The two teachers differ as well in the degree to which they emphasize classroom-based or community-based prior knowledge. M. López does of course draw on concepts developed or topics discussed in previous lessons in the course of any particular lesson (e.g., Wyoming trip, 3-7-88; *país*, 3-17-88; *héroe*, 4-11-88); but far more characteristic are her frequent appeals to students' knowledge from outside the class or the school. For example, during Spanish reading: she draws the students out on whether they like and how they prepare *pulpo* 'octopus' (apparently a favorite Puerto Rican delicacy) in order to introduce the word *marino* 'marine' (3-7-88); in a discussion of President Reagan's overnight decision to send American soldiers to Honduras, she includes a student's volunteered news that his *tio* 'uncle' was called to go (3-17-88); and she clarifies the name of a stone, *yunque*, by identifying it as the same name as the mountain in Puerto Rico (3-12-88). During English reading, too, she draws on students' community-based knowledge: in order to define 'sift', she elaborates on 'Mom' making a cake and on preparing rice for cooking by sifting out the stones, etc.; to define 'ancestors', she provides a brief exposition of the source of the three ancestral heritages, European, Indian, and African, that make up Puerto Rico; and in discussing 'interview', she encourages a discussion of the interviews several of the students had had a few weeks earlier to go to Conwell Middle Magnet School next year (3-7-88).

An area of prior knowledge which in a sense represents a combination of classroom-based and community-based knowledge is the students' knowledge of the other language. M. López frequently draws on this. Direct translation is a convenient means of rapid identification: in reviewing English vocabulary, at the word 'ledge,' she asks, 'What's the Spanish for that?' and a student replies, *'lecho'* (3-7-88). Similarly, she assists the students to draw on school community language resources when their own knowledge falls short; indeed, she models this strategy for them. In compiling a list of the capitals, languages, and nationalities of the South American countries, she is uncertain of the name in Spanish for Bolivian and Paraguayan nationalities, and sends Aisha to ask Sra. Leal, one of the Spanish teachers, for these terms (3-7-88). A corollary to this explicit drawing on community language resources is the acceptance of both languages in the communication of information. When the Spanish reading class needs to refer to a map and the map happens to be in English, that is not seen as an obstacle to the communication of the necessary information; in this case, identification of the oceans, continents, and countries (3-7-88). The children bring with them not only knowledge of two languages, but also a wealth of knowledge from their experience at home and in the community. M. López takes advantage of her shared linguistic/cultural background to exploit that wealth.

In contrast, L. McKinney is not able to exploit a common reservoir of community-based knowledge, but compensates for that by emphasizing the students' classroom-based prior knowledge. She does of course draw on their experience outside the classroom and school (e.g. TV, 3-7-89, 3-9-89; drugstore and breakfast, 3-28-89). Far more characteristic, however, are her

frequent appeals, usually through display questions, to students' knowledge from previous lessons or shared class experiences. She may encourage students to connect across stories: a story about Pablo Picasso includes a picture of his painting, 'Harlequin' and she reminds the Full group of an earlier story they read about a harlequin (1-31-89; also "The Girl Who Found a Dragon", 2-7-89). She may seek connections across reading groups as well - after the Full group composes a new stanza for the poem, "Over in the Meadow," she jokes with the Rhymes group that this stanza is 'Almost as good as the one you did, Rhymes' (2-14-89).[11]

She draws on shared class experience in discussing vocabulary: for the word 'exhibit,' she refers to class trips to the Academy of Natural Science, the Zoo, and the Art Museum (2-9-89); for the words 'meadow' (2-14-89) and 'camper' (2-28-89), she ties discussion to their future camp trip; and for the word 'germ' she discusses the flu going around the class and school (2-21-89).

Perhaps most representative of her activation/reinforcement of students' classroom-based prior knowledge, are her "remember" statements: 'Remember I said English is hard because when you learn a rule, you have to learn five more that have broken it' (2-7-89); 'Remember I want you to get a little more independent. Read the directions yourselves' (2-7-89); 'Remember we talked about the main sentence in the paragraph in our workbooks? What sentence usually tells us what the main idea of the paragraph is?' (2-9-89); Indeed, L. McKinney insists that remembering is the sign of learning: 'You learn something, you remember it. If you learn something and forget it, you haven't really learned it' (3-9-89).

