

PLANNED ALTERNATION OF LANGUAGES (PAL): LANGUAGE USE AND DISTRIBUTION IN BILINGUAL CLASSROOMS

Migdalia Romero; Angela Parrino

Note: This information was originally published and provided by The Bilingual Education Teacher Preparation Program at Boise State University. Every attempt has been made to maintain the integrity of the printed text. In some cases, figures and tables have been reconstructed within the constraints of the electronic environment.

Court decisions brought about by litigation which mandates bilingual education, such as the Aspira Consent Decree in New York or the Serna v. Portales decision in New Mexico, are vague about how to prepare limited English proficient (LEP) students for the eventual use of only English in the classroom (Trueba & Barnett Mizrahi, 1979). Legal decrees and decisions simply provide a mandate or a framework. They may specify the use of the native language (L1) to teach some subjects and the use of English, the second language (L2), to teach others. Decrees often emanate from the assumption that within three years students will be ready to be mainstreamed into all-English classes. What they don't spell out is how a teacher is supposed to prepare a student for all-English instruction when subjects initially are taught through the native language.

In preparing students for eventual mainstreaming, bilingual teachers use two languages to teach academic content. Within the context of lessons, they alternate between the use of these languages in at least three ways: (a) spontaneous, (b) direct translation, or (c) purposeful language alternation. Teachers may decide on the spot when to use L1 and when to switch to L2 with the goal of assuring comprehension and meaningful involvement of students. More often, however, teachers are unaware they are switching; i.e., switches are made unconsciously (Tikunoff, 1985; Ovando & Collier, 1985). An exception to unconscious code switching or translation is the New Concurrent Approach (NCA) (Jacobson, 1981) which focuses on purposeful and systematic alternation of languages by bilingual teachers within the context of teaching a lesson. Both spontaneous and purposeful code switching or language alternation as studied by Tikunoff (1985) and Valdes Fallis (1978) or as proposed by Jacobson (1981) focus on the bilingual teachers' use of language during classroom lessons.

Clearly, the academic and linguistic challenges to bilingual teachers are great. They must help students learn new content through their native language, help them learn a new language, and help them learn new content through that new language. The problem faced by teachers is how to wean students from the use of their native language as they teach new and challenging content. This is not an easy task. The

conceptual load of new content is intensified for ESL students by their lack of familiarity with the language. It is exacerbated by the linguistic complexity of accompanying text, which is most often written for native English speakers.

The immediate goal of the teacher is to make content comprehensible (Krashen & Terrell, 1983). Initially this is done by teaching students through their native language with the long range goal of moving students towards use of their second language in acquiring new concepts. However, when the weaker language is used, the teacher must break down both the conceptual and linguistic load of new content and make both language and content comprehensible to the second language learner (Mohan, 1986).

Critical to these challenges is the use of language by teachers to foster learning in general and language learning in particular. At the same time the teacher must focus on the use of language by students, since it is through active use by students that language is acquired. In attempting to meet these challenges teachers find themselves looking beyond the immediate lesson towards a long range plan for transition. In the process they raise many of the following questions:

1. How do I help students make the transition to classes taught only in English?
2. How much of the students' native language should I use and how much of the second language?
3. When should each language be used and for what functions?

On the surface the questions seem to focus on classroom lessons. However, within the context of long range program planning and goal setting they require a long range response which integrates the objectives of a lesson with the goals of a program. In essence the approach must be an articulated response between lesson planning and program planning where the immediate goal is concept development, and the long range goal is second language acquisition and the ability to be able to learn academic content through English. Teachers' decisions about which language to use and when must be guided simultaneously by the need of the moment and by their vision for the future. Teachers must negotiate the tension created by their need to assure comprehension and engagement on the one hand, while simultaneously supporting students towards greater use of their second language on the other.

The article will propose answers to these questions within the microcontext of a lesson and the macrocontext of instruction over time. It will describe an approach to content area teaching and program planning which systematically uses two languages, guiding rather than prescribing language use and distribution. While some of these questions have been addressed in the literature (Gonzalez, 1980; Jacobson, 1981), our response to them differs. Jacobson, for example, focuses on language use within the context of individual lessons and in programs where maintenance is the goal. His model assumes a high level of dual language proficiency on the part of the teacher. Gonzalez focuses on dual language programs where English speakers and Spanish speakers are acquiring two languages simultaneously, their home language and a second language. Neither model proposes an integrated and articulated plan that will take students from non English proficiency to full English proficiency and mainstreaming.

The Planned Alternation of Languages (PAL) approach, on the other hand, is a response to transition as a goal and the need to prepare students for mainstreaming. It takes into consideration the immediate goals of content area classroom lessons as well as the longer range goals of a program. It focuses simultaneously on the students' and teachers' use of language. In this approach both languages have viable functions and support learners through the acquisition of new knowledge and the gradual acquisition of a second language. The approach emanates from what some bilingual teachers are already doing intuitively and effectively, but often unconsciously. Our goal is to acknowledge and systematize what is being done so that others can replicate it.

This article is divided into three parts. The first focuses on a definition and rationale for PAL, showing how it differs from translation, spontaneous code switching, and the NCA. The second part describes the functions of language and the variables which need to be considered in the use and distribution of languages during instruction. The third portion of the article describes in detail the paradigms and accompanying models that make up PAL.

