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Four young children who were learning English as a second language were observed during their participation in an English Language Development class in a school in the North Texas area. Demographic data and checklists were used to describe progress in expressive language and the key vocabulary approach to beginning literacy as adapted by Trietsch and Monk. Data from the interviews with the classroom teachers of the subjects and anecdotal records were used to describe the interaction of the subjects with other English-speaking children and adults. Comparisons were made between progress in writing the key vocabulary and progress in expressive language and between progress in writing the key vocabulary and the progress of interaction with other English-speaking children and adults. The subjects progressed in literacy in English as a second language while learning English as a second language.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

On April 29, 1975, the first reception center for Indochinese refugees opened at Camp Pendleton, California (24, p. 3). A total of 130,810 refugees came to the United States from Indochina that year. Out of a sample of 117,106 refugees, 17,667 were age five and younger and 18,603 were between the ages of six and eleven. Of 20,956 heads of households representing a sample of 95,138 refugees, 30.3 per cent had no English language skills and 30.3 per cent had only some English language skills (23, pp. 10-11). Texas received 6,085 refugees for resettlement in 1975, second only to the 20,310 resettled in California (24, p. 5).

In 1975, the United States began the task of resettling a large number of refugees with limited English language skills in a short period of time. The relocation policy was formed in late spring after most school districts had set budgets, hired staff, and ordered materials (15, pp. 3-4). Commenting on the situation, Ambassador Brown stated, "we are faced with a situation of unprecedented dimensions. Never before have we been called upon to absorb as large an influx in so short a period of time" (15, p. 4). Thus many schools faced and will continue to face the task of educating
Indochinese refugee children. As of January, 1979, 50,000 Indochinese refugees were being admitted to the United States each year (14, p. 13).

In addition to the recent influx of Indochinese refugees in American schools, the plight of children who speak English as a second language also has a legal history. As late as the 1960's some teachers faced the prospect of losing their jobs for using any language other than English in the classroom. Children were still being punished for using their own language on the playground. In 1970, laws were still on the books naming English as the language of instruction (20, p. 130).

A breakthrough occurred with the passing of Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 1967. This act encouraged the growth of bilingual education by offering grants to school districts for the development of bilingual programs. Title VII, the Bilingual Education Act, was also the first federal legislation in which Congress recognized languages other than English for use in public school classes (26, p. 410). The 1974 Supreme Court decision in the case of Lau vs. Nichols gave further support to the special consideration of bilingual children. The court ruled that federally funded school districts must provide services to minority students with English language deficiencies so that they might have an equal opportunity for an education (21, p. 43).
The Problem

Will the key vocabulary approach reflect progress in learning English as a second language by Indochinese kindergarten and first-grade children?

This problem was investigated to find a way to help young children learn English as a second language that is congruent with their cultural background and with the way young children learn a second language. The second purpose of this study was to find an appropriate way to help young children begin to use and to understand written English by offering an alternative to the traditional basal reading series.

Research Questions

This study was conducted in answer to the following questions:

1. What is the progress for each child in attaining literacy in English as a second language through the key vocabulary approach?

2. What is the progress for each child in expressive language?

3. What is the progress of the observed verbal interaction of each child with other English-speaking children?

4. How does the expressive language of each child compare with the progress in the key vocabulary?
5. How does the observed verbal interaction of each child with other English-speaking children compare with the progress in the key vocabulary?

Background and Significance

The task of teaching children to speak English as a second language is a very real concern of the public schools. One of the first decisions to be made in serving these children concerns their placement. Should they be placed in a class by themselves until they gain some English language skills or should they be placed with their peer group? Saville-Troike wrote that in the past the English as a Second Language (ESL) program was thought of "as a 'pull-out' or segregated program divorced from the curriculum, which concentrated solely on the acquisition of English skills without consideration for the child's native language and culture" (20, p. 131).