Finally the two teachers differ in their approach to the development of students' strategies for interacting with text. Both teachers encourage their students to signal understanding through such moves as defining word meanings (3-7-88), identifying the main idea in paragraphs, and following a story line as it unfolds (3-17-88). Both also encourage students to analyze features of the texts they read, ranging from minimal units such as letters (3-17-88, 2-7-89, 2-16-89), sounds (3-7-88, 3-28-89), morphemes (3-7-88, 4-25-88), or words (3-7-88), to sentence level features such as punctuation and complete thoughts (3-7-88, 3-17-88, 4-11-88) to discourse level features such as title information, the structure of paragraphs, main characters, author's purpose (5-2-89), and genre (3-7-88, 3-17-88, 1-31-89, 2-7-89, 2-14-89, 3-7-89). The students are also encouraged to reason about the texts they read by exploring alternative interpretations and expressions in text and by inferring, guessing, and predicting from text. The teachers seek to develop these strategies by pointing out features or giving definitions and rules, or asking the students to do so. Yet there is a difference in the way the two teachers do this. Whereas M. López' approach is characterized by helping her students 'connect and transfer' across languages, L. McKinney's is characterized by her insistence on precision at all times.

When I asked M. López about her approach to teaching reading and writing, she said, 'I don't know any name for it [my approach], but I think of it as just adding to the pile. I try to get

the kids to connect and transfer. I've noticed, I guess, language is language; the skills are almost the same; for example, prefixes, outlines' (3-17-88). Here, 'adding to the pile' refers to drawing on and building prior knowledge, while 'connect and transfer' refers to helping students make explicit connections across their two languages.

Thus, she encourages her students to signal understanding through translation. We have already seen above how students sometimes define words through translation into the other language (e.g. ledge - *lecho*). On another occasion, as she reviews students' comprehension of the day's story about aviator Richard Byrd, she asks in Spanish, '*Qué es la marina?*', 'What is the marines?', and a student answers by translating into English, "the marines" (4-11-88).

She also encourages students to analyze features across languages. As Sueane unsuccessfully looks up *disolvieron* 'they dissolved [it]' in the dictionary, M. López elicits from Damary that Sueane needs to take off the suffix to get the root word, *disolver* which she can look up. She then turns to Sueane to make an explicit connection between analyzing *sufijos* in Spanish and suffixes in English: 'You're in Book G, aren't you? Have you studied suffixes? yes? It's the same thing. *Es la misma cosa*' (3-7-88).

Finally, she encourages students to reason across languages. For example, she explains the difference between fact ('I can see it, hear it, feel it, touch it') and opinion ('any time you say, 'I think"), has students judge whether particular sentences express fact or opinion, and assigns this kind of task for both Spanish and English (3-7-88; 3-17-88).

L. McKinney encourages students to signal understanding, analyze features of text, and reason about text in very similar ways to M. López (2-7-89; 2-14-89; 3-28-89). But whereas M. López emphasizes the connections between the children's two languages, L. McKinney emphasizes precision in one. As children signal understanding by giving definitions or answering comprehension questions, their answers must be precise. For example, L. McKinney does not accept Sophorn's 'to sweep' as a definition of 'broom' because 'it tells me what you can do with it, but it doesn't tell me what it is;' nor Than's 'a screw' as a definition of 'tool' because 'it is a type of tool, but not a definition' (1-31-89). The following interchange exemplifies both the type of question and the type of response expected as she guides students toward being able to signal understanding of a story as it unfolds:

LM - 'In chapter 6, Mr. Arden gets very angry with Bob. Why?'
Sophorn - 'He goes into Mr. Arden's library.'
LM - 'Why did Bob go in?'
Sreysean - 'He wanted to read a book.'
LM - 'No.'
Noeun - 'He wanted to find out what was in back.'
LM - 'No.'
Sophorn - 'The door was open.'
LM - 'Yes.'

The same precision is required in analyzing features of text. "Spoon" is not acceptable as a word with the same sound pattern as "room" (1-31-89); 'apostrophe s' is not acceptable as the mark of contractions and possessives since 'there's not always an s' (2-9-89); and Than's definition of a homonym as 'same word, different meaning,' clarified as 'same spelling, different meaning,' is not acceptable since, 'the important thing is 'sound the same,' even though they're spelt differently in most cases' (3-7-89). Complete sentences are often required in oral answers ('Who was the man that was responsible? Try to answer me with a good sentence' 2-9-89), and always in students' written work (check on homework, 2-16-89; underlining on rough draft, 3-9-89).

Finally, she requires precision as students reason about text. She guides them toward precision in their reasoning about alternative word meanings: not only a book, but also a person can be 'firm' (2-21-89); the suffix '-er' can be used to compare things (e.g. 'bigger') as well as to mean 'one who does' (2-28-89; 5-2-89); 'center' means not only 'the middle,' but also 'building,' as in 'health center' (2-28-89; also 3-9-89); and you cannot always tell the meaning of compound words by taking them apart, for example, though 'a blueberry is a berry that is blue, a strawberry is not a berry that is straw' (3-28-89).