A DEFINITION OF PAL

PAL is the planned and systematic use of two languages for instruction both within content area lessons and across time within the total instructional program. It consists of two paradigms -- one focused on grouping as the dominant form of instruction and the other on the teacher-directed lesson. In each paradigm both languages play an active and complimentary role and assume some degree of fluency in both languages on the teacher's part. The objective of PAL is to systematically use the native language to facilitate learning while simultaneously moving students towards greater use of the second language (L2) as a means of promoting second language acquisition.

Both the grouping paradigm and the teacher-directed paradigm within PAL consist of three models, each moving students towards greater use of the second language as the dominant means of communication, interaction, and learning. Each model takes into account four variables: (a) the native language proficiency of students, (b) their second language proficiency, (c) a teacher's proficiency in the students' native language, and (d) the linguistic and cognitive objectives of the lesson.

The PAL approach is not based on either translation or code-switching. Translation implies the restatement of information word by word, sentence by sentence, or idea by idea. It is sometimes used in bilingual classes to be sure that all students understand instruction. However, constant use of translation can lead to dependency on the native language and delayed acquisition of the second language (Wong-Fillmore, 1982). Students who are more competent in the non-English language often tune out when English is used because they know the teacher will repeat the information in their stronger language (Wong-Fillmore, 1982).

Code switching, on the other hand, does not restate but adds information. It is the "alternating use of two languages on the word, phrase, clause, or sentence level" (Valdes-Fallis, 1978). It is also used informally

and spontaneously by bilingual teachers to assure comprehension, to promote on-task behavior, to provide clear and explicit directions, and to manage the behavior of students (Tikunoff, 1985).

It may also be used more formally and in a prescriptive manner as implemented in the NCA (Jacobson, 1981). In this approach, bilingual teachers consciously switch between two languages as the teaching and learning goals necessitate. This results in a preplanned script (tripartite plan) that takes into account an approximate 50-50 distribution of languages, leading to language maintenance. By affording each language equal time, each receives comparable status. In suggesting patterns of language use, the NCA claims to develop a natural flow of language, thus avoiding direct translation. Code-switching is finely tuned within NCA, so teachers respond to students in one or the other language, according to the function of the child's utterance or the teacher's goal. As such, it is a highly prescriptive approach that focuses on teachers' use of language in response to students' cues.

While PAL recognizes the function of code-switching, it does not directly prescribe it. Instead PAL moves beyond code-switching as an instructional strategy to language use by students and teachers as a programmatic plan. Unlike translation and code-switching, PAL focuses on students' use of language during the learning process while simultaneously focusing on their language needs. This is accomplished in two ways - by differential grouping and by gradational use of language over time during teacher-directed lessons.

PAL builds on the premise that for language to be acquired it must be heard, and it also must be used with increased frequency. The use and distribution of languages in PAL are preplanned and systematic but flexible. Less prescriptive than NCA, PAL underlines the need to roughly tune language use to the evolving language proficiency of students to facilitate their natural acquisition of language. PAL espouses that the more natural, spontaneous patterns of code-switching by teachers and students alike, rather than those which result from more restricted planning as in the NCA, better foster the goals of second language development and content understanding. In doing so, PAL also addresses the notion of variable competence within a group and empowers students to learn for themselves and from each other, inherently reflecting a whole language philosophy.

As teachers plan content area lessons using PAL, they must attend to the concepts to be taught, the language used to cover that content, the objectives of the lesson, and the longer range linguistic goals for their students. The preplanning and systematic approach in PAL have more to do with the long-range goals of the program and gradual movement of students over time to greater use of English, unlike NCA which attempts to achieve an equal distribution of languages. While PAL may be used in maintenance bilingual programs, it is more suited to transitional programs. It attempts to answer the question of how and when a teacher should use each language during the course of a lesson and over the course of a semester. Simultaneously it aims to focus on the following goals: (a) the students' comprehension of new content; (b) the extension of their basic comprehension to a higher level of understanding to include the evaluation, analysis, and synthesis of new content, i.e. the development of critical thinking skills; (c) the meaningful and active involvement of students using language in the learning process, and (d) the movement of students toward greater use of L2 in learning academic content.

THEORETICAL RATIONALE FOR PAL

In order to make informed decisions about the use and distribution of languages in a classroom, it is important to understand the functions of language in school. More specifically, teachers need to know the role of language in processing new concepts and learning a new language. They also need to know the variables that affect language use during instruction.

Functions of Language in School

Language in school has two basic academic functions. First, teachers use language to teach new content and concepts while students are expected to learn them through language. Second, teachers use language to teach language and to help students learn it.

Language for learning concepts.

Teachers use language to present new information to students and to motivate them to want to learn it. However, it is the students' own use of language to discuss and clarify new concepts that allows significant learning to take place.

Students use language to learn, at first, introspectively and then verbally (Vygotsky, 1962). That is, most students initially think about new ideas and concepts before they talk about them. Connections to relate prior knowledge are made in a student's mind, and inconsistencies are often first identified using inner talk. Students raise questions internally and may even practice those questions before uttering them aloud. This internal or inner use of language is necessary as students make sense of new information and try to make connections between known content and concepts and those being learned in school.

As students are introduced to new ideas, experiences, and concepts, they learn to label them with new words. These labels allow students to store new knowledge conceptually and to share it with others. In this way, both speakers and listeners have a common understanding of what is being discussed. Shared labels enhance communication.

