Creating successful learning contexts for biliteracy[1]

Nancy H. Hornberger

This paper seeks to shed light on the complex challenge that faces teachers in schools serving linguistically and culturally diverse student populations. Drawing from a long-term comparative ethnographic study in two Philadelphia public schools, it describes what it is that two of the teachers in these schools do to create successful learning contexts for the biliterate development of the linguistic minority children in their classes. Two classrooms situated in contrasting community, program, and language contexts are brought into focus: one a fourth-fifth grade in a two-way maintenance bilingual program attending to Puerto Rican children and the other a fourth grade in a mainstream/ ESOL-pullout program attending to Cambodian children. The learning contexts are discussed in terms of four themes identifying critical aspects of contexts for teaching for biliteracy: motivation, purpose, text, and interaction. Specifically, the paper asks what it is that these teachers do that goes beyond good teaching to be good teaching for biliteracy, and how their approaches differ according to the particular configuration of biliterate contexts, biliterate media, and individual biliterate development of the linguistic minority children in their classes.

The Philadelphia School District, like other large urban school districts in the United States, serves an increasingly bilingual school population. In 1989, the District's 195,000 students included approximately 18,000 Hispanic and 6,000 Southeast Asian students, 9% and 3% of the total enrollment, respectively (Mezzacappa, 1989). The two elementary schools reported on here, each with about 1000 students, have concentrated language minority populations. The Potter Thomas School, grades K-5, counts approximately 78% of its students as Hispanic, of which the vast majority are Puerto Rican. The Henry C. Lea School, grades K-8, counts about 37% of its students as Southeast Asian, of which the vast majority are Cambodian (School District of Philadelphia, 1987-88). As these and other schools seek to serve linguistically and culturally diverse student populations, teachers are confronted with a complex teaching challenge.

The two classrooms reported on here, a fourth-fifth grade at Potter Thomas and a fourth grade at Lea, are situated in widely disparate communities, within different types of programs, and the particular languages involved contrast in a number of ways thought to be relevant to the development of biliteracy (cf. Hornberger, 1989a), yet both teachers appear to be successfully

creating learning contexts for their students' biliterate development. This paper asks, what are the things they do that permit this?[2]

Many of the things these two teachers do could simply be characterized as 'good teaching' anywhere, not just for linguistic minority children, and not just for biliteracy. However, although good teaching in these classrooms may look a lot like good teaching anywhere, it in fact reflects sensitivity to a wide range of factors unique to these classrooms. Specifically, then, the paper asks, what are the things these teachers do that go beyond 'good teaching' to be good teaching for biliteracy?

Shulman has argued that pedagogical excellence must be defined by a model that goes beyond a set of globally effective teaching skills considered without reference to the adequacy or accuracy of the content being taught, the classroom context, characteristics of the students, and the accomplishment of purposes not assessed on standardized tests (1987: 6, 20).[3] This paper seeks to contribute to our understanding of pedagogical excellence by providing a description of the content and context-specific ways these two elementary teachers teach for linguistic minority children's biliterate development. Here, the content is the children's second language and literacy. The context will be discussed in terms of four themes which are drawn from the literatures on bilingualism, literacy, second and foreign language teaching, and the teaching of reading and writing: motivation, purpose, text, and interaction. These themes identify critical aspects of contexts for teaching for biliteracy (cf. Hornberger, 1989b).

The description focuses not only on the similarities but also on the differences in the ways these teachers teach. Significantly for a discussion of biliterate development, one classroom uses both of the children's languages as mediums of instruction, while the other uses only their second language. As a 'believer' in bilingual education and the value of students' being able to develop and apply their first language (L_1) literacy skills in their acquisition of second language (L_2) literacy, I was perplexed over the fact that the Cambodian children appeared to be thriving despite the fact that they were not receiving any instruction in their L_1. Specifically, then, the paper also asks, what are the things that the teacher in the monolingual instructional setting does for her students' biliterate development that appear to compensate for the lack of first language instruction?

The term biliteracy refers to any and all instances in which communication occurs in two (or more) languages in or around writing. An individual, situation, and a society can all be biliterate: each one would be an instance of biliteracy. I have recently argued that every instance of biliteracy is situated along a series of continua that define biliterate contexts (the micro-macro, oral-literate, and monolingual-bilingual continua), individual biliterate development (the reception-production, oral language-written language, and L_1-L_2 transfer continua), and biliterate media (the simultaneous-successive exposure, similar-dissimilar structures, and convergent-divergent scripts continua; Hornberger, 1989a).