As students choose, in succession, all five sentences of the following paragraph as the main idea, she guides them toward the 'correct' response (sentence #2), but at the same time, does not deny the "main ideaness" of their responses, since in this case all the sentences seem to carry only part of the main idea (2-16-89):

> Most zoos keep the animals in special pens, or fenced-in areas. But there is another kind of zoo. This kind of zoo lets the animals go free and puts the people in cages! These zoos put all the animals in a big park. The visitors can see the animals from their car or from a bus or train.

As she guides students to infer, guess, or predict from text, the goal of precision remains whether they are inferring at the level of grammar, vocabulary, or discourse:

> 'Look at these words [it's, its]. One's a contraction, one's a possessive. Remember I told you there are some possessives that don't use an apostrophe - pronouns; so which one of these is the contraction? You should know the answer from what I just said' (2-7-89).

> 'I'm not going to tell you what 'flummoxed' means, you'll have to figure it out from the story.' After reading the story, "The Woman Who Flummoxed the Fairies," to the class, she guides students through some of the things that the woman did, to elicit the meaning 'tricked' for 'flummoxed' (3-7-89).

> LM - 'Why does Bob say, 'Oh, he's rich, he won't break the law'? Can't rich people break the law?'
> Tyjae - 'Rich people can do anything they want to 'cause they have the money.'
> LM - 'Sometimes it can seem that way....Does Bob want the job? Why? [she elicits the idea that he wants to keep the job because he's making good money, and

> therefore doesn't want to admit that there might be something wrong.] So in a way, Bob is trying to make himself feel good' (5-2-89; also dragon, 2-7-89; elephant, 2-14-89).

Good Teaching for Biliteracy

The two elementary teachers reported on here adapt their teaching for their students' biliterate development, and, specifically for the particular biliterate contexts and media of their program, school, community, and school district. Both teachers have found ways to create successful learning contexts for biliteracy for the students in their classroom; but these contexts are both similar and different.

Both teachers build motivation in their students by creating a classroom community in which membership is made desirable through affective/experiential bonds and simultaneously is dependent on the successful execution of literacy tasks. While M. López builds those bonds upon a shared linguistic and cultural background with her students, L. McKinney builds them by creating classroom-based shared experience. Both teachers take an interest in and hold accountable each individual in the classroom community. For M. López, this requires accomodation to a high classroom population turnover while for L. McKinney it requires accommodation to a complex multi-layered pull-out structure.

Both teachers build meaningful purpose in their students by keeping them focused on literacy tasks that are clearly defined and suited to the immediate situation. At the same time these tasks embody a broad social purpose which is congruent with the program and community context. M. López, the Potter Thomas two-way maintenance program, and the Puerto Rican community share a broad bilingual/bicultural maintenance purpose, reflected in attention to the allocation of use of the two languages in literacy tasks. On the other hand, L. McKinney, the Lea School ESOL pull-out program, and the Cambodian community share a broadly tolerant assimilationist purpose, reflected in more attention to meaning than form in literacy tasks.

Both teachers build their students' exposure to a variety of texts. The strength of M. López' approach is the inclusion of both L_1 and L_2 texts; the strength of L. McKinney's is the inclusion of a wide opportunity for oral and written, receptive and productive interaction with a wide range of genres.

Both teachers build students' interaction with text by taking advantage of a variety of participant structures, drawing on students' prior knowledge, and developing students' strategies for signaling understanding of text, analyzing features of text, and reasoning about text. M. López allows small group peer interaction to occur spontaneously and asystematically as a natural outgrowth of shared cultural values, emphasizes her students' community-based prior knowledge, and seeks to help her students to 'connect and transfer' strategies across languages. L. McKinney

structures small group peer interaction more carefully, emphasizes her students' classroom-based prior knowledge, and builds her students' strategy use by insistence on precision at all times.

Foster has recently noted that "we have little empirical evidence that documents what takes place when teachers and students share a common cultural background which positively affects classroom interaction" (1989:2). At the same time, Nichols has suggested that while it is undoubtedly true that "teachers teach from within their own cultural traditions," it is also possible for teachers to adopt a "'double perspective' [Bleich, 1988]... which requires [them] to understand both the limitations of their own cultural perspectives and to appreciate separate ways of understanding and shaping the world" (1989:232).

