the school district guidelines more consideration.

V. CONCLUSION

It is not surprising that all four teachers were quite different from, and at the same time similar to, one another in terms of their perspectives, teaching approaches, teaching materials, and other instructional peculiarities. I maintain that although the teachers' basic perspectives and teaching approaches regarding regular content-area literacy instruction could be applied to content-based ESL instruction, there were specific aspects that could be more effective for ESL students, and these need to be studied further.

This study has several limitations. First, the ESL and regular instruction took place in different schools. I visited a second-grade and a third-grade ESL classroom in Cleveland School. I observed a second-grade and a third-grade regular classroom in Roosevelt School. These two schools belong to the different school districts and this might have influence on the differences between teaching content-based ESL and providing instruction in regular content-area literacy.

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

Next, the main issues addressed in this paper were content-based ESL and content-area literacy instruction. I had planned to focus only on this mode of instruction, but I also observed outside the content-area classes in areas such as pure reading and writing classes, because sometimes the teachers asked me to visit at particular times, and sometimes I visited the class without knowing the class schedule. However, this turned out to be helpful, because it allowed me to see the teachers' wider teaching approaches.

As I ended this study, I thought some more questions to explore further. First, this research considered only the teachers' perspectives and approaches toward content-area English literacy instruction. It would be very meaningful to see the impact of content-area English literacy instruction on students' learning from the students' point of view.

Second, more research on CBI is needed, especially in the Korean context. Using the results of the present study, Korean educators can understand concrete teaching approaches and teaching materials in CBI. Then, they need to continue to investigate CBI for the Korean context because studies of this instruction are currently lacking. In particular, teacher education for CBI is necessary so that the English teachers in Korea can become confident to teach English through the content matter. Examination of the following issue is especially needed: How can English teachers implement content-based instruction appropriately for students in the Korean context?

REFERENCES

Blachowicz, C., Fisher P. J., Ogle, D., & Watts-Taffe, S. (2006). Vocabulary: Questions from the classroom. *Reading Research Quarterly, 41*, 524-539.

Brinton, D., Snow M. A., & Wesche, M. B. (2003). *Content-based second language instruction.* Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Longman.

Brown, C. L. (2007). Content-based ESL instruction and curriculum. *Academic Exchange Quarterly*, *11*(1), 114-119.

Chaille, C. (2008). *Constructivism across the curriculum in early childhood classrooms*. Boston, MA: Pearson Allyn and Bacon.

Dimitriadis, G., & Kamberelis, G. (2006). *Theory for education.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Echevarria, J., & Graves, A. (2007). *Sheltered content instruction* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Allyn and Bacon.

Garcia, G. E. (1991). Factors influencing the English reading test performance of Spanish speaking Hispanic children. *Reading Research Quarterly, 26*, 371–392.

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

Gordon, T. (2007). *Teaching young children a second language.* Westport, CT: Praeger Publisher.

Harper, C., & de Jong, E. (2004). Misconceptions about teaching English language learners. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, *48*(2), 152-162.

Hawkins, B. (2001). Supporting second language children's content learning and language development in K-5. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (3rd ed., pp. 367-383). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Kim, S., & Lim, H.-W. (2009). Magic, group interaction, and English speaking proficiency development for young learners. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 15*(3), 171-198.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation.* Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Lincoln, F., & Beller, C. (2004). English language learners in the science classroom. *Science Scope, 28*(1), 28–31.

Ovando, C. J., Collier, V. P., & Combs, M. C. (2003). *Bilingual and ESL classroom: Teaching in multicultural contexts* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.

Park, J.-K. (2006). Korea-Japan English camp: A case study of English immersion program in Korea. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 12*(4), 91-115.

Park, S. J. (2010, January). *How content-based ESL compares with regular content-area literacy instruction.* Paper accepted at the 2010 Annual Hawaii International Conference on Education, Honolulu, Hawaii, United States.

Peregoy, S. E., & Boyle, O. F. (2005). *Reading, writing, and learning in ESL: A resource book for K–12 teachers.* New York, NY: Longman.

Robb, L. (2003). *Teaching reading in social studies, science, and math.* New York, NY: Scholastic Professional Books.

Spencer, B. H., & Guillaume, A. M. (2006). Integrating curriculum through the learning cycle: Content-based reading and vocabulary instruction. *The Reading Teacher, 60,* 206–219.

Toohey, K. (1998). *Learning ESL: Participation in situated communities of practice.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association for Applied Linguistics, Seattle, WA.

Toohey, K. (2000). *Learning English at school: Identity, social relations and classroom practice.* Toronto: Multilingual Matters.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1962). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

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

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

Vygotsky, L. S. (1981). The genesis of higher mental functions. In J. Wertsch (Ed.), *The concept of activity in Soviet psychology* (pp. 144-188). Armonk, NY: Sharpe.

Examples in: English
Applicable Languages: English
Applicable Levels: Elementary

Seo Jung Park
Department of English language and literature
Pukyong National University
599-1 Daeyeon 3-Dong, Nam-gu,
Busan, Korea 608-737
Tel: 051-612-6850
Email: parkseojung@gmail.com

Received in April, 2010
Reviewed in May, 2010
Revised version received in June, 2010

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre