1974

The Linguistic, Cultural, and Developmental Considerations Inheritent in the Design and Implementation of an ESL Program for Navajo Children at Borrego Pass School

Charles E. Hancock
School for International Training

The Linguistic, Cultural, and Developmental Considerations Inherent in the Design and Implementation of an ESL Program for Navajo Children at Borrego Pass School

Charles E. Hancock

PART IV

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Arts in Teaching Degree at the School for International Training, Brattleboro, Vermont.

July, 1974

This project by Charles E. Hancock is accepted in its present form.

Date July 18, 1974 Principal Advisor Janet Bing

Project Advisors/Readers:

Mary Helen Creamer
Donald Creamer

Acknowledgements:

I am indebted to Don and Mary Helen Creamer for their advice and criticism in the design of the ESL program at Borrego Pass and in reading this paper.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract: This paper examines the considerations — linguistic, cultural, and developmental — which should be considered in the design and implementation of an ESL program appropriate to the setting of a bilingual-bicultural education program and to the needs of Navajo children. The process of language development in both first and second language learning is related to the design of learning activities and sequencing of language objectives. Observations of learning styles and language usage as provided by the culture, the individual, and by his peers as they relate to the development of a bilingual Navajo child are examined. The paper discusses the roles and uses of Standard English and a Borrego Pass English dialect in the classroom and in the community. The aforementioned considerations are incorporated into the design of an ESL program for this school.

INTRODUCTION

I taught at Borrego Pass School for three months last year (January, February, March of 1973) as a student-teacher, and this year (1973-1974) as the ESL teacher for third, fourth, and fifth grades. The CORE English program, published by Ginn and Company, had been specified as the official text for the Borrego Pass ESL program. I had followed the sequencing and activities suggested in CORE quite closely last year, and noticed that the activities presented for learning new structures did not seem appropriate for this setting or simply were not interesting enough for the students here. At the beginning of this year, I used some CORE activities and some of my own, but continued to follow CORE sequencing. Problems with the sequencing and those CORE activities that I used led me, after two months, to use CORE only as a reference for English structural objectives. For the remainder of the school year I sequenced language materials and developed activities to present them based on my own and others' observations of the children's needs, likes, and dislikes.

This paper represents a systematization of the assumptions inherent in the process of designing an English language program appropriate for this setting and these Navajo children. Part I describes the community, school setting, ESL program, and the problems encountered with CORE. In Part II, my own observations (and those of others available in the literature) of developmental, linguistic, and cultural factors that apply to second language

learning in this setting are discussed. Part III describes how these factors have been and will be incorporated into the design of an English language program. Specific activities from last year and those that I intend to use next year are presented.

Those observations on learning style, dialect (linguistic and sociolinguistic), language development, and community attitudes towards English usage that are presented in this paper are my own, except where otherwise noted. These observations are based on my own experience — in and out of school — with Borrego Pass children; my experience in other settings with other Navajo children (I taught in Rough Rock Demonstration School's summer program for two months during the summer of 1971) has been influential but secondary in this paper. These observations should <u>not</u> be seen or accepted as generalizations that apply to all Navajos, their children, or the schools that they attend.

PART I

THE SETTING

The Community

Borrego Pass School is located in a small community consisting of a trading post, several family homes, and the school compound itself. Its students are from the surrounding area which is inhabited entirely by Navajos. These Navajo families live in widely scattered settlements sometimes consisting of several relatives' houses placed within a mile of each other, with several miles usually separating settlements. The school and the surrounding community are ten miles from the nearest paved road and are linked by a network of dirt roads, most of which are rough and frequently impassable during inclement weather. The town of Crownpoint, site of a Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) administrative center, is about twelve miles from the school. The town has several small stores, gas stations, and three schools.

Navajo is the dominant, and in many cases the only, language spoken in most of the homes in the community. For most of the children coming to Borrego Pass School, Navajo is the first language. Navajo is the language of communications among most family members, in meetings with other community residents, and at the Borrego Pass Trading Post, where many of the people do most of their shopping. Thus, a knowledge of Navajo will satisfy the communicational requirements in most situations in this community.

To function as a resident of this community, English competence is required for trips to Crownpoint, or to Gallup or Grants, two

larger towns about 60 miles away. English is also the sole language of instruction in the Crownpoint schools which many of the children attend (and which nearly all will ultimately attend). A few families in the community use English exclusively and some use both English and Navajo. I have observed that some of the parents speak English exclusively with their children in the belief that this will help them in school. As a result, though older children speak Navajo wherever possible, they will have at least a working knowledge of English. In most families, though, they don't speak English very often to younger brothers and sisters, so that English exposure for younger children is limited to trips to town, conversations with parents (in those families with bilingual parents), or work in school.

The Bilingual-Bicultural Program in the School

The Borrego Pass School program is "bilingual" and "bicultural." In the academic year 1973-1974, the school had about one hundred Navajo children and went from kindergarten through fifth grade. Navajo is the language of instruction in kindergarten, first and second grade. The children learn to read and write in Navajo and are taught by Navajo teachers. Activities which develop aspects of Navajo culture through Navajo folk tales, songs, cooking and weaving, along with math and science activities, are carried out by the teachers and Navajo parent-aides from the community.

English is the language of instruction in third, fourth and fifth grades. Third grade is a year of transition from Navajo to English.

It is taught by a white (or "Anglo", as they say in the Southwest) non-Navajo-speaking teacher. A bilingual Navajo aide provides translation into Navajo when it is needed. English is the dominant language in Fourth and Fifth Grades, although there is translation into Navajo when it is appropriate and both teachers are bilingual Navajos. Interest centers offer activities in the major subject areas and are organized by the two bilingual Navajo teachers and two Navajo aides. Of the fifty children in the third, fourth and fifth grades, one is monolingual in English and five are bilingual. Navajo is the dominant language for the rest of the children and they have varying degrees of competence and confidence in English.

The CORE Language Program at Borrego Pass

The CORE English program, published by Ginn and Company, was to be the formal text for the ESL program at Borrego Pass for 1973-74, after some sporadic use in the classrooms the year before. I was the ESL teacher for the third through fifth grades. (For a description of the ESL program in the kindergarten through second grades, and a history of the school, see Anne Bermant's IPP). The CORE series is apparently designed to be used with Spanish-speaking children in an urban environment, based on the nature of the structural and sound production problems that are anticipated in the text and on the sequencing of the materials. There are four books in the series and it is designed to be a complete ESL program for primary and elementary-age children. The English language in the books is carefully controlled and sequenced so that both the children and the teacher know what is

expected of them. In each ESL session, one new item is presented and practiced in several contexts by all of the children. The teacher is instructed to move on to the next objective after a majority of the children have correctly performed the objective. The children are held responsible for those objectives they have specifically learned: only the cumulative vocabulary and structures presented in previous lessons.

Problems Encountered with the CORE Program

The most immediate problem with using the CORE program at Borrego Pass was that the CORE activities didn't arouse sufficient interest. The children would become bored fairly quickly and become restless or move away before their turn to produce an objective so that they frequently wouldn't hear or practice a difficult objective.

Some children were uncomfortable with the CORE requirements for language production. Often, those who did feel comfortable producing an objective would become the only participants, while the others would drop out of the activity or go "passive" and refuse to participate. Also, the stress on immediate production in the lessons seemed to encourage short-term memorization where a new objective was not incorporated into the child's language knowledge and could not be remembered later. Also, the production requirements seemed to sometimes run counter to the children's language development process. An apparently difficult item would be drilled and drilled without success in a variety of contexts. I would then give up and hear it a few weeks or months later in the children's free conversation.