M. López' teaching provides evidence of the positive effects that a shared linguistic and cultural background can bring to the teaching of biliteracy. On the other hand, L. McKinney's teaching seems to exemplify a double perspective that allows space for Cambodian children to draw on their own linguistic and cultural backgrounds within a learning context that is situated squarely in a second language and culture.

Both teachers have found ways to build their students' biliterate development. The differences between the two teachers' approaches point primarily to the degree to which community-based knowledge and experience, the development of students' first language literacy, and goals for bilingual/bicultural maintenance are incorporated in the students' learning. These are not negligible differences. Nevertheless, it seems to me that in the highly complex, increasingly multicultural environments in which our schools are situated, we will need to allow for the greatest possible range of approaches for teaching for biliteracy, among them both of these two.

---

[1] I want to thank M. López and L. McKinney, the two teachers who not only permitted but welcomed me into their classrooms and shared with me both the successes and the difficulties of their teaching. I am also grateful for a National Academy of Education Spencer Fellowship which enabled me to devote full time to this research during 1989; and for support from the Literacy Research Center, the Research Fund, and the Dean's Fellowships of the Graduate School of Education, University of Pennsylvania, all of which provided support for graduate students to work with me on the project.

[2] Data for the paper come from a long-term comparative ethnographic study on school-community literacy in two languages, beginning in February 1987. The classrooms described were the focus of intensive observation by the author during spring 1988 and spring 1989. Criteria for determining the success of the learning contexts in these two classrooms include my own observation over time of the students' oral and written performance in literacy tasks, the students' progress in reading level through the school year, and schoolwide (and in one case, district-wide) recognition of the teachers' excellence. Attention here is explicitly on the teachers, although evidence of the efficacy of their approaches is in the children's responses; and on their teaching of reading, writing, spelling, and language arts, though many of the characteristics of this teaching are observable in their teaching of math, science, and social studies content areas as well.

[3] Such a model would include the categories and sources of the knowledge base of teaching and the complexities of the pedagogical process. Among the categories of the teacher's knowledge base, Shulman includes: content knowledge; general pedagogical knowledge; curriculum knowledge; pedagogical content knowledge; knowledge of learners and their characteristics; knowledge of educational contexts; and knowledge of educational ends, purposes, and values and their philosophical and historical grounds (pg. 8). The sources of the knowledge base include: scholarship in the content disciplines; educational materials and structures; formal educational scholarship; and the wisdom of practice (pp. 8-12). Among the complex processes of pedagogical reasoning and action, he includes: comprehension, transformation (preparation, representation, selection, and adaptation and tailoring to student characteristics), instruction, evaluation, reflection, and new comprehensions (pp. 14-19).

[4] Ogbu argues that the variability among minority groups in school performance and the persistence of problems created by cultural differences for some minority groups (the involuntary minorities) can be explained by their differing relationships with the larger society, a difference which he summarizes as primary vs. secondary cultural discontinuity. Immigrant minorities are "people who have moved more or less voluntarily to the United States because they believe that this would lead to greater economic well-being, better overall opportunities, and/or greater political freedom." Involuntary minorities are "people who were originally brought into United States society involuntarily through slavery, conquest, or colonization" (p. 321).

Immigrant minorities are characterized by primary cultural differences (i.e., differences in cultural content, which predate emigration), a social/collective identity which retains a sense of peoplehood from before emigration, the acceptance of the dominant group's 'folk theory of making it,' and a willingness to accomodate to discrimination because of an underlying trust in the larger society. On the other hand, involuntary minorities are characterized by secondary cultural differences (i.e. differences in cultural style, which have arisen in response to the contact situation), a social/collective identity which is oppositional to the dominant group's, a rejection of the dominant group's 'folk theory of making it,' and a deep distrust of the larger society due to past and present experience of discrimination (pp. 321-326). Immigrant minorities tend to see their cultural differences as barriers to be overcome, while involuntary minorities perceive them as markers of identity to be maintained (pp. 327, 330).

[5] Citations of the form (14A 17) refer to a taped interview, and indicate the tape number, side, and location on the side.

[6] Chapter 1 refers to Chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981, revised from Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; and specifically to the Chapter 1 Local Educational Agency Grant program that provides financial assistance for supplemental, remedial instruction for educationally-deprived students in school districts with high concentrations of low income students. TELLS (Testing Essential Literacy and Learning Skills) is the state-wide testing program initiated in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in the 1980s. Both of these programs provide for supplementary instruction for children whose test scores fall below a certain level.

[7] Here, and throughout, dates in parentheses refer to field notes from those dates.

[8] In this and all cases of quotations from the teachers and the students, direct verbatim quotes taken from tape-recordings are enclosed in double quotation marks (" "); while paraphrased quotes taken

from my field notes are enclosed in single quotation marks (' '). All quotes in Spanish are immediately followed by the English gloss, also enclosed in single quotation marks.