Implications of such a model for teaching for biliteracy are that the more the contexts of the individuals' learning allow them to draw on all points of the continua, the greater are the chances for their full biliterate development. Here, a learning context for biliteracy is taken to be successful to the degree that it allows children to draw on the three continua of biliterate development, that is, on both oral and written, both receptive and productive, and both L_1 and L_2 language skills, at any point in time.

Let me clarify that I am calling what happens in both classrooms biliterate development even though the Cambodian children are being taught literacy in their second language only, because as individuals these children are involved in biliterate development, even though their school program is not. To varying degrees the Cambodian children interact around written communication in their first language at home and in their community. More importantly, in school they are building English literacy on a foundation of two languages, not one.

The following sections of the paper take up first the similarities and differences between the two classrooms as to the biliterate contexts and media in which they are situated, and then the similarities and differences in the successful learning contexts for biliteracy each teacher creates. A concluding section comments briefly on the significance of these findings for meeting the challenge of teaching biliteracy to linguistic minority children.

Contexts and Media of Biliteracy

The Puerto Rican community of North Philadelphia and the Cambodian community of West Philadelphia differ in a number of ways, most of which can be aptly summarized by Ogbu's distinction between the involuntary minority and the immigrant minority (1987).[4] The Puerto Rican pattern of immigration tends to be a cyclical one in which the mainland community is constantly receiving new arrivals from the island and in which individuals may alternate island and mainland residence during their lifetimes. The Cambodian pattern is one of once-and-forever refugee immigration. While long-term contact with their homeland and the development of a sense of identity in opposition to the dominant culture have led to the creation of institutions in the Puerto Rican community which foster and strengthen the maintenance of Spanish language and literacy (see Micheau [to appear] for a description of some of these institutions), no such institutions have yet evolved in the Cambodian community.

Since 1969, the program at Potter Thomas School has been a two-way maintenance bilingual program in Spanish and English: Spanish speaking children learn English while maintaining their Spanish (the *Latino* stream), and English speaking children learn Spanish while maintaining their English (the *Anglo* stream; 14A 17).[5] This program, as an example of the enrichment model of bilingual education, is unique in Philadelphia and rare in the United States (cf. Hornberger, 1990). In it, both languages are developed beginning in kindergarten and through

fifth grade at the school, and both languages and literacies are used for subject matter instruction. In contrast, the program at Lea School, which has arisen over the last decade in response to the influx of Southeast Asian children into the school, pays no explicit attention to the Cambodian children's first language (L_1) and literacy, but rather mainstreams them into their second language by means of a pull-out ESOL program (cf. Hardman, 1989 on some problems ESOL creates for language minority students).

The two classrooms described here contrast sharply in terms of their population. The *Anglo* and *Latino* streams, the Spanish and English reading cycle structure, and the bilingual teaching staff at the Potter Thomas School yield up classrooms which are relatively homogeneous as to linguistic and cultural background. The classrooms at Lea School are linguistically and culturally more heterogeneous. M. López, who came to mainland United States from Puerto Rico at age 8, teaches reading to classes of approximately 25 students, all of Puerto Rican background. In contrast, L. McKinney, a third generation Italian immigrant, teaches reading to approximately 28 students, of whom 11 are Southeast Asian (9 Cambodians, 1 Vietnamese, 1 Vietnamese-Laotian), 16 African-American and 1 Ethiopian.

Though community, program, and classroom contexts differ for the two teachers, they share the context of the various policies and guidelines which govern all public schools in the district. Grade assignment guidelines which assign children to grade by age regardless of level of English or achievement mean that both teachers' classes encompass a wide range of English and academic abilities. City-wide and state-mandated testing has consequences for students' promotion to the next grade and their participation in Chapter 1 and TELLS programs.[6] Grading guidelines dictate that a student reading below grade level cannot receive a grade higher than C and those reading on grade level cannot receive a grade higher than B (3-7-88, cf. 1-31-89).[7] The standardized curriculum assigns goals and objectives for every curriculum area, for every grade, for every school in the district. Both the standardized curriculum and the grading guidelines create indirect pressure for schools and teachers to use basal reading series for reading instruction. In fact, in both these cases, the teachers feel that they really have no autonomous choice about the basals (25A 70; 4-11-88).