It became increasingly apparent to me as the year went on that different children had different learning styles. Some seemed to thrive in the formal ESL sessions while others would avoid me entirely and still develop their English at a pace sometimes surpassing the ESL session regulars. These children could work on their own and devise their own English language activities. Two of them, Earl and Mike, engaged in elaborate dramatic intrigues in English while the other children were away at recess or lunch. Both avoided ESL sessions and this was their only English practice in school. Yet, by the end of the year, their English competence was among the highest in the school.

The sequencing of materials in CORE frequently didn't seem appropriate for these children. Some materials when introduced would be produced without effort, while the next ones in the lessons would apparently be very difficult and, once practiced in formal sessions, would never again be used in free conversation. This could be due to the fact that the materials were sequenced on an analysis of the differences between Spanish and English, which are fairly closely related languages. Navajo has little in common with either.

My goal for the ESL program was to develop the children's competence — grammatical and social — in English; to help them increase their comprehension and production so that they could understand and use English to suit a wide range of communicational needs and be able to later function effectively in English language situations. I wanted to do this in a program in which attendance at and participation in the ESL sessions would be voluntary with competence developed

in activities involving free conversation. My ultimate goal for the children was that they have sufficient competence and confidence in English to operate in either a Navajo or an Anglo setting, so that a lack of English would not restrict their choices of life style. This would require the children to make and analyze their own observations about Navajo and Anglo culture and language.

This requirement is not developed in the CORE English series in its carefully defined sequencing and in its order, amount, and timing of input and production. The expectations for production and the resulting implications for learning styles didn't foster the kind of independent, individual observation and analysis that a bilingual, bicultural individual needs. It doesn't make sense to overly criticize CORE since it wasn't designed for this situation. Any text or set of language materials has to be adapted to a particular situation. As the year went on I strayed further and further from CORE's prescriptions, trying out new materials, presentations, sequencing, and groupings of children. The program's development became a process of exploring the assumptions and factors inherent in the first and second language learning situation -- both at Borrego Pass and elsewhere.

PART II

LEARNING A SECOND LANGUAGE: THE DEVELOPMENTAL, CULTURAL, AND LINGUISTIC FACTORS

The Learning Process

I have come to favor the generative-transformational view of language development. The components of this theory most relevant to developing a language program deal with the individual's "innate language learning capacity" which develops as one of his normal cognitive capacities.

According to this theoretical point of view: (1) Children are not taught how to learn: they make their own observations about language and this information is processed according to the child's own language capacities; (2) These observations are systematized in some way to form basic rules for the language being learned; (3) Novel utterances are then generated from these rules. The theory holds that the child is not just a passive receptor of language; he actively organizes and analyzes language information. His utterances are not imitations; they are based on cumulative language knowledge. Thus, in the process of speech production, the communicational needs of a situation are assessed, appropriate language knowledge is applied, and a response is generated. This process is a creative one and the resulting generations may be forms the child has never heard or used previously.[1]

How This Process Operates in Second Language Learning

There has been much less research done on the process of second

---

[1]The transformational theory of language learning is a result of pioneering work by Chomsky. The debt to him for the creation of this model is hereby acknowledged.

language learning than on first language learning. It is possible that a child's initial contacts with a second language are handled by the language processing equipment already in place — i.e. the child actively organizes, makes generalizations and simplifies. If so, like the first language, the child's imitations are not exact duplications or even random reductions of input, but reflect knowledge similar to that revealed in his other uses of language. As one writer puts it, "any learning model which predicts language learning on the basis of input, without regard to the selective processing by the learner, will not work except for trivial problems. And yet most of our rationales for procedures in second language instruction have been based on assumptions that organization of input, plus practice, will have predictable results." (Erwin-Tripp, 1970, p. 314). The CORE series seems to be based on such assumptions. It imposes on the learner a more passive role in language learning than he is perhaps used to. Confusion, boredom, or rebellion could ensue if the new learning model in CORE conflicts with the pre-existing one already in place.[2]

The child's language knowledge is systematized as he actively makes rules. The influential strength of these rules can explain the persistence of "incorrect" forms. As noted frequently in the literature, children tend to overgeneralize a new form at first. (See Cazden 1972, p. 110) Children will use forms of words that they haven't heard,

---

[2]I suspect that the design of this model reflects mostly the desire of the CORE authors and later the teachers to be able to show and predict regular progress in the students' language development.

apparently based on an internalized assumption or rule and persist in using "their" form even when corrected repeatedly. In second language learning, these forms are based on the child's observations of the second language. Cazden (1972, p. 110) notes that a teacher or adult can increase the frequency of certain constructions and they will be reflected in a child's vocabulary even if he is not ready, although they may be used only in "safe" contexts in rigid or uncertain form, suggesting lack of comprehension.

This explanation could account for the successful production of problem forms in formal ESL sessions coupled with a lack of comprehension of the form shown in different contexts. Such rule-governed errors can and do disappear from a child's speech after a period of time, no matter how well-practiced they may be and regardless of whether they are still modelled. An example from Borrego Pass children is the extension of the NP + Be (aux) + VP +-ing form to the simple past. The present progressive tense ("I'm going") had become the one most widely used and most easily learned here. The past progressive ("I was going") was a short, quick, logical next step for most of the children, as was the "going to" future ("I'm going to go"). However, in situations where the simple past, regular ("I walked") or irregular ("I went"), was appropriate, the children would persistently say "I'm walk" or "I'm go". This form would seem to be based on the NP + Be (aux) + VP + -ing form which had as a constant the use of be as an auxiliary with the -ing denoting continuing action. Consistent with this form, the children probably

figured, having noted the sense of completed action in the simple past and having heard verb stems lacking -ing in simple past situations, that the simple past would be formed by using the NP plus the "be" auxiliary plus the stem of the verb, with the -ing being deleted to indicate the completion of the action. Their fondness for the "be" auxiliary persisted through repeated ESL sessions which provided extensive modeling and practice of the simple past. After a while, the children would drop the "be" auxiliary, and occasionally use the -ed or irregular verb form in such sessions. However, the "be" auxiliary persisted in their free conversation and I finally despaired of eradicating it. Over time though, the "I'm go" form became modified in free conversation to "I go" or "I walk" (no -ed or irregular forms at first) and, by the end of the year, many of the fourth and fifth graders were using the -ed or irregular past forms when appropriate. The fond "be" auxiliary had been limited to and enshrined in the present and past progressive and "going to" future tenses. However, even some of the most fluent third graders persisted in using the "I'm go" forms, suggesting that some sort of maturation process might be involved or that the "I'm go" form was too frequently heard among peers' speech in the third grade room to be cast aside without further consideration.[3] My difficulties in eliciting the -ed or irregular past forms were in large part due to the fact that I was insisting on the "correct" form which, for the children, in

---

[3]It is difficult to "teach" "correct" forms of English when the teacher is one of very few native English speaking models and the student body forms a natural reference group.

Cazden's words, was only superficially correct. Until the simple past rules were internalized, I was interfering with the development of their language process by insisting on the "correct" form.

What is Attended to in a Language Learning Situation

The observation has often been made that children can learn to use a second language quickly and accurately enough to suit their communicational needs outside the classroom. Susan Ervin-Tripp (1970, p. 339) states that in second language learning

> "as long as the learner orients to speech, interprets it, and learns the form or arrangement that represents the meaning, he learns language as fast as someone speaking. Children have normal language development who cannot or do not speak. The only case where motor practice might have any merits is in articulation of new sounds or in writing letters in a new alphabet."

It is evident to me that in second language learning passive observation precedes production, that production is not necessary for comprehension, and that language development proceeds according to a learner's own ability to process language. What else is provided in the natural second language learning situation and not in the classroom which is critical to the operation of language development?