Learners also use language verbally to explore new ideas and to construct meaning. They ask questions which will clarify or extend concepts that are not fully understood. They use language to verbalize connections they have made in their mind to prior experience. Once new knowledge and concepts are acquired, students will use language to talk about what they have learned and to explain it to others, so that they, too, can understand and use it (Barnes, 1985; Britton, 1985). When students are able to apply, analyze, and evaluate new knowledge in their new language, they can create new ideas and raise more questions. Through language, ideas are challenged, clarified, modified, and enriched. Talk between and among students as they learn not only clarifies new concepts but often raises questions not posed by a teacher or a textbook. For these reasons, negotiation of ideas through language is critical to the learning process.

Obviously, when the native language is used a student is better able to understand, clarify, make

connections, analyze, and raise questions which will extend concepts to a higher level of understanding. How much critical inquiry or in-depth exploration of concepts can go on when negotiation of content and concept is done in one's weaker language? How complex can questions get? How involved can responses be? Clearly, the language of communication and interaction affects the depth with which one explores new concepts and content.

Language for learning language.

Teachers also use language to teach language, and students use language to learn it. Words are first produced by students in the mind as images of the objects, actions, or concepts they represent, or as written symbols if a learner is literate in the language. These images and symbols help students visualize and retain new language forms and new information. Language often is practiced in the mind through mental repetition or echoing. As students formulate the rules of language subconsciously, they may plan dialogues and rehearse utterances internally or privately before they do so publicly (McLaughlin, 1985).

Outwardly, students use language to repeat utterances verbatim, transform them, and formulate new utterances in the process of practicing what they are learning (Ventriglia, 1982). They also formulate generalizations aloud about language spontaneously and when prompted. They may even raise questions about the language under study. Talk about language is helpful in language learning since it encourages students to think about and formulate rules which they use intuitively in speaking. Once verbalized within one context, replication and application of language rules to other contexts are easier tasks.

The task of learning a new language is complicated for students who are attempting to develop two kinds of language competence, the ability to use the second language for social communication and the ability to use it to learn new academic content (Cummins, 1981). Learning the social and academic forms of language is contingent on its use by the learner in a variety of contexts and for a variety of purposes. To facilitate its use, teachers must create contexts which force students to use more than single word utterances in class. Teachers must also promote use of the second language for critical inquiry, a task made easier when students have engaged in the process in their native language.

SUMMARY

From this discussion of the functions of language in the classroom it seems obvious that the presentation of new concepts and their discussion and clarification by students is rendered easier when a student's primary language of communication and thought is used. Learning is thwarted, and students are frustrated when they are not able to ask questions about critical issues or interact with their teacher or peers. Use of the native language by students and teachers can facilitate comprehension, promote concept learning, and assure full and meaningful participation of students in the learning process. In addition, incremental and structured use of the second language can prepare students to use the second language to learn in the same involved ways in which the native language is used.

PAL is designed to move students along two continua simultaneously -- the concept acquisition

continuum and the language acquisition continuum. Over time, the goal is to increase the students' proficiency in L2 and their ability to handle more content and more complex concepts through their second language. To these ends, the students' native language is used initially, while systematically promoting greater use of the second language. PAL is also intended to help teachers and students accomplish the two primary learning functions of language language for learning content and language for learning language.

Variables Affecting Language Choice and Distribution

Four questions guide the decisions teachers make about the use and distribution of languages during instruction:

1. What is each student's level of native language proficiency?
2. How proficient is the teacher in the native language of students?
3. How proficient are students in their second language?
4. What are the objectives of the lesson?

Students' proficiency in their native language.

The native language skills of a student are used as a guide in determining whether a teacher relies more heavily on the use of the native language than on the second language during instruction. Students who have studied in their native language and who are literate in it will bring to school a wealth of conceptual information about their environment and linguistic information about the workings of language in general and of their language in particular. They will be able to question, to contribute to language-rich discussions, and to understand written material in their native language. They may also be able to compare L1 to L2, especially if they have studied their native language formally. Skills that are well developed in L1 can be transferred to L2. Sound-symbol correspondences, reading and study skills, word attack, and recognition skills may offer varying degrees of transferability in learning a second language. A teacher's job is facilitated when a student is literate and has a high level of competence in L1.

Proficiency of teachers in students' native language.

The choice and distribution of languages within a lesson are also affected by a teacher's competence in the native language of the students. Only those who are fully competent in students' L1 can teach content and engage them in critical inquiry through it. Teachers who are less than fully proficient must rely less heavily on teacher talk in L1.

Teachers who can understand and communicate in the L1 of their students are at an advantage since they can capitalize fully on their students' native language. They can enhance learning in several ways. First, their use of L1 serves as a language model for students. They can help students compare and contrast L1 with L2. In addition, they can communicate with students spontaneously and with grammatical correctness, checking comprehension, clarifying misconceptions, and fostering critical thinking. By

initially using L1 in the learning process, teachers can connect new content with their students' lives and their prior knowledge, making learning interesting, relevant, dynamic, and engaging.

These teachers can assess students' linguistic and academic knowledge and determine their needs through the native language, thereby providing an objective and informal measure of what a student brings to the learning task. A teacher's knowledge of a student's level of proficiency in L1 and the degree to which social and academic forms of language are known and used can shed light on why students may be having trouble with new material or with similar forms in L2. These functions of teacher talk are important to learning and to effective use of language for learning.