The foregoing paragraphs describe differences and similarities between the two classrooms across the three continua of biliterate contexts: macro-micro, oral-literate, and monolingual-bilingual. As for the continua of biliterate media, the two classrooms differ on all three. The Spanish language and its writing system are relatively similar to English: both are Indo-European languages and both use the Roman alphabet. In contrast, the structure of the Khmer language (in terms of its phonology, syllable structure, and syntax) and its script, which is derived from Sanskrit, are markedly distinct from English. Furthermore, whereas the Puerto Rican children in Potter Thomas School are acquiring literacy in both languages simultaneously, those Cambodian

children at Lea School who are acquiring Khmer literacy are most likely doing so before or after English literacy, rather than simultaneously with it.

The classrooms are alike then, in that the linguistic minority children in them are developing biliteracy. They differ, however, in the degree to which the linguistic minority community and the school program support the maintenance of biliteracy, the students and teacher share linguistic and cultural backgrounds, and the two languages and scripts are similar or divergent and simultaneously or successively acquired by the students.

Learning Contexts for Biliterate Development

The following sections discuss what the two teachers do to create successful learning contexts for their students' biliterate development. As noted above, the discussion is organized around four themes which identify critical aspects of contexts for teaching for biliteracy: motivation, purpose, text, and interaction. Both similarities and differences in the two teachers' approaches are brought out in each section.

Motivation

Both teachers make membership in the classroom community desirable through affective and experiential bonds while at the same time maintaining the successful execution of literacy tasks as the criterion for membership. In both classrooms, the teachers explicitly include themselves in the community. For example, they share personal anecdotes with their students (e.g., ML on camping trip 2-29-88, 3-7-88; LM on Alaska 3-9-89) and hold themselves accountable to them for their own absences (e.g. ML court 3-7-88; LM jury duty 3-28-89).

Yet the basis for the classroom community is entirely different in the two classrooms. M. López builds on a shared cultural background with her class in ways that may oftentimes not even be apparent. For example, she brings four stuffed dolls to school one day because they are so appealing to her. She sets them up at the front of the room, and in response to students' requests and on condition of their completing their assignments, lets them borrow the dolls for brief periods in order to, as she tells me, 'help them be children; they're too grown up' (5-9-88).[8] Both the open display of tenderness and affection and the motherly concern for the children are expressions of the warm human caring typical of the Puerto Rican community.

L. McKinney does not share a common cultural and linguistic background with her students, but makes up for that by creating classroom-based shared experiences. One way she does this is the annual camp trip she and another teacher take their classes on for three days in May. Throughout the year, she refers frequently to the future camp trip, linking class activities to what they will do, see, and experience at camp. For example, camp buildings and natural features were the reference points for a map lesson in social studies (5-2-89). The students participate in a

candy sale to raise money for the trip. Students who present consistent behavior problems are warned, and if necessary, excluded from the trip (5-2-89; 2-16-89). She works conscientiously, often with the help of the home-school co-ordinator (2-16-89), to convince parents that their children will benefit from the trip and be well-supervised, and is genuinely sorry that each year there are a few parents who will not give permission for their children (usually girls) to go (5-2-89). Furthermore, she makes every effort to assure that no child will be excluded because of lack of ability to pay the $30 contribution asked of each child (toward a $50/child cost; 5-2-89).

Another way she creates classroom-based shared experience are the games in which she participates with the students (e.g. 2-9-89; 3-7-89; 3-9-89; 3-21-89). One of the most popular is the panel game, modeled on a TV game show. The teacher, acting as 'host,' designates 9 students as panel members, each of whom chooses a pseudonym, and 2 students as Mr. O and Ms. X. Mr. O and Ms. X ask the questions of the panel members and must judge whether the answer given is correct or not; the challenge of the game lies in the fact that panel members may bluff. The host scores for X or O only when a correct answer is given; any one question remains in the game until a correct answer is given.

The panel game exemplifies the two important aspects of membership in the communities these teachers create. Not only is membership made desirable through affective/experiential bonds, but also membership is made dependent on the successful execution of literacy tasks. The questions used in the game are comprehensive review questions composed by the teacher and covering social studies, math, and language arts lessons from the few preceding weeks.[9]

Aside from creating a desirable, literacy-based classroom community, the other major way these teachers build their students' motivation is through taking an interest in and holding accountable each individual as an individual. This individual attention to each student's ability, activities, and 'current status' achieves the double purpose of demonstrating the teacher's concern for that student, while at the same time making clear her expectation that each and every student participate fully.