> ". . .it would appear to be impossible to learn to recognize what contrasts of sound or structure are important, or to learn to interpret either lexicon or structure, unless one knows what is meant." (Ibid., p. 339)

Given meaningful language input, the learner formulates rules and generates language without an explicit, formal learning model.

> Children "normally learn language if they hear simple repetitive speech. . .and after a few months this speech usually refers to meanings that are obvious from context. The first syntactic structures children interpret and produce are thus focused on basic semantic relations. These are picked out very early from the complex input."
> (Ibid, p. 339)

It would appear that meaning plays a crucial role in communication, serving as the child's measure of the grammatical appropriateness of lexical and syntactic structures. Meaning acts as a measure and model in natural communication situations. In the school, however, language is often restricted, (particularly when we try to "teach" it) and the teacher's judgment of what is correct or incorrect frequently acts as a measure of appropriateness. Children's speech is usually corrected on the basis of grammaticality, not meaning.

The Role of Imitation in Language Learning

Imitation is often the process substituted in school (and in CORE) for meaning as a measure of grammatical progress. Cazden (1972, p. 125-126) examines those devices, expansion and extension, which are often used by teachers and adults to model correct speech. Expansion is an attempt by the adult to express the meaning of the child (as the adult understands it) in syntactically complete form. Extension presupposes a particular expansion but then builds out from it along some dimension of meaning. A child might say, "Dog bark." An expansion would be "Yes, the dog is barking." An extension would be "Yes, but he won't bite" or "I guess he's mad at the kitty."

In an experiment with three groups of black pre-school children

learning their first language, the speech of one group was regularly expanded, one group's was extended, and one group was left alone. The results were that there was no evidence that expansions in the experiment situation aided the acquisition of grammar. Semantic extension proved to be slightly more helpful. Cazden concludes:

> "The richness of verbal stimulation may be a critical factor. Focusing on a grammatical structure tends to limit the ideas to the presumed meaning of the child and tends to limit the grammatical elements to those used by the child. Focusing on the idea extends that idea beyond the presumed meaning of the child and introduces more varied grammatical elements to express those related meanings." (p. 126)

Another implication of the study is that the innate language learning process resists outside attempts to re-structure learning. These attempts are ignored perhaps as irrelevant or never processed because of boredom.

I am not sure how similar this model of first language learning style is to the second language one, or how susceptible to change the second one is if it is based on the model for the first. In a second language learning situation, if there is limited, precisely timed, language input and correct output is stressed, one feature at a time, without interest or meaning in communication serving as a measure, other learning models such as "memorization" are encouraged. Memorization will here be defined as the processing of a language input in which it is not integrated into the individual's language knowledge or analyzed in relation to generative rules. This memorization model is commonly based on the strict reproduction of surface structure and remains as a rigid part of an individual's

language repertoire, usually for a short term. I don't know if this model can be made to supersede the generational model,[4] but it can come to serve as a language learning model in certain contexts for children (appropriate just, say, for school). Language learned this way can be retained over a long term in some cases, and it can extend to whole structures, or dialogues (as in some texts). It can also be appropriate for some types of language requirements (greetings, elementary questions).

This memorization model does have some merits. It meets the communication needs for certain situations. It is reassuring in its rigidity — if you memorize the correct form and intonation — you will always be right. This makes it good for situations where you know beforehand what is expected of you and can memorize the appropriate language; it offers a lot of security in such situations. Much of my own second language learning was done this way. Yet, I felt I began to lose the capacity to make my own second language observations (I wanted a text) and make trials of new structures (I was afraid of being wrong). I also began to lose flexibility in comprehension and adapting what I knew to different situations.

The disadvantages of the memorization model seem to outweigh the advantages. It frequently works against the language learning system already in place in a child in second language learning — to

---

[4] I would tend to regard it as the first step of the generational language learning process with the surface structure never analyzed or incorporated so that it could be generated as opposed to a complete, separate process.

his confusion — and can be denigrating to him. Unless this memorization model is consistent with the child's pre-existing language learning system or is enthusiastically received by him as appropriate to his needs, the child loses his initiative; his search for meaning is de-stressed at the expense of both his interest and possibly his view of the second language as a viable means of communication. The child also loses his language flexibility; if all his learning is based on memorization of explicit expressions, his speech becomes stiff and formalized, may not extend to situations outside the school, or may soon be forgotten entirely. Most importantly, the child cannot function effectively in a wide range of communication situations and he loses his ability to attend to a wide range of environmental input in such situations.

For most of the Navajo children that I've observed learning English at Borrego Pass School and at other schools, the negative factors of the memorization model suggest that this learning model is inappropriate for this setting. The memorization model as I have seen it used (and sometimes used it myself) in ESL programs such as CORE and the one which the BIA has developed for use in its schools frequently depends on the reinforcement "good" for motivation. But, there are other things being reinforced besides the acquisition of a particular English language item. The children come to rely on the teacher as the only "authority" and ultimate judge of what speech is correct and appropriate in the classroom. This promotes passivity and promotes fear of relying on one's own and one's peers' language judgment.

If an example of speech is not right, it is wrong, so there are few rewards for independent trials of new forms and free conversation is discouraged accordingly. This system also encourages the children to find out what is expected of them in learning a new form or situation and memorize it, with language learning thus becoming a process of tension reduction instead of a positive, creative experience. There are few opportunities in the classroom for spontaneous individual language explanation or analysis, either by the teacher or by the children, which can implicitly serve to confirm a child's suspicions about the difficulty and arbitrary nature of expression in a second language. Given these problems with the memorization model, it should be regarded as the first phase of the transformational-generative model since that would seem to be the more appropriate (and possibly pre-existing) one for this situation. Within the framework provided by the generative model, a language program should encourage those steps in the learning process that lead to the integration, analysis, and generation of a second language based on the development of the individual's language knowledge.

Types of Communicative Competence

Hymes (1970) offers the notion of second type of competence one equally significant as grammatical competence. The significance of this competence is acknowledged in descriptions like Labov's (in Hymes 1970, p. 54):

> "The contention that native speakers can hear phonemic distinctions much better than non-phonemic distinctions was not borne out by the evidence. Instead, one might say that

> the ability to perceive distinctions is determined largely by the social significance of the distinction to the listener."

Hymes (Ibid, p. 54) notes that "here are differences between one and the same speech community, entering into the inner competence itself" and suggests the need for a "theory of competence that can take account of socially conditioned differences in a natural and revealing way." Hymes details the competence for the use of a language that develops in the same way as competence for grammar:

> "Within the developmental matrix that children acquire knowledge in principle of the sentences of a language, they also acquire the knowledge in principle of a set of ways in which the language is used. . .(and) they internalize attitudes towards a language and its uses and language itself or its place in a pattern of mental abilities."

This observation is based on the following assumptions:

> "1. Each social relationship entails the selection and/or creation of communicative means considered specific and appropriate to it by its participants.
> 2. The organization of communicative means in terms of social relationship confers a structure that is not disclosed in the analysis of the means separately.
> 3. The communicative means available in a relationship conditions its nature and outcome (what people have to work with affects what they can do with it)." (p. 58)

When one examines examples of free speech, one should examine both performance for grammar and performance for use:

> "When we shift. . .to the difference between the speech of a middle class child and a lower-class child, however, we aren't looking at the total of what is available in language as a set of symbols, but only what is actually used by certain individuals at the moment of framing an utterance." (Cazden <u>in</u> Hymes, p. 61)

It would seem obvious that other contingencies than grammaticality effect the framing and performance of an utterance. As Hymes notes, if a person was to produce speech governed only by its grammaticality he would probably be quickly institutionalized. Yet, if the context of speech is limited in a language program, not enough practice is provided in developing competence for use. This competence for use will be based on an individual's own social background, his own observations and judgments about the social conditions in a particular situation, and the influence of his peers. Such competence is crucial to the development of the ability to use a second language as a viable means of communication in widely differing situations both in and outside of school.