When students and teachers are able to communicate in a shared language, students are less likely to feel frustrated. If they are not ready to communicate in their second language, they may use their native language as a vehicle to express ideas until transition to L2 is possible, knowing that their native language will be understood. A teacher's use of students' native language also provides a secure environment for the students to take risks, one in which they feel comfortable communicating ideas and feelings in the home language, while experimenting with the new language. Therefore, use of L1 by teachers supports learning and communication, builds strong self-concepts, and promotes risk-taking behavior.

Second language proficiency of students.

A student's proficiency in L2 must also be considered in deciding on the extent to which each language is used for instruction. Knowing how well students know English should guide teachers in determining how much English to use and for what purposes. A student with a low level of proficiency in L2 will be prevented from full participation in meaningful discussions about the new material. Likewise, students more competent in English need to be encouraged to use it more extensively for critical thinking and in processing new academic content.

English proficiency is as important to assess in students who have been in this country for a while as it is for recent arrivals. Even with beginning level ESL students, language ability varies. Some may have studied English in their native country. As a result, variations in the degree of proficiency of the four skills may be found. It is not unusual to find that the reading and writing ability of some recent arrivals may be well developed in contrast to their speaking and comprehension skills. Assessment of the students' ability in L2 should help teachers define the linguistic objectives of a lesson and their readiness to participate in lessons which rely heavily or exclusively on the use of English. The underlying goal of all lessons should be to ensure full comprehension and participation in learning while simultaneously moving students just beyond their current level of competence in both the content and the language used to teach the content. Assessing students' L2 proficiency must involve consideration of their control of both the social and academic forms of language as well as their oral and written skills.

Objectives of the lesson.

Content area lessons for bilingual students usually have two sets of objectives. The first set deals with

the subject matter, and the second relates to language. If the content objectives take precedence over the language ones, then the students' stronger language is used for instruction. If, however, both sets of objectives are integral to the lesson, then both languages need to be used. While the content objectives are usually defined by the curriculum or the text being used by the teacher, language objectives are defined by the needs of the students and their level of proficiency in English.

Summary of variables.

In sum, in planning instruction for bilingual/ESL students, teachers must have some basic information about their students' language proficiency. They need to determine the students' level of oral proficiency in their native language and their level of literacy. Teachers also need to know their students' level of English proficiency, including their degree of literacy. Information on students' oral and reading ability in their native language and English will help teachers make more informed decisions about the objectives of a lesson which will push students to a higher level of academic and linguistic competence. This same information will enable teachers to decide how to group students and when to use one language over the other to promote active participation and understanding to help develop second language skills.

PAL PARADIGMS

There are two basic PAL paradigms. The first is designed for classes that group students for instruction and the second for teacher-directed classes. Within both the grouping paradigm and the teacher-directed paradigm are three possible patterns or models of language use and distribution. Each model in turn increases the use of English while decreasing the use of the native language. Simultaneously, each takes into account different stages in the language acquisition process, from very limited knowledge of English to readiness for transition into the mainstream.

Grouping Paradigm

There are three grouping models in the PAL grouping paradigm. The first model makes almost exclusive use of the student's native language and assumes a teacher's fluency in it. The second attempts to make comparable use of both English and the native language, assuming at least moderate proficiency in L1 on the teacher's part. The third model, in contrast, relies almost exclusively on English and assumes little or no fluency in L1 by the teacher. Both the second and third grouping models assume enough proficiency in English by students so they can profit from and participate in discussion conducted in English, albeit for some in a limited way. Those more proficient in English become a resource for the less proficient. The grouping paradigm depends on a teacher assigning groups a task. Groups are expected to work together in reading, discussing, and producing a product around their task. The language of interaction in the group and the language of the final product are defined by the grouping model.

Grouping model 1. The first model offers the greatest opportunity for concept development and native language enrichment since it relies almost totally on the student's dominant language for instruction and

group work. Teachers working with students in group 1 provide direction, information, and clarification in the students' native language. Students working as a group interact in L1 and are expected to develop a product representative of what they have learned using both L1 and L2. Language use and distribution are based on two premises. The first is that thoughtful discussion leads to concept development and clarity. The second is that students who have a thorough understanding of concepts can more readily learn the labels required to express those concepts in a second language.

Students in this group are entry level ESL students who are limited in their ability to understand and use English. They fall into the preproduction or early production stage of second language acquisition (Krashen & Terrell, 1983). The former is characterized by a silent period in which students focus on selective listening and comprehension. Their responses may consist of matching, miming, pointing, acting out, circling, or drawing. Early production is characterized by limited use of L2 in the form of single word utterances, labels, and repetition of simple language forms.

The use of the native language at this stage fosters more student talk and a deeper understanding of concepts before those same concepts are discussed in the second language or before new related content is introduced in English as will be proposed in the second and third grouping models. Model 1 groups use L1 to discuss, explore, and clarify concepts in depth. The final product of the group, be it in oral or written form, should also be in L1. Those literate in L1 should be given the opportunity to use their skills in developing their final product in written form. Those whose L1 literacy is limited can demonstrate their mastery of the concepts in oral form.

Grouping model 1 relies on the teacher working with groups in the native language and circulating among groups to be sure that students are working on task and that they understand the content and concepts embedded in the lesson. Teachers who use the students' native language as they work with them can build on the students' knowledge of that language. They can direct a group's discussion, asking questions that not only keep students on target, but that encourage the higher order thinking skills of comparison, contrast, analysis, synthesis, evaluation, and application. In this way, students are in a better position to develop these skills and transfer them to classes which use L2 as the dominant means of communication and instruction.