In these two classrooms, this 'good teaching' practice requires the teachers to be attentive to specific community, program, and classroom characteristics. For M. López, this requires accomodation to the high classroom population turnover rate which is a concomitant of the cyclical immigration pattern mentioned earlier. Aside from the new students the school registers at the beginning of each year, many more arrive and leave during the school year - for the 1986-1987 school year, for example, records show 198 admits and 235 dismissals for Potter Thomas School (School District of Philadelphia, 1987-88:377). At the classroom level, this means students come and go throughout the year. For example, Miguel arrives in early March for his first day in M. López' class. He has just come to Philadelphia from Puerto Rico and knows neither English nor the routines of an American classroom. M. López finds him a place and a desk, introduces him to

the class and has students introduce themselves to him, points out to him the two other students who arrived from Puerto Rico during the year, and explains to him about the activity students are working on at that moment, journal writing. That day, and every day thereafter, she tries to bear in mind his particular linguistic and cultural needs, even while attending to the needs of all her other students as well.

For L. McKinney, this attention to individuals requires keeping track of which ESOL students have been pulled out for which ESOL class at which time. For example, she makes special arrangements for ESOL children in her class to be excused from ESOL to attend the special Settlement Music School assembly program with the rest of their classmates (2-14-89), or for them to copy an outline from the board, to make up their social studies test, and to go down and get their library book, all missed because of ESOL (2-21-89; 3-9-89; 2-28-89). This configuration is further complicated by the fact that different segments of both ESOL and non-ESOL students are also regrouped for Chapter 1 and TELLS instruction at different times during the week.

At its best, the teacher's ability to focus on individuals makes it possible for each individual to experience a coherent learning activity in the midst of a group lesson. Consider Sophorn's experience as L. McKinney works with her group in Increasing Comprehension (Kravitz and Dramer, 1978: 8-9). When the students take turns reading aloud, Sophorn reads the second paragraph. After all three paragraphs have been read, L. McKinney asks which sentence in each paragraph is similar to the 'main idea sentence' given in the exercises. Sophorn volunteers at her paragraph, 'I got it,' and reads, "It is its lung that makes this one-foot-long fish different from other fish" from the story, to justify "It is its lung that makes the walking catfish different" as the sentence expressing the paragraph's main idea. Despite the fact that several student turns intervened between her original reading and her answer to the main idea question, she has the opportunity to successfully answer the question relating to the paragraph she originally read (2-16-89). Sophorn's experience epitomizes the way motivation works in these classrooms. As an individual she is held accountable and given opportunity to successfully execute the literacy task, and as a member of the classroom community she values, she wants to do so.

Purpose

These two teachers establish both broadly social and more narrowly task-focused purposes for their students' biliterate development. As to broad social purpose, there is a contrast between the two teachers in their approach to the students' non-English linguistic and cultural identities. M. López feels her identity to be primarily American, despite having spent her early childhood in Puerto Rico, and having attended Spanish church and studied Spanish in high school in mainland U.S. She attributes this American identity in part to the fact that she never lived in a Hispanic neighborhood and her father did not allow Spanish to be spoken at home. Nevertheless,

regardless of her own sense of identity, she explicitly states that the important thing at Potter Thomas is for the teacher to accept students where they are, whether they prefer Spanish or English, or want to identify with the Puerto Rican or American cultures. That is, she leaves open the option for maintenance of either or both languages and cultures by her students. Her bilingual/bicultural maintenance approach is congruent with the school's 2-way maintenance bilingual education program and the community's institutional support for literacy and culture in Spanish as well as English.

In contrast, L. McKinney notes that although she doesn't want the Cambodian children to lose their culture, she sees it happening, just as it happened in her own family's history (2-16-89). While she is appreciative of linguistic and cultural diversity, she tends to see it as a contribution to a "mix." She is cognizant of unique aspects of the Cambodians' language and culture. For example, Shariff gives evidence of his teacher's awareness when, upon being frustrated because Than keeps saying 'wolleyball' instead of 'volleyball,' he finally remembers that his teacher (L. McKinney) told him they don't have 'v' in their language.