Variations in Learning Style - Individual, Cultural, and Social

An ESL program should recognize the variations in learning rate, style, order, context, and company between individual students. Some relevant variations noted at Borrego Pass:

— Different personalities select the language appropriate to and needed for their expression. A particular construction or form can have differing degrees of utility for different individuals. This is especially apparent at the early stages of second language development where production is limited and each item must serve a wide range of meanings and contexts. Alfred, a third grader, used the expression "shut up" very frequently with me. It appeared in different situations to have at least the following meanings in addition to the usual: (1) "Go away, leave me alone". (2) Teasing, as one

might say "Yeah, sure. . ." (3) "Look at me -- be quiet and look at what I'm doing." Other children didn't use this expression since it may not have been appropriate for their use. It is very difficult to determine whether it is lack of comprehension or lack of utility that causes an individual's refusal to use a particular expression or structure. For this reason one should avoid stereotyping an expression or form, thereby possibly limiting its range of usefulness, since it can have different uses for different individuals.

— Some children will accept, at least temporarily, limited input and output in a language learning session because of the security that it offers. Some children like to know what's expected of them, seek it out, and then perform, not deviating from the model.

— Some children like to explicitly know the rules governing an utterance, or are comfortable voicing them. This can be because that is one way they make and test their observations about English, or it can be done to show off in front of other children, to please the teacher, or to protect their dominant role in a language session. At the beginning of the year, most of the children were confused about the appropriate use of some and an: they would confuse number, saying "some book" or "an apples." With the help of Don Creamer, now Title VII program director here, I made a series of programmed learning exercises that focused on some and an.

The exercises were placed on a board connected with a bell, which would ring if the child placed the tip of a wire next to an inappropriate use of some or an. I explained the workings of the device to the children and encouraged them to use it on their own when they had some time. When they were ready, they could take a test; if they passed, they could listen to a tape recorded story which would stop occasionally to offer a choice of some or an in a situation. The correct choice would cause the story to go on and a bell would ring if they were wrong. Some of the children worked on their own with the programmed exercises, apparently formed their own rules about the use of some and an, and passed the test. Others would ask, "When do you say some and when do you say an?" Once the rule had been explained to their satisfaction, they would start work on the exercises. Some would tell me the rules (usually in front of others) after a few trials. For others who had trouble, my explanations of the rules proved absolutely fruitless although most of those children who didn't give up gradually, through practice, mastered the constructions.

— Some children require more observation before trials than others or prefer to participate in language activities without producing language, or producing very little. Some will produce a new or difficult structure after a minute of internalization; for others, that structure may not be produced

for weeks or months after initial exposure. This can apply also to whole blocks of language knowledge as well as specific structures.

— Some children are comfortable performing in front of their peers; others are not.

— Some children do not like the formal language situation. They will create their own situations; from them one can observe what language models are the most respected and most influential. Among those considerations influencing the choice of a model or situation for language development were the degree of the individual's acceptance of learning styles implicit in Navajo culture, his respect for the language modeler, his interpretation or projection into the future of his own life style, and his ability and desire to imagine other life styles and their communicational needs. The elaborate play of Mike and Earl (mentioned in Part I) was an example of this as they tried out different situations, acting out different parts, and analyzing the appropriateness of each other's speech in relation to their definition of the situations and the various characters' roles in it. They would sometimes argue over the grammaticality and appropriateness of speech to one of the portrayed figure's character. ("He wouldn't say that. He'd say this. . .") This type of play was suited to their own language development, but not to others.

Any observation of second language learners will turn up a wide

variety of learning styles. A language program should enable each individual to use his own wherever possible.

Cultural Aspects of Learning Style

Observations of Borrego Pass children in learning situations suggested the prevalence of a passive learning model which differed substantially from the Anglo one implicit in the CORE program and often in my own expectations. I have noticed that a substantial period of passive observation of a task precedes any trials by the learner. Children are extremely reluctant to try out a new task or produce new speech until they are relatively sure that they have mastered it. If pressure to perform is placed on them before they feel they are ready, they tend to withdraw or show signs of discomfort. I have noticed that errors in spoken English by a child are quickly singled out, either by teasing or repeating, expecially pronunciation problems. It is possible, then, that immature performances are recognized and teased to mark deviations from the passive learning model. This model deviates substantially from the Anglo model where "practice makes perfect" and the learner is expected to produce trials before he is sure of mastery so that difficulties can be recognized and corrected by others.

There also appears to be among Borrego Pass children a marked reluctance to allow an individual to "stand out" in front of his peers. Exceptional individual performances or showing off is quickly recognized and responded to by the group. Ricky, one of the most fluent English speakers, made a series of tapes detailing imaginary

(and elaborate) pitfalls that could encounter the unfortunate prison escapee in a "Get out of Jail" game that we played. He was shunned for a while in several games after the other children heard the tapes. Other less fluent children who made similar tapes were mocked for their grammatical or pronunciational faults in them. Ricky's grammatically impeccable (as far as the listeners could determine) performance was greeted with silence. Many other instances of this same behavior underlined its influence as a factor in group learning situations.

Consistent with this prescription of not standing out in front of one's peers was an apparent one of helping others when they were having problems. In oral language sessions, a child who was having trouble would be offered a way out of the situation by inevitable whispered suggestions. Rarely was a child left to suffer in silence when a response was expected and he could not produce it. (Some of my most painful memories of school experience are of when I was in such a situation). When written material was called for, as a matter of course or in tests, aid for those having trouble was usually available through a discreet glance elsewhere, usually accommodated by an advantageous shifting of the helper's paper. It is also possible that widespread "cheating" (looking at the answers) in various programmed texts resulted from an application of both the "don't try before you're ready" prescription and the "help your friends" prescription (in this case you are your own best friend). All of these prescriptions surface when a teacher tries to introduce situations supporting individual competitiveness, although observations

show that the Navajo prescriptions can break down and the Anglo ones become dominant after years of experience in schools with Anglo children or strong-willed Anglo teachers. My own aforementioned vivid memories and the need to recognize a pre-existing, operant, and viable cultural model for learning behavior strongly support the creation of an ESL program in which learning can be consistent with the Navajo model.

The Role of Dialect in Second Language Learning

It has become increasingly apparent to me as I listen to the English used by the Navajo children, staff, and parents in and around Borrego Pass School that there are some constructions, expressions, or words which are not used by this speech community. Other constructions are used much more than I am inclined to think Anglos use them, or acquire new meanings. Some are modified in form: "isn't it" becomes invariable (like the French n'est-ce pas?) as a tag question and do ("don't they?) and are("aren't they?") variations are not used. There has to be some recognition in the ESL program of the domains of dialect and standard English in order to develop appropriate grammatical competence and a knowledge of appropriate use (competence for use and competence for performance of both). Dialect is used in English conversation in the Borrego Pass school and community setting and Standard English (S.E.) is used (and expected to be performed) in the BIA and Public Schools in Crownpoint.