Within this model, teachers may opt to group literate students homogeneously as well as heterogeneously. Grouping students homogeneously capitalizes on their literacy and further encourages its development. As they explore written academic content through their native language, they can use primary and secondary sources of information to supplement their textbooks. They can also work as a group from written guidelines, independently of the teacher. Heterogeneous grouping takes the form of pairing literate students with those who have not yet developed literacy skills. This pairing may be used to naturally develop literacy among the less literate.

At this stage of their English language proficiency, students are exposed to the second language in limited ways which are directly related to the content under study. Only after content is understood, and native language labels are known, should students be asked to produce some portion of their group work

in English. This might include the translation of charts, graphs, or other visual organizers into English. Teachers can also incorporate some form of group practice of what was learned through poetry, song, or transformation drills. These enrichment activities give students the opportunity to practice their new language around content that is understood and with support from their peers.

Grouping model 2. The second grouping model pays greater attention to the use of English and the development of English skills in the process of learning academic content, while maintaining some use of the native language. The use of the native language ensures comprehension and full participation in learning. The use of the second language gives students the opportunity to discuss new information and concepts within a socially interactive and supportive environment. These goals are accomplished by having students work cooperatively in pairs or groups using both L1 and L2, while developing a product exclusively in L2, reflective of what they have learned.

Model 2 groups students who are at a similar intermediate level of English proficiency when students are beginning to use the second language for extended discourse and critical thinking. At this point, students have basic comprehension skills and are able to express ideas simply in English through the use of lengthier and more complex sentences. Their vocabulary may be limited, and they may revert to the native language because they don't know a particular label in the second language or out of frustration because they cannot express complex ideas as they are evolving within the constraints of simple sentences. As a result, their ideas are not fully communicated even if students know conceptually what they are talking about. Basic errors in the use of L2 appear, reflecting the students' emerging knowledge and their generalizations about the structure of L2 (Krashen & Terrell, 1983).

This model encourages students to use English in a supportive environment with peers who are roughly at the same proficiency level in L2. Students insecure about their ability in a second language may be easily intimidated by more proficient L2 speakers. Homogeneous grouping of students is designed to lessen their feelings of insecurity. While teachers want to be sure that students are challenged linguistically and are exposed to language models that move them towards greater L2 proficiency, teachers must also be sensitive not to stifle active participation in discussion. Acquisition is fostered through participation and active use of the second language. However, by permitting students to also use the native language, thorough concept development is ensured.

A supportive environment takes a variety of forms. Teachers support learning by encouraging critical thinking regardless of the language of discussion. Teachers can also support second language acquisition by structuring tasks to promote the use of English. This can be accomplished by giving students structured observation sheets and task cards to work with in English. It can also be achieved by having students negotiate cooperatively the meaning of academic text in English with the expectation that the final group product will be produced and delivered in English. It is important when assigning tasks to such groups that the tasks be interesting, motivating, and relevant to the students' lives so as to promote natural and extended discourse rather than single word utterances.

Another supportive role of teachers is to circulate among students and encourage the use of English to

negotiate concepts within groups. However, informal use of the native language should not be prohibited. Informal clarification of ideas through the native language may be just enough to keep students engaged and actively participating and learning. Allowing students to use L1 when they are frustrated or under stress may make a critical difference in their learning and should not be stifled.

Students who have studied their native language formally, whether or not they are literate in it, should be encouraged to compare and contrast it orally with their second language. This is another responsibility of the teacher in this grouping model. Conscious comparative analysis of the two languages promotes transfer of language skills and greater awareness of language structure.

Model 2 takes into account that since students in bilingual programs share the same native language, the use of it is inevitable. While L1 use may take away from English language development in the short term, its directed use promotes concept clarification and richer discussion which transfers to English language development later. If, however, the end product is expected to be developed and presented in English, then using L1 for some portion of discussion does not present a threat to English language development. A threat is created when students avoid using the second language at all costs. Then its use within groups must be monitored more strictly by the teacher. However a greater threat to learning is created when students don't fully understand content and cannot effectively communicate their questions or talk about what they have learned.

Grouping model 3. The third grouping model focuses on almost exclusive use of the second language in group work and in producing a final product. Students in this group have greater English proficiency than those in grouping model 2. At this advanced level, students have good comprehension skills and use more complex sentences. They can be expected to analyze, synthesize, defend, evaluate, and justify responses through their second language. Nevertheless, a certain degree of linguistic heterogeneity is inevitable. The heterogeneity of this advanced ESL group provides the opportunity for the more proficient English speakers within the group to serve as linguistic models for the less proficient, thereby promoting greater and more precise use of English. The role of the teacher is to circulate among students to be sure that English is used and to clarify content and concepts for students in English. Since premature placement of students into this group can stifle participation and full exploration and understanding of concepts, it is meant to be used when students have been in the classroom for a while and are comfortable with both the content of the curriculum and the use of English to negotiate meaning.

Summary

In the three models which make up the grouping PAL paradigm, the language of instruction and the placement of students is determined largely by the students' linguistic profile. Once proficiency in both languages is determined by the teacher, students are assigned to a group to promote either thorough concept development through L1 (model 1) or second language development with some concept development through L2 (models 2 or 3). This does not mean that students must begin placement in grouping model 1 and move sequentially through each model. It is conceivable that new students with some proficiency in L2 can be placed in grouping model 2, and that students inclined to use L2 more

and who are willing to take risks can be moved from model 1 to model 3.