Although L. McKinney is aware of their different language and culture, she intentionally mixes Southeast Asian and non-Southeast Asian students at their worktables and does not seem enthusiastic about the Cambodians' using their L_1 in class. She says that last year her all-Cambodian pre-primer group would at times speak Khmer among themselves -- upon which she would admonish them, 'Hey, wait a minute! I don't know what you're saying' (2-16-89). Her tolerant assimilation approach is congruent with the school's pull-out ESOL/mainstream program and the community's relative lack of institutional support for literacy in Khmer.

At the level of task-focused purpose, the two classrooms are quite similar in many ways. In both classrooms, tasks are clearly defined, teacher correction is focused on the task and includes teacher acknowledgement of her own mistakes (e.g. LM page number 2-7-89; stanza structure 2-14-89), and the teacher continuously adapts the definition of the task to the immediate situation (e.g. ML Verna 3-17-88). All of these are good teaching practices. What is of interest here, however, are the ways in which the teachers' task definitions, corrections, and adaptations reflect responsiveness to the particular configuration of biliterate contexts, media, and development in any one situation in their classrooms, and how the two classrooms contrast with each other.

For example, M. López corrects Wandaly for using English during Spanish reading (3-17-88), not because she can't understand (cf. LM above), but because the present task (Spanish vocabulary introduction) requires the use of Spanish. At other moments of the same lesson, the teacher encourages use of one language to aid development of the other (see Interaction discussion below).

In L. McKinney's classroom where Cambodian children are becoming literate in their second language without recourse to their first, it is significant that her corrections of students' oral

reading and of their writing emphasizes meaning rather than phonological or grammatical form (her approach to her students' use of Black English Vernacular is similar, 2-7-89, 3-9-89, 3-28-89). For example, Sreysean reads a paragraph from Increasing Comprehension, pages 10-11, fluently, but substitutes "Joe's" for "Joseph's" and "train track" for "railroad track." L. McKinney does not correct these, and Sreysean goes on to answer the multiple choice comprehension question correctly (2-16-89; also Sophorn). Noeun, Sreysean, and Than all get 3 out of 3 on their homework sentences, despite grammatical errors such as: "I am skater with my sister;" "I'm reading a book call Peter Pan;" "The winner has win again" (5-2-89).

Such instances are consistent with L. McKinney's expressed approach to student writing. In correcting their written work, she says, she looks for complete sentences and for answering the question, but doesn't pay too much attention to spelling (1-31-89). For creative writing especially, she prefers not to grade at all since it's not done for grammar or spelling, but for the expression of ideas (2-7-89).

This emphasis on meaning over form is also reflected in her adaptation of tasks to the situation. In a lesson based on a reading about Native Americans, she adapts to the ambiguity in an exercise involving fill-in-the-blank sentences followed by a word search puzzle. As she notices that in more than one case the sentence can be meaningfully filled by more than one word, she tells the class she will accept their answer if it makes sense, even if it's not the one she was looking for; but that they should be aware that they may not find that word on the word search (2-7-89).

In M. López' classroom, the bilingual maintenance purpose is reflected in attention to the allocation of use of the two languages. In L. McKinney's classroom, the tolerant assimilation purpose is reflected in greater attention to the meanings expressed by the children than to the form in which they express them.

Text

As noted above, both teachers feel constrained to use basal reading series. Such texts can be used in narrow and limiting ways (cf. Dyson, 1988: 222). Yet these teachers not only use them in more open and challenging ways (see Interaction discussion below), but they also seek to expose their students to genres in addition to those in the basal readers and workbooks.

For example, M. López reads aloud a short biography of Luis Muñóz Marín to her class (from Kieszak, 1977), one of several short biographies she reads over the year (5-9-88). Her room, as well as the Potter Thomas School library, is stocked with books in both Spanish and English, for students to read and do book reports on.

While the variety in M. López' classroom derives primarily from exposure to both L_1 and L_2 texts, in L. McKinney's classroom it derives primarily from a wide exposure to both oral and written texts, and both receptive and productive interaction. She says, "reading is very important

to me, and I want the kids to feel that reading is enjoyable, not just a burden" (25A 10). There are a lot of books and magazines in this classroom, including a well-stocked and well-organized library, complete with card catalog, designated librarians, and borrowing rules. The library collection encompasses fantasy, adventure, biography, and social studies and science reference works.