[9] The questions used in one of the games on 3-7-89 were: a) Tell me the number of continents. b) Apostrophes are used in two kinds of words: name at least one. c) Words that mean the same thing are called what? d) What is 8 x 6? e) Homonyms are words that do what? f) What is the name for the two continents that are sometimes named as one? g) William Penn named the streets of Philadelphia after what two things? h) What is 42 divided by 6 times 3 plus 2? i) What is an equivalent fraction?

[10] In reporting on the strategies I saw these teachers seeking to develop with their students, I have grouped them according to three of Lytle's (1982) six major types of moves. Two clarifications about my use of Lytle's framework are in order.

First, whereas Lytle is describing moves that readers make in response to text (as discovered through the use of a protocol), I am describing the kinds of moves teachers are seeking to activate in their students. It is for this reason that I apply the term strategy where Lytle used move. In her system of analysis, a strategy is a sequence of moves guided by a specific purpose; that is precisely what these teachers seek to develop in their students.

Second, I have focused my discussion on only three of the six categories: signaling understanding, analyzing features, and reasoning; but not monitoring doubts, elaborating the text, or judging the text. This is not because the latter were totally absent: indeed, for example, Jimmy (Truong Truyen) judged the map in his social studies text (entitled "Cities, States, and Capitals" without designating United States) to be a "bad map" because it doesn't 'tell you what it is' as L. McKinney said all good maps do. Rather, I have focused on the former three categories because they seemed to receive the most attention from the teachers.

[11] The Full group is reading Full Circle and the Rhymes group Rhymes and Reasons, levels 3.2 and 4.1, respectively, of the MacMillan series.

References

Anderson, R. C. , R. J. Spiro, & M. C. Anderson (1978). Schemata as scaffolding for the representation of information in connected discourse. American Educational Research Journal 15 (3), 433-440.

Dyson, A. H. (1988). Unintentional helping in the primary grades: Writing in the children's world. In B. Rafoth & D. Rubin (Eds.), The Social Construction of Written Communication. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex.

Foster, M. (1989). 'It's cookin' now': A performance analysis of the speech events of a Black teacher in an urban community college. Language in Society 18, 1-29.

Hardman, J. (1989). Learning and coping in the shadow of ESOL. Unpublished manuscript, University of Pennsylvania.

Heath, S. B. (1986). Sociocultural contexts of language development. In Beyond Language: Social and Cultural Factors in Schooling Language Minority Students. Los Angeles: Evaluation, Dissemination, and Assessment Center, California State University.

Hornberger, N. H. (1989a). Continua of biliteracy. Review of Educational Research 59 (3).

Hornberger, N. H. (1989b). Teaching for biliteracy: What do TESOL and Reading tell us about it? Manuscript submitted for publication.

Hornberger, N. H. (1990). Extending enrichment bilingual education: Revisiting typologies and redirecting policy. To appear in O. García (Ed.), Festschrift for Joshua A. Fishman, Volume 1: Focus on Bilingual Education. John Benjamins Publishers.

Kieszak, K. (1977). Puntos Críticos: Una Colección de Biografías Cortas. Globe Books.

Kravitz, A. & D. Dramer (1978). Increasing Comprehension. Modern Curriculum Press. (Skill Booster Series).

Lytle, S. L. (1982). Exploring Comprehension Style: A Study of Twelfth Grade Readers' Transactions with Text. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

Mezzacappa, D. (1989, October 9). Fallout clouds school board appointments. The Philadelphia Inquirer, B1-2.

Micheau, C. L. (to appear). Efforts at Ethnic Maintenance in Three Generations of the Puerto Rican Community in Philadelphia. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

Nichols, P. (1989). Storytelling in Carolina: Continuities and contrasts. Anthropology and Education Quarterly 20 (3), 232-245.

Ogbu, J. U. (1987). Variability in minority school performance: A problem in search of an explanation. Anthropology and Education Quarterly 18 (4), 312-334.

Philips, S. U. (1983). The Invisible Culture: Communication in Classroom and Community on the Warm Springs Indian Reservation. New York: Longman.

School District of Philadelphia. 1987-88. Superintendent's Management Information Center. Philadelphia, PA: Philadelphia School District Office of Research and Evaluation. Report No. 8818.

Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. Harvard Educational Review 57 (1), 1-22.

Slavin, R. E. (1987). Ability grouping and student achievement in elementary schools: A best-evidence synthesis. Review of Educational Research 57 (3), 293-336.