In addition to considering language proficiency, grouping models are assigned dependent on the teacher's objectives. When material is first introduced, the teacher may want to encourage students' thorough and deep understanding of the content and therefore assign them to models 1 or 2. As students become more familiar with the content they can be encouraged to use more English and eventually be moved to the next grouping model.

It is conceivable that all three grouping models could be operating simultaneously in the class around the same content. While one group is organized around grouping model 1, another could be using model 2 or model 3. Table 1 illustrates the three models within the grouping paradigm and the variables to be considered in their selection.

Teacher-Directed Paradigm

In contrast to the grouping paradigm, the teacher-directed PAL paradigm focuses on language use and distribution in a teacher-directed lesson. Through the planned use and distribution of languages during a lesson, bilingual teachers can help students acquire new concepts while they acquire the language forms that are needed to discuss that content in the second language.

The teacher-directed paradigm is designed to attend to both the students' and teacher's use of language during lessons. Teacher-directed lessons are divided into two phases—the instructional phase and the summary phase. By controlling or carefully monitoring the use of language during each phase, three models of language use and distribution are created. Each moves students towards greater use of the second language, fostering thorough concept development and full student participation. During the instructional phase, new content and concepts are introduced, discussed, clarified, and enriched. In the process of introducing new content, teachers motivate students and help them make connections to known content and to prior knowledge and experience. During the summary phase, students review what was learned and practice it orally, in writing, or both.

Language is assigned to each phase of a lesson, consistent with (a) the linguistic proficiency of students in each language, (b) the degree of difficulty of the language used and the content being taught (linguistic and cognitive load), and (c) the linguistic and cognitive objectives of the teacher. The distribution of languages is predicated on the premise that as a student's proficiency in the second language evolves, so does the extent to which that language can be used for learning and for negotiating the meaning of academic content. In addition, as cognitive objectives are met using the native language, and as students become more familiar with the academic content itself, then their ability to process and talk about that content in L2 needs to be developed.

Teacher-directed model 1. When teachers want to introduce new material, have students explore new content in depth, or encourage critical thinking and discussion by students, the students' stronger language is used during the instructional phase. This means that L1 is used initially in lessons to provide new information and to enable students to negotiate actively the meaning of new content. In order to

stress the use and acquisition of L1 for academic tasks, English is used for the summary phase of the same lesson when students review and practice the new content. Practice is structured and even controlled by the teacher to give students the opportunity to use the vocabulary and syntax critical to the discussion of that content through English. The approach is called a linguistically controlled summary (Romero, 1991). It involves the conscious use of language by teachers in ways that enable students to figure out the syntactic structure of utterances (Wong-Fillmore, 1982).

The objective of this model is to combine one known or familiar element (either language or content) with the other element, which is presumed to be new and to do so within the context of a lesson. The balancing between known and new is a way of responding to the learning difficulties which arise when teachers try to introduce two new elements, content and language, at the same time. In introducing two new elements simultaneously, teachers increase the learning load for students.

This model introduces new content through the known language during the instructional phase. As students become familiar with the new content through discussion and negotiation of meaning in the native language, then the new language is used to review and practice during the summary phase what was just learned. While review and practice are part of the learning process, some knowledge and understanding of the new content are presumed. Therefore, review focuses on language development as its primary objective and is given in English.

Teacher-directed model 2. For more advanced second language learners, the languages are reversed in this model of PAL. The second language is used during the instructional phase of lessons and the native language during the summary phase. The model presumes some knowledge of the second language, akin to that of students placed in grouping model 2. Only when students become familiar with some of the English vocabulary and syntactic structures which are an integral part of a subject area, should new content be introduced using L2.

While English is supposed to be the primary medium of communication among teachers and students during the instructional phase of model 2, the native language still has a role. Students who are literate in L1 can use bilingual dictionaries to look up the meaning of new words which are impossible to comprehend contextually. Likewise, they may be allowed to answer questions in their native language when frustration sets in and learning is thwarted.

A great deal of instructional support or mediation is necessary when teachers use the second language to introduce new material, even if it is about a subject with which the students are familiar. Since the focus is on learning content and language simultaneously, teachers need to adjust their teaching to accommodate students who are still limited in their ability to understand and to respond to instruction delivered totally in L2. Mediation in teaching, therefore, must take a variety of forms - linguistic, organizational, and instructional (Romero, 1991). Linguistic mediation within model 2 involves teachers monitoring their use of language in order to assure clarity of expression and comprehension by students. Teachers do this by simplifying their use of language. In this context, simplification means using vocabulary with which students are familiar (social forms and high frequency forms of language) before

using more academic forms and by paraphrasing academic text to enable students to understand. Building repetition and paraphrase into lessons gives students multiple opportunities to hear the same message in English a variety of ways, one of which may be more familiar to students than another. Short et al. (1989) suggest other forms of simplification. They include using the active rather than the passive voice, using simple sentences that maintain a subject, verb, object (SVO) order, and minimizing the number of new vocabulary words introduced in a single lesson.