Hillson admitted that isolating foreign students in special classes is an improvement on placing them in traditional classrooms where children are expected to learn the same subject matter at the same rate (13, p. 145). However, both Hillson and Saville-Troike agreed that class assignments should be made according to age and not proficiency in English. Hillson added that age peers would encourage the foreign student in his attempts to communicate in a new language. In turn, the foreign student could also help his
classmates grow in their understanding and appreciation of people from other cultures (13, p. 157; 20, pp. 83-85).

After the foreign child enters the American classroom, the next question concerns the kind of instruction he should receive. Hillson disclosed a poor record for traditional, rigid, grade-level teaching for non-English speaking students and poor school achievement in large immigrant populations (13, pp. 154-155). The Center for Applied Linguistics also reported a high correlation between the inability to use standard English and low school achievement (4, p. 2). Hillson described the downward trend of the non-English speaking child placed in an unindividualized program of instruction.

This insidious process starts on the first day a foreign child enters a classroom. In the beginning, there are instinctive reactions to a strange environment: the alienation of being different from the rest of the class, the fear of appearing ridiculous to classmates, the dread of not knowing what the teacher expects. A few years later, these feelings are no longer linked to new experiences; the child knows that he cannot measure up to anyone's standards, and he accepts the label of slow learner (13, p. 155).

Some unique factors that influence the understanding and learning of the foreign child have been identified by Hillson, Dubois, and the Center for Applied Linguistics. The cultural background of the child, with its own particular values and customs, has an influence on motivation and learning styles (4, p. 3; 13, p. 154). The child's background of experiences can cause difficulties in understanding both teachers and the content of textbooks (8, p. 692).
Also, the child's first language can cause certain difficulties in the learning of a second language. Linguistic interference occurs when the sounds of English are heard in terms of the sound system already established by the child's first language (4, p. 2). When using English, the child may change grammatical forms to fit those of his native language. In turn, the grammatical system of the child's native language may interfere with his understanding of English (8, pp. 692-694).

Once the foreign-speaking child has been placed in a class and his unique educational needs have been recognized, the structure given to the teaching-learning environment has to be considered. Andersson stated, "In order to teach satisfactorily, a teacher should be well acquainted with the prevailing philosophy and practice in the American elementary school" (1, p. 43). Educators such as Carroll and Leeper joined Andersson in emphasizing the importance of teachers who are proficient and competent in the language being taught (1, p. 43; 3, p. 15; 16, p. 210). The daily assignment of time for direct instruction in vocabulary, sentence patterns, and the unfamiliar sounds of the second language was also recommended (2; 4, p. 3; 5, pp. 3-4; 13, p. 157). Another suggested practice was the organization of content from easier structures to the more difficult, each lesson building on what has gone before (5, p. 2; 9, pp. 302-303).
In determining the exact content of language lessons, however, more than one recommended practice is available to the teacher. One viewpoint emphasizes the academic language that all children are expected to learn in order to function in a traditional school situation (9, p. 295).

Bereiter and Engelman wrote:

The problem of prescribing the content of a basic language training program is solved only by looking at language, not in terms of what is normal or expected but in terms of what is necessary. . . . in order for language to function as an adequate communication system between teacher and children in the learning situation (2, p. 122).

The proponents of this viewpoint consider the background and environment of the child inadequate and view the task of direct language instruction as one of creating a new environment capable of teaching the language desired by the school (9, p. 301). This approach to selection of content requires the child to conform to the school.

Another approach emphasizes the child and requires the school to adjust to the background of experiences of the child (5, p. 2). Saville-Troike suggested that although the vocabulary the child needs to survive in an English-dominant school is important, the source of that vocabulary should be the immediate home-school environment of the child (5, p. 3; 20, p. 87). Leeper suggested that the vocabulary presented in the second language needs a counterpart in the first language of the child (16, p. 210).
Should the school adjust to the background and abilities of the child, or should the child conform to the demands of the school? The debate continues from content selection to actual teaching techniques. Saville-Troike suggested using a variety of techniques based on the culture and learning style of the child, recognizing the fact that children "have learned to learn in different ways" (20, p. 84). In addition, the use of concrete objects was recommended by the Center for Applied Linguistics, ranging from those in the classroom to a wide variety from the world outside (4, p. 3; 5, p. 3). Teaching the second language through everyday active experiences was considered an important support to direct instruction by Leeper and others (5, p. 3; 16, p. 210). Offering the child plenty of opportunities to share thoughts and personal experiences with teachers and peers is also a part of adjusting to his needs (4, p. 3; 20, pp. 123-124).