It is difficult to determine which (S.E. or dialect) will have more utility for these children, and it has to be determined how S.E.

or dialect will be appropriate for their needs when an ESL program is being designed for them. The different intonational and inflectional demands of S.E. should not over-ride attention to the meaning of utterances. In this school setting, where the influence of the peer group on molding and defining behavior is so strong, it is perhaps of most importance that stress be placed on the development of language performance that is consistent with one's peers. Exceptional language behavior, showing off (or what is seen as such) by using unusually complex structures, or variations from dialectical English, is usually recognized, with the producer of such language ignored, teased, or dismissed as a viable model accordingly. Such situations provide about the only opportunity both to assess the degree to which a Borrego Pass student has a conception of Borrego Pass English and also, by gathering observations about such situations, to begin to isolate elements of this dialect. The outlines of this conception can be determined in the degree to which students recognize (by teasing, ignoring, or subsequently not using themselves) deviations from it.

Examination of the linguistic and sociolinguistic role of dialect in the children's English language development brings out the problems of learning how to function in two different languages and cultures. Linguistically, the languages are very different; expression of the same idea in both languages will require the use of much different structures, requiring different ways of organizing a thought so that it can be expressed. Sociolinguistically, the two languages are

different in cultural outlooks and values. Where the same concept occurs in both languages, it can be translated from one language to the other. Where the same concept doesn't exist, it must be interpreted into the terms of the other language and then translated. How can a program encourage and develop observation, analysis, and learning of the two different cultures and languages without comparing one to the detriment of the other? Inherent in both are different social orders and world views which the individual must come to understand and define appropriate to his own needs, as well as find out others' conceptions of them.

PART III

DESIGNING A PROGRAM

Learning Styles and the Use of Imagination in the Classroom

The problems experienced with the CORE program and the language learning considerations presented in Part II suggest the viability of the following approach: a language learning program should provide situations which will stimulate individual observation without inhibiting different learning styles and which will enhance language growth. The special demands placed on a Navajo child who has to be able to function in different cultural settings using two different languages should be provided for in a language program by offering ways for him to visualize and experience such settings.[5]

In order to develop competence and performance for use, children should be provided opportunities to project themselves out of the school environment (and that in which they are already adept) to other environments. Creative, imaginative play and drama can provide the medium for this projection. Ideally, such play should become spontaneous, like that of Mike and Earl, but, initially, situations and roles can be suggested with the skills and imagination required to fill them being developed as more exposure to such situations is

---

[5]I have often heard it said in this community that this generation of Navajo youth is using and generating forms and usages of Navajo and English different than their parents or teachers. Education programs must recognize this change and such recognition should be an integral part of their design. Offering ways for these Navajos to visualize, experience, and adapt language to different situations would be an effective means of recognizing this change.

provided.

Borrego Pass children are not comfortable with situations requiring one individual to stand out from the others. Attempts at play acting with individual roles failed last year, perhaps for this reason. Some games, though, were highly successful in providing opportunities for creative, imaginative individual participation. The advantage of a game format is that it can offer controlled context and controlled roles. Some set characters can be performed by the more courageous or adept at first, and other children can fill these roles later, following the model of their peers as closely as their initial uncertainty dictates. Or, a situation can be presented and explored by all at first and later by individuals who have been encouraged to try to imagine themselves in that situation. As the game format becomes more familiar, fewer prescriptions for participation should be offered. The children should come to play the game as they like with the teacher providing (until the students can) an outline of the prerequisites of the situation, and perhaps some roles. Language requirements can be integrated into the performance of the roles, or the situation can be varied to require the use of certain language skills. Such requirements should be fitted to the situation; the usefulness of this type of approach is seriously diminished if roles, language, or ways of participation become stereotyped.

One such game that proved highly successful last year was one that I devised called the "Get Out of Jail" Game. The game was played on a two-by-three foot piece of poster paper (the other side

contained a BIA exhortation to stay in school). On the right side was a jail, connected by approximately fifty one inch squares to the left side, a Navajo hogan (traditional home). The distance between the two could be traversed in a number of ways, since the squares were arranged in four curving lines with several connections between them. The players (two to six) start in jail, having each committed crimes as heinous and bizarre as his imagination permits, and each tries to be the first to reach the hogan, which provides sanctuary and a place where you can "watch TV, read comics, drink pop, and eat fry bread," (a Navajo specialty) which constitutes the Borrego Pass conception of what an ideal sanctuary should provide. The squares between the jail and the hogan are fraught with obstacles, explicit and implicit. The individual can choose his own course, and traverses the squares by moving his marker the number of squares shown on the dice when he rolls it. Some of the obstacles on the squares are explicit: pictures of man-eating dinosaurs, turtles, snakes, impassable sections of mud, water, or volcanoes, strafing and bombing planes and helicopters, trips to the top of the Empire State Building with King Kong, trips to the horrors of the La Brea Tar Pits with Godzilla, minefields, guillotines, police (singly or in massive roadblocks), electric chairs, and whatever other elements of a prison escapee's nightmares that could be thought of. Some squares contain implicit obstacles. These have question marks on them, and the obstacles are discovered as the person who landed on the square listens to the situation described on a tape recording previously made by a classmate.

Such recordings usually detailed encounters with innocent-appearing individuals or structures, with the listener offered several choices (based on entirely incomplete information) as to what to do next. After making the choice, the listener listens to the consequences, which can offer immediate entrance into sanctuary, return to jail, or abrupt and infinitely varied journeys into oblivion. An example:

> "It's really cold outside. You have no coat and it's getting colder. You come to a house. What will you do--stay outside or go in the house? (Tape is stopped, listener makes choice) If you stay outside you're OK (although in some other tapes you freeze to death). If you go in the house, the door closes and it's (the house is) like a rocket. It blasts off and takes you all the way to. . .Pluto. Then it just blows up, and you're dead and out of the game."

Some tapes offer situations and choices with the consequences to be determined by all the participants in the game based on the response of the person who landed on the square. The squares with explicit pictures on them require immediate action to avert the pictured obstacles. Quick imagination is required to create a story detailing successful aversion, although some common sense prevails (you can't divert Godzilla's wrath by telling him that there's a phone call for him someplace in the opposite direction from where you're going). Generally, though, anything goes, with the appropriateness of the response, and the responder's fate, being determined by the other participants.

Landing on some specially-marked squares entitles the participant to take the top card of one of two piles (depending on which square he has landed), marked F (for Friend) or W (for weapon). Friend

cards contained substantive aid for the escapee: helicopters, boats, airplanes, tanks, motorcycles, etc., as well as the Governor, who could use his considerable political clout to commute death sentences or entice police to look the other way, and the Executioner, who could short circuit electric chair wires, cut hangman's nooses, or immobilize guillotines. Weapon cards contained weapons, which could be used as needed.

When this game was first introduced, its routine could be relatively fixed, with the number of obstacles and means of avoiding them limited so that the students could establish themselves in the game situation. Initially, I would suggest obstacles, ways of avoiding them and possible routes, make the obstacle tapes, and be the sole judge of appropriate responses. Gradually, the number and nature of obstacles and means of avoiding them increased, whoever volunteered could make tapes, the participants became the judges of appropriateness of response, new rules were created, and I became a participant subject to the whims of fate like the others.

During the month and a half that this game was played, the following structural and lexical objectives, most of them new or difficult for the students, were modelled, regularly employed in the game, and later used in free conversation by the children:

Simple Present, present progressive, imperfect, future (will and going to), simple perfect (-ed and irregulars), past progressive (was going), present perfect progressive (have been doing), and conditional (would, could) tenses — alone, or juxtaposed with

others in statements and questions; all WH questions where appropriate with appropriate responses and tenses; If - then (consequential) and If - would, could (conditional - "If you had a gun you could shoot him"); and noun and adverbial clauses. The gradual modification of the "I'm go over there" perfect detailed in Part II to "I go" to "I went" occurred for most of the students during the month and a half that the game was played. I noticed a significant improvement in the ability of the students to communicate or ask questions with precision during this period as well as increased flexibility in using language in a variety of situations. Communicational precision was reinforced in the game since, in avoiding an obstacle, a responder was held responsible for his every word by the others -- imprecision could lead to his demise in unpredictable ways. While at first it might seem unlikely that the specific competence and performance for use developed in this game would be of much use to the students unless they have to escape from jail some day, flexibility was developed in placing oneself in a new and challenging situation and using language to achieve the desired consequences. The individual's creative use of imagination was rewarded.