Mediation at a linguistic level also involves attending to the students' use of language. Minimizing teacher talk provides students with an opportunity to increase their productive ability in English (speaking and writing) as well as their receptive skills (listening and reading). Students' talk and, more importantly, their negotiation of ideas, are critical to the learning process. Students can be encouraged to talk when teachers use a dialogue rather than a lecture format to teach. The dialogue format should consist of both closed and open-ended questions. Closed ended questions provide an opportunity for the less proficient students to participate in classroom discourse. Such questions usually elicit short, grammatically simple responses. On the other hand, teachers should not fail to ask open-ended questions. These types of questions are more broadly focused. Open ended questions engage students in lengthier, more structurally complex responses. Teachers should also encourage students to pose their own questions. Both open-ended and student-initiated questions are cornerstones of critical thinking and are, therefore, the ultimate goal of education.

In order to get the more reluctant students to participate during the instructional phase of model 2, teachers sometimes need to create opportunities for students to participate nonverbally or to use language in structured and mechanical ways. Both nonverbal and structured participation give even the most reticent students a chance to become meaningfully involved. Nonverbal participation can be promoted by having students respond to directives as in the Total Physical Response approach (TPR) to second language acquisition (Asher, 1977). They can also illustrate comprehension in mime, art, or written form. Structured use, mechanical use, or both, involve students in repeating, paraphrasing, and even responding to previously answered questions (Romero, 1991).

During the instructional phase of model 2, organizational mediation involves structuring tasks to promote interaction and to encourage the reciprocal sharing of information. Reciprocal interaction (Barnes, 1985) can occur between teacher and students, between and among students, as well as between students and texts. Teacher-student interaction occurs when teachers consult privately with students during class or after. Student-student interaction is the outcome of any form of student grouping or consultation which is embedded into a lesson by the teacher. Student-text interaction can be accomplished through interactive and purposeful activities in which students orally summarize written academic text or rewrite it in order to explain it more clearly to their peers. Students can also interact with text by outlining or visually representing new information in table format, and on graphs and time lines. They can also be encouraged to raise questions and to discuss new insights with peers.

Instructional mediation during the instructional phase of lessons involves the teacher's use of strategies which promote comprehension and student engagement. Concrete objects, as well as drama, gestures, and mime serve as visual reinforcers or aids to comprehension. Graphic organizers are another form of

instructional mediation. They help students visualize the organization of a lesson and the relationships which exist between characters, events, places, and new and old information. Semantic maps, story maps, time lines, tables, charts, graphs, and calendars are some examples of graphic organizers.

The summary phase of lessons in model 2 of the teacher-directed PAL paradigm is conducted in the native language. It is used to be sure that students have fully comprehended the new content which was presented and explored through their second language. By asking students in their dominant language what they have learned during the instructional phase of the lesson, teachers are in a better position to know if the cognitive objectives of the lesson have been achieved. The discussion and questioning should encourage the open-ended use of language.

Teacher-directed model 3. In the third grouping model, English is used during both the instructional and the summary phases of a lesson. The objective is to move the students towards independence in the second language so they can rely more directly on text for meaning. Because student proficiency in L2 is still evolving, there may be times when the students will fall back on their use of the native language. Teachers need to assess whether the use of L1 is necessary or simply convenient. If necessary, the class as a group can be encouraged to restate, translate, or otherwise present the same information using English.

Because full English proficiency has still not been achieved, some of the same forms of mediation employed in model 2 need to be used, but to a lesser degree, to assure full comprehension and involvement.

Summary

The three teacher-directed models are represented in the Synthesis of the Teacher-Directed Paradigm (Table 2).

Each model moves the students from limited to full use of the second languages and from extensive to very limited use of the native language. Initially, extensive use of the native language when introducing new content assures maximum concept development, while limited use of English assures exposure to the new language around familiar content and concepts. As proficiency in the second language increases, students are exposed to more English by introducing new content in their second language. Throughout the implementation of the teacher directed paradigm, it is important that while teachers encourage increased use of the second language, it not be done at the expense of students using the native language to facilitate comprehension. Teachers must toe a very thin line between the two languages. They must constantly work towards promoting both comprehension and second language development, so when students are mainstreamed, they are prepared for all content being taught exclusively through English.

SUMMARY

PAL is an approach to transitional bilingual classroom instruction which addresses the critical variables involved in learning and teaching in such a setting. In planning for instruction, teachers using PAL must take into account both their language proficiency in L1 and L2 as well as that of their students, together with the cognitive and linguistic objectives of the lesson. PAL paradigms and models heighten teacher effectiveness in conveying content as students develop proficiency in their first and second languages. Students' needs are met with meaningful instruction, both in small groups and in whole group instruction. PAL does not prescribe the equal distribution of languages as does the NCA. It addresses students' development of language and concepts in a comprehensive way, leading towards transition and the eventual mainstreaming of bilingual students. The use of the native and the second language to promote learning during all stages of PAL lets students know that their language has a place in the learning process. However, it also prepares them systematically for the exclusive use of English when they are mainstreamed. In effect, PAL recognizes and deals with the reality of schools and the transitional goal of most bilingual programs.

Mainstreaming, however, should not preclude the students' continued study of their native language and of rich literary and cultural heritage. This can and should be accomplished by offering students the opportunity to study the language and its literature within school. In providing native language classes, schools acknowledge both overtly and covertly the importance of the students' native language and their support of bilingualism as a goal.

Laws legislate educational change by establishing policy and providing a framework for instruction. However, teachers who work with English language learners need more than a framework to accomplish the goals which legislation was designed to accomplish. If transition or mainstreaming is the intended goal, then teachers need practical instructional models to take students from the point of entry with limited skills in English to the point of mainstreaming when content will be taught exclusively through English. In the process, teachers need to deal with both the content and the language learning needs of their students as well as the instructional goals of the curriculum. PAL provides a model that accomplishes these educational goals, thereby helping teachers meet the real needs of their students.