Every day in the 25 minutes between recess and lunchtime, L. McKinney reads aloud to the class. During this time, she reads books of her own choice, that she liked as a child or that she has found to be good, such as The Lion, The Witch, and The Wardrobe, by C.S. Lewis (1-31-89 - 2-16-89). To a certain degree, she follows the sequence of genres indicated in the district curriculum guide, but her main goal is for the children to "like being read to" (25A 20-40). There are variations on the story time. Sometimes she will read a story brought in by a student (The Lost Prince: A Droid Adventure, 2-21-89). Toward the end of the year, she has the students themselves each choose, practice, and read a story to their classmates (5-2-89).

She gives the students an opportunity to gauge their own oral reading of a story in their reading group at least once during the year by taping and playing back their reading (3-28-89).

> "I explain in the beginning that this is...as a learning tool, that it's something that we're not making fun of each other. We all sound pretty bad when it comes down to it. ...But you want to really be able to say, 'What is it that I have done wrong?' And somebody else might be able to pick something up that you didn't, and, ... it's what we call constructive criticism" (25B 5ff).

Each year, basal readers are put aside for a couple of weeks and the children read book-length stories (2-16-89; 3-28-89; 5-2-89). L. McKinney tries to

> "bring out...what an author puts into writing a book... and that language is very important. Like in the Ghost of Windy Hill [by Clyde Robert Bulla], we point out all the dark language that's in the story, and events that are leading up to, foreshadowing (I'm a frustrated English major). Why is this person in the story? Why did this happen? And why didn't the author tell you this? ... So it's a great way to -like a short story is hard to get children to get into it as much..." (25A 135-150).

In writing, students explore a variety of genres, including autobiography (1-31-89), personal letters (2-7-89), poems (2-14-89), and fantasy stories (3-7-89). In providing for her students' exposure to a wide range of genres and to opportunities to listen, discuss, read aloud and silently, and write across those genres, she is cognizant of the fact that different students in her class are at different points along the continua of biliterate development. For example, she notes that Noeun's written work is much better than her oral reading or her speaking, which are barely intelligible. Noeun's writing sometimes takes her by surprise, she says, because it doesn't seem she could have understood so well (3-7-89).

In M. López' class, there is not such a variety of oral and written texts and receptive and productive interactions as in L. McKinney's class; the variety of genres lies instead along the L_1-L_2 continuum. It seems that, because of the inter-connectedness of the developmental continua of biliteracy, a particularly rich environment along one or two of the continua may make up for poverty with respect to another (Heath, 1986:144).

Interaction

In both classes, interaction with and around texts is characterized by opportunities for a range of participant structures (cf. Philips, 1983), the activation of prior knowledge (cf. Anderson, Spiro, and Anderson, 1978), and the development of strategies for signaling understanding of text, analyzing features of text, and reasoning about text (cf. Lytle, 1982).[10] All of these are good teaching practices. Yet, differences between the two classrooms in their interactions around text point to options that go beyond what is simply good teaching to what is good teaching for biliterate development.

Small group peer interaction occurs differently in the two classrooms. In M. López' classroom, there is a complex desk arrangement which yields approximately four group areas of seven to eight desks each (in either two rows or a three-sided rectangle), as well as some individually situated desks; and there are at least three different seating patterns for the children, one each for Spanish reading, English reading, and homeroom periods. Within these groups, when the students are not working with the teacher, there is a certain amount of peer interaction, which seems to be neither encouraged nor discouraged by the teacher. Both the students' initiation of peer interaction and the teacher's permission of it seem to me to be congruent with a culture which values social relationships and mutual support and cooperation.

This is somewhat different from the peer interaction in L. McKinney's class, which appears to be both planned and tightly controlled. The children are seated at nine worktable areas (created by pushing four desks together); and do a minimum of moving around. Rather, the teacher comes to them when she wants to work with, for example, a reading group made up of two or three adjacent worktables (2-14-89; 3-9-89). She encourages the children to interact with the others at their worktable, and distinguishes between "busy noise," which is directed noise, evidence that students are working, and "noisy noise," which is not (3-7-89). Yet she also specifies when such interaction should and should not occur. Thirty minutes into the children's writing of fantasies, she tells them, 'Let someone at your table read your story and see if they understand it' (3-7-89). On another occasion, she tells Yeap, Husim, and Vantha, 'Sometimes you girls help each other and that's OK sometimes, but sometimes you have to get it yourself' (2-7-89).