On the other hand, language production could be avoided if the student felt unsure of himself. By avoiding certain squares, most of the serious obstacles could be avoided. The student could play several games this way, passively watching and listening to others'

models. Many students played this way at first, watching the more adept and courageous students, and becoming more adventurous and productive themselves when they felt they were ready. While the nature of the roles in this game was limited to that of prison escapee, the way in which this role could be played was limited only by one's imagination. The language requirements of the game increased and varied as new situations and responses to them were created.

Television, movies, stories, and comic books can provide more models for dramatic play. Comics are particularly effective in engaging the reader's imaginative participation, since the pictures and words together can be explicit enough to suggest the inherent dynamics of a situation but not visually or auditorally overwhelming enough to restrict participation.

This year we had a comic library at Borrego Pass. It usually consisted of about thirty to sixty comics with new ones being supplied as old ones fell apart, got lost, or were exchanged. The students could check out one comic at a time and could check out another as soon as they returned the first. The children showed great interest in some of the comic characters, asking such questions as "Why did he do that?", "What would he do (say) if. . .?", or questions about aspects of the character's life other than those depicted. Some children would pretend they were the characters, saying and doing what they thought would be appropriate. Ricky, a fifth grader, was particularly interested in and curious about the life of Conan the

Barbarian (also my favorite). He asked me a lot of questions about the life of a barbarian -- what it was like, what other barbarians were like, how they treated each other, how they talked, etc. -- occasionally offering his own suggestions. Gathering this information and projecting some more he spent several days imagining himself to be Conan, acting sufficiently barbaric to lead several classmates to conclude that there was a genuine wild man in their midst, although some would join the role in participating in the ritual slaughter of unfavored classmates (especially Ricky's hapless brother).

Such dramatic production, not necessarily barbaric, will be developed next year through having older children read, with appropriate expression, comics to the younger ones. This can be taped, with different children reading different parts. Such production develops naturally expressive use of language and role play since each picture frame of a comic provides an obvious context for interpretation. I have seen such expressiveness used by children on their own in reading comics. If the picture depicts your character on the verge of being stabbed, you are not likely to say "Stop, not me!" in a monotone when you read it. The advantage of this type of drama is that the explicitness of the picture and the supportiveness of the audience (as in the case of a tape made for younger brothers and sisters) limits excessive self-consciousness in playing the role more than drama without text does. Additionally, such tapes can provide peer models of English language and its use in context for younger children.

Next year we plan to take slide pictures of each frame of a

story in a comic and project these slides on a screen. Some possible uses: (1) different children could read and tape the parts of the different characters portrayed with the speech in the speech balloons remaining intact to encourage the reading of certain words or structures by the audience (or to orally model structures, intonation); (2) speech balloons could be wholly or partially blanked out, with the audience required to furnish either appropriate speech or portions (or particular words) of speech; (3) slides from one story (or several stories featuring the same character) could be mixed, with the children making up a story and sequencing the slides appropriately. (4) slides from several stories could be placed together in an epic-length show with parts taped or provided by the audience. This method of presentation of comic stories suggested by-Don Creamer, increases audience participation in dramatic production, and offers more challenges to the actors themselves.

Another use of this format would be to use pictures with empty (or non-existent) speech balloons and let the students determine what should be said. I presented the children with picture cards (not the kind that just have a single picture of a duck or a dog on them -- these showed several actors in widely varied contexts) and encouraged them to play guessing games with the cards -- one could choose a character in one of the cards and give a clue about him by saying what he might say or do in or out of the context of that picture. By putting subsequent clues together, more and more role play was developed as further portrayal of a character was encouraged as others tried to guess which one was being portrayed. Other games were

developed in which several students could collaborate in portraying the characters in a pictured situation, producing some stories in the process. This process is akin to that of directing and acting in a dramatic production, and can be further developed to encourage role play and creative use of language.

Such limited dramatic play as I used this year was generally successful in creating and sustaining interest, moving children to work at the limits of their language ability, and engaging their imagination and capacity for observation. Language requirements were varied to suit the needs of individual children without seeming artificial, and could be practiced in context at whatever rate and in whatever style the children found comfortable. Meaning could serve as a measure of grammatically or socially appropriate language usage. Dramatic play seemed to be the best way to move the language situation out of the confines of the classroom and draw into play language skills that would be needed out of school. It was also a lot of fun and will be used extensively in the program next year.

Sequencing of Material

Cazden (1972, p. 127) states that an artificial setting of language expansion rate can depress a child's attention process. Stimuli of a certain degree of novelty get the greatest attention, leading to the observation that language acquisition can be facilitated by events that "enhance the child's attention to the adult's utterance and to relevant features of the verbal and nonverbal context in which it is spoken." In other words, if a child is ready

for an aspect of language, it is most likely to be singled out, attended to, and absorbed. First language learning is done on an unsequenced basis. The process is not divided into small parts; the child is exposed to a body of mature speech and expected to cope. Out of this, the child picks what he needs to build his own language system (Cazden 1972, p.138).[6]

Second language development must be integrated into every aspect of school curriculum in recognition of the fact that much of language learning and use will take place as the second language is used as a medium of instruction and conversation in the upper grades. At Borrego Pass next year, individual language needs will be identified and appropriate language programs developed with coordination between teachers and specialists so that practice is provided in all suitable areas of the curriculum. Coordination between the ESL specialists and the reading specialist will develop the use of reading materials containing language appropriate to the level of the individual children reading.

In setting up a second language program, how explicit should language goals be? How can a program be developed so that the

---

[6] Second language programs in schools rarely acknowledge this characteristic of first language learning. Language input and output is restricted and sequenced according to adults' abstractions of how language can best be organized and sequenced during second language learning. The making of such abstractions would not necessarily be consistent with the process that children follow on their own in learning a first language (and which could apply to a second language) either in method, order, or substance of organization. I suspect that in school programs conducted in a second language and offering explicit second language programs, most significant second language learning takes place as the child attempts on his own to cope in the second language medium of the general school program. The question,"Why have a separate second language program?"must be seriously considered.

children can determine (and be exposed to at the right time) their own level? How explicitly should this ability be recognized and developed?

One way of developing this ability and studying the way in which, or degree to which, it operates in this setting would be to design a program in which the child can explicitly select his own level of structural objectives. Such a program, as suggested by Don Creamer, will be tried out next year. In it, a child would be shown or told some objectives which observation had shown to be foreign or difficult for him and asked which of them he thought he could learn within a specified period of time (one or two weeks). The child would then contract (make a formal commitment) to learn the specified objectives within the time permitted. Activities where those objectives and others would have to be used would be scheduled for the classroom during this time, and the child could use them as an aid to learning if he wanted. Other than the commitment to learn the specified objectives, the design of the child's language program would be up to him. Over time and after several contractings, the child could possibly come to be more able to recognize what structural objectives he knew, and, of the ones that were unfamiliar, which he was most ready to learn. The advantages of this type of system would be that the child would have the opportunity of learning the structural objectives in his own way, which process over time could give him a sense of progress in his language learning. The program could be used selectively and could provide

insights into the sequencing of second language learning even if it did prove to develop explicit skills that were not necessarily more effective than implicit ones already in use.