Table 1. Synthesis of Grouping Paradigm 1

Variable	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Linguistic Profile of Students	Oral fluency in L1, *+/- literacy in L1, *Entry level English proficiency	Oral fluency in L1, *+/- literacy in L1, *Intermediate level English proficiency	Oral fluency in L1, *+/- literacy in L1, *Advanced level English proficiency
Linguistic Profile of Teacher(2)		*At least moderate proficiency in students' L1	
Objective of Lesson	*Fluent in students' L1	*Comprehension of academic content *Development and use of English	*May have very limited proficiency in students' L1
Language Distribution	*Thorough and in depth exploration of concepts	*L1-L2 comparison	*Concept development via L2
Group Work/Product	*Native language enrichment *Group work in L1 *Product in L1/L2	*Group work in L1 & L2 *Product in L2	*Extensive and exclusive use of English *Group work in L2 *Product in L2

(1) In maintenance/developmental bilingual programs, teachers may choose to use Model 1 even when student proficiency in English would dictate the use of Model 3. The goal under these circumstances would be native language enrichment.

(2) It is assumed that the teacher is bilingual but may be more proficient in one of the two languages. This variable accounts only for the teacher's proficiency in the students' L1.

(3) Teachers using Model 3 may be fluent in L1, but given the English language development objectives of the lesson, will minimize their use of L1.

Table 2. Synthesis of Grouping Paradigm

Variable	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Linguistic Profile of Students	Oral fluency in L1, *+/- literacy in L1, *Entry level	Oral fluency in L1, *+/- literacy in L1, *Intermediate level English proficiency	Oral fluency in L1, *+/- literacy in L1, *Advanced level
Linguistic Profile of Teacher(2)	English proficiency	*At least moderate proficiency in students' L1	English proficiency
Objective of Lesson	*Fluent in students' L1	*Introduce new content in new language	*May have very limited proficiency in students' L1
Language Distribution	*Introduce new content in known language of concepts	*Content in L1 & L2	*Introduce new content
Group Work/ Product	*Content in L1 *Summary in L2	*Summary in L1	*Content in L2 *Summary in L2

REFERENCES

- Archer, J. (1977). Learning another language through actions: The complete teacher's guidebook. Los Gatos, CA: Sky Oaks Productions.
- Barnes, D. (1985). From communication to curriculum. Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton Cook Publishers, Inc.
- Britton, J. (1985). Language and learning. Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton Cook Publishers, Inc.
- Cummins, J. (1981). The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students. In Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework. Los Angeles, CA: Evaluation and Dissemination and Assessment Center.

- Gonzalez, G., & Maez, L. F. (1980). To switch or not to switch: The role of code switching in the elementary bilingual classroom. In R. V. Padilla (Ed.), *Ethnoperspectives in Bilingual Education Research, Vol. 2: Theory in bilingual education.* (pp. 125-135). Ypsilanti, MI: Eastern Michigan University.
- Jacobson, R. (1981). The implementation of a bilingual instructional model: The new concurrent approach. In R. V. Padilla (Ed.), *Ethnoperspectives in Bilingual Education Research, Vol. 3 Bilingual education technology.* (pp. 14-29). Ypsilanti, MI: Eastern Michigan University.
- Krashen, S., & Terrell, T. (1983). *The natural approach.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- McLaughlin, B. (1985). *Second language acquisition in childhood: Vol. 1, Preschool children.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Mohan, B. (1986). *Language and content.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Ovando, C., & Collier, V. (1985). *Bilingual and ESL classrooms: Teaching in multicultural contexts.* NY: McGraw Hill Book Co.
- Romero, M. (1991). Transitional bilingual education: An instructional perspective. In A. Carrasquillo (Ed.), *Bilingual education: Using languages for success.* New York, NY: NYS Association for Bilingual Education.
- Short, D., Crandall, J., & Christian, D. (1989). *How to integrate language and content: A training manual.* Los Angeles, CA: Center for Language Education and Research, UCLA. (Clear Educational Report 15)
- Tikunoff, W. J. (1985). *Applying significant bilingual instructional features in the classroom (First ed.).* Rosslyn, VA: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.
- Trueba, H. T., & Barnett-Mizrahi, C. (Eds.) (1979). *Bilingual multicultural education and the professional: From theory to practice.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.
- Valdes-Fallis, G. (1978). Code switching and the classroom teacher. *Language and education: Theory and practice (Vol. 4).* Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Ventriglia, L. (1982). *Conversations of Miguel and Maria.* Reading, MA: Addison Wesley Pub. Co.
- Wong-Fillmore, L. (1982). Instructional language as linguistic input: Second language learning in classrooms. In L. Cherry Wilkinson (Ed.), *Communication in the Classroom.* New York, NY: Academic Press.

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

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Migdalia Romero, PhD, is a professor and chair of the department of curriculum and teaching at Hunter College of the City University of New York.

Angela Parrino, PhD, is an assistant professor in the department of curriculum and teaching at Hunter College of the City University of New York.

[Return to JEILMS v.13 Table of Contents](#)

The HTML version of this document was prepared by NCBE and posted to the web with the permission of the author/publisher.

[NCELA \(formerly NCBE\) HOME PAGE](#)

www.ncela.gwu.edu