I will re-sequence the CORE objectives next year, based on observations this year of the order in which objectives were acquired, the relative apparent difficulty of the acquisition, the apparent utility of the objective for the learner, and the degree to which the objective was later comprehended or used in free conversation. Advanced objectives in the comprehension and production of Standard English will be prepared for the sixth graders who will be entering an all-English environment the following year. Individual language needs will be assessed based on recordings made at the end of this year and activities and projects incorporating those objectives will be prepared for the classrooms.

Testing

The preparation of language activities and the sequencing of structural objectives raises the question of how a language program and its participants can be continually evaluated. Ideally, testing should provide a means of measuring both progress and program. It should help both the teacher and the students evaluate their achievement and needs without judging them by artificial standards. It should be challenging, in order to determine the limits of language ability, yet should be non-threatening. The testing situation should correspond to those occurring naturally so that representative language will be used and the children will not feel self-conscious about using

English in that situation. The rewards received in testing for progress should be apparent to all participating and should be consistent with the rewards one can expect to receive in most situations requiring second language usage. For the teacher, testing should help assess the language program, especially the sequencing of materials. He should find out which second language structures are produced, which ones are ignored, and which are difficult, as well as which are subject to or should be replaced by dialectical items. There are few cases where something is right or wrong. At this stage in the development of the program, any response that deviates from Standard English could be taken as evidence of inappropriate usage, lack of understanding or knowledge, or the operation of a non-standard dialect.

A Borrego Pass English Language Test

This year I used picture slides taken on a third, fourth, and fifth grade field trip to Phoenix, Arizona, as test material. I set up a slide projector, screen, and hidden tape recorder in a small room and brought in all of the third, fourth, and fifth graders in groups of two and three. I showed them the slides and tried to engage the students in conversation about them. I tried to encourage, wherever possible, the use of structural objectives that had been presented during the year by making statements or asking questions which would require in response the use of these objectives. Mostly, though, I tried to get the students to talk about the pictures and whatever associations went with them, to ask questions, and respond based on their interest as one would usually do when looking at pictures like

these. I quickly discovered that if the students suspected that I was trying to test their English language usage they would quickly become silent, responding to questions with one or two word answers, and my voice would become the only one heard in the room. When the students were actively participating in discussion about the slides and when the desire to communicate something about the trip became the motivation for speaking, English structures were produced that I had not heard before from these students. I am sure that it was a frustrating experience for some as they struggled to express what they meant to say, but the rewards of successful communication -- a funny comment producing laughter, a question understood and responded to, something remembered by one producing a response from others -- apparently were sufficient to move most of the students to speak to the limit of their ability and realize the benefits of their increased ability. I later transcribed the tapes, comparing individual performances to those of the beginning of the year to determine progress, current strengths and weaknesses, and the effectiveness of the activities which developed specific structural objectives. I made a chart incorporating all of the objectives presented in CORE, and marked each objective that was fully produced, noting whether it had been produced in a session which explicitly developed it or in free conversation, or both. Each student's language production was recorded. This chart will serve as a basis for next year's program, as a measure of individual progress and as a basis for the re-sequencing of objectives. Next year I intend to use such recording sessions fairly

frequently throughout the year as a measure of both individual progress and program.

Dialect

Learning English Phonology

In second language programs where the phonology of one language is radically different from that of the other, the question arises of whether to "teach" phonology formally, and whether this teaching period should provide limited second language input only. Referring to a report on the acquisition of speech sounds in a first language, Cazden (1972, p. 59) states: "In view of these results, perhaps the hypothesis should be entertained that the speech production mechanisms operate more accurately when given an abundance of contextual clues." She further states

> "Under this hypothesis the context provided by a section of discourse provides cues and feedback for the muscles of the vocal apparatus, thus making individual phonemes more likely to be correctly articulated." (p. 60)

The implication for education about speech sound discrimination and production would be:

> "Identical pronunciation can be intelligible to one listener and not to another, depending on the degree of shared background of experience between speaker and listener, and the availability of extralinguistic cues to what the child is talking about. . .There should be continuity in education in adult-child relationships. One could increase the range of listeners to whom the child's speech can be used as a measure of his development." (p. 61)

She concludes that "teachers must distinguish between developmental deviations in pronunciation and dialect differences. A child needs speech therapy only if his speech deviates from the norms of his own community."

My own experience suggests that attention to speech errors can cause needless self-consciousness in children. Consistent with Cazden's conclusions, testing for phonological development should be done on the basis of the range of peer listeners that can understand what is being said in the second language.[7] Older students can model dialectical speech. This modelling would be important since it can act as a transition between Navajo and the production of difficult sounds in English. As the child gets older, Standard English phonology can gradually be integrated into his language production so that it can be used in suitable contexts.

Integrating Dialect into the Program

The CORE program builds on increasing uses of dependent clauses and other complex structures as a measure of language progress and development. However, richness and precision of description and differentiation of meaning is achieved in this speech community both with and without employing these clauses. This necessitates the formulation of new

---

[7]This could be done by creating situations where one individual or group would have to explicitly carry out the spoken directions of another individual or group. "Literal" interpretation of the individual's directions would be encouraged. Directing someone how to make a peanut butter sandwich is an example. The directee can end up spreading peanut butter on his hand if not told explicitly how and where to do it. Literal interpretation can be a lot of fun in such situations, with the range of peer listeners who can understand an individual becoming apparent as appropriate actions are carried out from his directions.

standards of what constitutes progress in language development in an environment where dialectical modifications occur, especially in the lower grades where dialect should prevail to provide transition from Navajo to English. In the higher grades, an understanding of the contexts in which expression in Standard English is appropriate should be developed, with an emphasis placed not on which is "better" or "correct" — Standard English or Dialect — but on the types of situations, roles, and expressions in which one can be more effective than the other. This can be done through social studies programs, field trips, and activities which require participants to project themselves into different types of situations. A formal non-Navajo cultural studies program has been set up for next year with a full time staff member developing the program and co-ordinating it with other programs. Extensive field trips are planned, and English language requirements will be integrated into the trips and subsequent reports on them. Anglo models that the children have seen can be portrayed, as can encounters in off-reservation cities. What should be developed is an appreciation for the expressive capabilities of each form of English, an implicit understanding of the viability of both without detriment to each other, so that neither dialect nor Standard English or speakers of each will become stereotyped or a source of embarrassment to these students in later life.

Culture and Language

A second language program should promote linguistic awareness: a recognition and exploration of differences in cultures by means of

language analysis. This analysis can provide a means of introducing cross cultural study into a school curriculum without resorting to reliance on stereotypes or the making (or acceptance) of broad value judgments. Aspects of the process of functioning as a bilingual, bicultural individual can be explored through translation and interpretation from one language to the other. A social study program should offer methods of observation of culture through language with the individual student encouraged to work independently to develop his ability to observe without premature judgment and draw his own conclusions. Some possible projects:

— An examination of the kinship terms in a language including the expectations for behavior, duties, and reciprocities inherent in each. This can lead to the development of a conception of family and social life in a culture.

— An examination of the grammar of one's first language in the expression of a thought. This grammar can be analyzed and later compared to the grammar of a second language exhibited in the expression of the same thought and can lead to the exposure of elements of world view in each. For example, in English the action in which a coyote has attacked a man could be expressed "The coyote attacked the man" or "The man was attacked by the coyote." In Navajo "Ma'ii hastiin yik'iilwod" (The coyote attacked the man) is grammatically correct but culturally inappropriate, since man ranks higher than coyote in a Navajo hierarchy of entities and beings, and hence should

appear first in the determination of subject-object word order in a sentence. The appropriate expression of this action in Navajo would be "Hastiin ma'ii bik'iilwod." ("The man was attacked by the coyote"). (Paul Platero, conversation. See also Creamer, 1971). Linguistic awareness of differences in grammar could be used in the preparation of materials to be used to help younger children learn the English form of a Navajo expression where differences between the two presented problems.

— The preparation of field trip reports. These could provide practice in observing aspects of Anglo culture and expressing them to other children in English. Field trips will be made to other areas, children will observe and record (with pictures and/or tapes) aspects of life in that area and the pictures and tapes can be organized into a show to be presented to the other children back in school. Aspects of the trip, including new and foreign situations and concepts, would have to be explained in English to the other children. This requires the use of appropriate language which will then in the slide show be modelled in context for the other children by their peers.

— A student exchange program. A pilot exchange program is being set up for next year in which Anglo students from a school in Albuquerque will spend a few weeks at Borrego Pass while Borrego Pass students spend a few weeks at the school in Albuquerque. This will provide firsthand experience in functioning in two

languages and cultures through observation of representatives of different backgrounds and actual interaction with them. The development of relationships with them will entail the formulation and production of appropriate language. Second language models will be provided in the context of interaction and Borrego Pass children will be reinforced for the use of new language where it is required for communication, by the success of communicating meaning. The language program that I have outlined has been designed to simulate interaction with English speakers; actual face-to-face interaction should test the effectiveness of that approach.

In the design of an ESL program for the Borrego Pass School setting, the generative model of language acquisition seems more appropriate to the children's needs than the memorization model, both in its possible consistency with the way in which they learn their first language and in its stress on the development of an individual's ability to analyze and produce language on his own. The ESL program must be flexible enough to allow for individual and cultural variations in learning style,and rate, as well as the sequence in which language materials are learned. Practice must be provided in the appropriate use of language in the wide range of social situations that these children will encounter. Dialectical differences in English should be allowed for in early speech production and peer modeling.

The ESL program will be flexible enough to allow for individual, cultural, and dialectical variations. Such variations will be accommodated in the creation in the program of different situations requiring different functional levels and social usages of English. Participation in sessions offering these situations should develop the language skills that these children will need. The desire and ability to participate in these situations will lead to increased precision and accuracy in the children's social and grammatical use of English.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Alatis, James E., ed., Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics, The 21st Annual Round Table. Washington: Georgetown University Press, 1970.

Presentation and discussion of papers on Bilingualism. See papers by MacNamara, Ervin-Tripp, and Phillips in this collection. An excellent source for comparing the thoughts of some major figures in the field of bilingualism.

Cazden, Courtney B., "Some Views on Subcultural Differences in Child Language", Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 12, pp. 185-219. p. 190 quoted in Hymes 1971, p. 54.

Cazden, Courtney B., Child Language and Education. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1972.

Primarily deals with first language acquisition but offers implications for second language learning. An extremely useful source of work done on learning models, both of grammar and of style.

Cazden, Courtney and John, Vera P., "Learning in American Indian Children". Anthropological Perspectives on Education. Wax, Murray L., Stanley Diamond, and Fred O. Gearing (ed.) New York: Basic Books, 1971, pp. 252-272.

A survey of relevant research of learning styles and abilities of Indian children in education situations.

Creamer, Mary Helen. "Ranking in Navajo Nouns". Paper presented at the American Anthropological Association Convention. November, 1971.

By examining the hierarchy by which nouns are ranked in Navajo and the implications for Navajo grammar, this paper offers a solid example of how the relationship between culture and language can be examined without resort to stereotypes.

Ervin-Tripp, Susan. "Structure and Process in Language Acquisition". Monograph Series in Languages and Linguistics, The 21st Annual Round Table. Alatis, James (Ed.), Georgetown University Press, 23, 1970, pp. 313-341.

Consideration of first language vs. second language acquisition process both in and out of the classroom.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Hancock, Charles E., Acculturation, Biculturalism, and American Indian Education. Unpublished B.A. Thesis, Wesleyan University, 1972.

This paper's predecessor. A general look at differences between the educational process in the Navajo home and in the school. Based on my experiences in Summer School at Rough Rock, although primarily a research paper.

Hymes, Dell. "On Linguistic Theory, Communicative Competence, and the Education of Disadvantaged Children". Anthropological Perspectives on Education. Wax, Murray L., Stanley Diamond and Fred O. Gearing (Ed.) New York: Basic Books, 1971, pp. 51-66.

Introduces and clearly details the idea of competence and performance for use vs. that of grammar. Discusses how the language performance of lower-class and other ethnic groups should be evaluated.

Labov, William. "Stages in the Acquisition of Standard English" Shuy, Roger W. (Ed.), Social Dialects and Language Learning, Champaign: National Council of Teachers of English. 12, pp. 102. Quoted in Hymes, 1971, p. 54.

MacNamara, John. "Bilingualism and Thought", Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics, The 21st Annual Round Table, Alatis, James (Ed.). Georgetown University Press, 23, 1970, pp. 25-40.

A smooth look at the relationship between cognition and bilingualism including the degree of determinism of one on the other, how and whether it can be determined to exist, and its implications for growth and performance.

Phillips, Susan U., "Acquisition of Rules for Appropriate Speech Usage". Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics, 21st Annual Round Table, Alatis, James (Ed.) Georgetown University Press, 23, 1970, pp. 77-95.

Hymes' notion of competence and performance for use clearly brought to life in the presentation of the social rules governing English usage among a group of Indian children in and out of an Oregon school.

Wolk, Elsie (Ed.) Core English. Lexington: Ginn and Company, 1972. William R. Slager is Editor of CORE levels One and Two; Elsie Wolk is Editor of CORE Three and Four.

Designed to be a complete ESL program for primary and elementary age children. Apparently based on urban, Spanish-speaking

BIBLIOGRAPHY

population. Methods are described; English language production carefully sequenced and structured. Comes with wall charts, puppets, picture cards, records. Could be effective where the teacher and/or the children want to know what should be done in and expected of an ESL program.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Secondary Sources

Sindell, Peter S., "Some Discontinuities in the Enculturation of Mistassini Cree Children", Chance, Norman A. (Ed.) Conflict in Culture: Problems of Developmental Change Among the Cree. Saint Paul: Canadian Research Center for Anthropology. 1968.

Excellent, clear presentation and analysis of difference of appropriate behaviors and how they are learned in Cree culture and in a Canadian school.

Wax, Murray L. Indian Americans: Unity and Diversity. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1971.

An introduction to American Indians and issues involved in their education, preservation of culture and language, and experience in dominant Anglo culture. Includes history, studies of the life and problems of various tribes at different times. The best work of its kind that I've seen.

Wax, Murray L., Rosalie H. Wax and Robert U Dumont, Jr., "Formal Education in an American Indian Community". Social Problems. 11, 4, pp. 1-126.

Learning in Sioux culture and learning as it is presented in a Dakotan school. Discusses the role of the peer group in forming attitudes, behavior, and shaping the Sioux youth's experience in the school setting.

Wax, Rosalie H., "The Warrior Dropouts", Trans-Action, 4, May, 1970, pp. 40-46.

How Sioux learning models operate in a hostile school setting. How the peer group influences what, how, and where behavior is learned.

Young, Robert W. "English As a Second Language for Navajos: An Overview of Certain Cultural and Linguistic Factors", Albuquerque: Bureau of Indian Affairs, 1968, ERIC ED 021 655.

A clear introduction to most of the factors inherent in the second language development of Navajo children written by the author of the most widely used Navajo-English dictionary.