Another method for the language instruction of young children developed by Bereiter and Engelmann requires the child to conform to the demands and requirements of the school. This method consists of a highly structured, rigid, repetitive series of drills (2, p. 111). An important part of this drill is the teaching of rules or definitions for certain language concepts and helping children apply these rules to different situations (2, pp. 105-110). The rationale behind the teaching of these rules is that the average middle-class child learns certain rules in the normal
acquisition of language. Therefore, the child who does not speak standard English must learn the same rules as the middle-class child for success in school (9, pp. 294-296).

The children in a teacher-directed program emphasizing drills are most often required to respond in unison to the questions and commands of the teacher with very little time allowed for individual responses (2, pp. 112-113). Teachers are encouraged to correct mistakes whenever they occur in a non-threatening but very consistent way (2, p. 119). Objects are considered useful only if they are to be used for the presentation of one concept under the direction of a teacher. In general, it is recommended that this program take place in very plain facilities (2, pp. 71-72). Bereiter wrote:

Ideally, the study rooms should be as small and plain as possible, perhaps no larger than 100 square feet of floor space. Uncluttered surroundings help ensure that the child will not get caught up in the glitter of an object-rich environment (2, p. 71).

Objections have been raised to the use of drills and the constant correction of mistakes in the teaching of a second language. The principle objection to the use of drills is that language is for conveying meaning (5, p. 3). Wolfe wrote, "We are not engaged in language behavior unless we are expressing ourselves syntactically as well as semantically by saying what we want or need to say" (25, p. 176). Wolfe also commented that the use of rules is more appropriate for adults since adults can actually think about language. Since children cannot do this, he recommended a
more natural language learning situation for them (25, p. 174). Saville-Troike and others advised caution in the correction of mistakes so that the child would continue to verbalize and try the new language (4, p. 3; 5, p. 6; 19, p. 537; 20, pp. 84-85).

The introduction of written English is another concern in the education of the bilingual child. In addition to the difficulties caused by the child's first language and his cultural background, the reading process itself can cause confusion in young minds. Studies conducted by Vygotsky and Reid showed that children do not always understand the purpose of reading and have trouble understanding such abstract concepts as "letter," "word," and "sentence" (7, p. 219; 18, pp. 60-61).

Finkel and Krawitz suggested that spoken English should be mastered before reading and writing are attempted (10, p. 91). Henderson agreed and included such readiness skills as printing one's name and recognizing the letters of the alphabet as prerequisites for reading instruction (12, pp. 15-16). However, Saville-Troike disagreed, stating that the child should not have to wait until he can speak English to begin reading English (20, p. 87). Finocchiaro recommended basing beginning reading material on the actual experience and existing vocabulary of the child (11, p. 137).

Recently, Trietsch and Monk adapted a comparable approach for beginning written language. The key vocabulary
approach, as they adapted it for use in American schools, depends entirely on the existing vocabulary and experiential background of the child (22, pp. 119-128). In writing about beginning reading, Clay concurred, suggesting the use of the child's own writing because such reading material is predictable and contains words the child can produce (6, p. 32).

Methodology

This study was conducted in an elementary school in the North Texas area. The population consisted of kindergarten and first-grade students who attended an English Language Development (ELD) class for part of the school day. All data were collected by the teacher of the ELD class.

Demographic data including date of birth, place of birth, grade level, language spoken at home, length of time in the school district, and previous school experience were collected from school registration forms and a survey of home language. The Prewriting Checklist of observations developed by Trietsch was also used to assess the fine motor coordination and interest in writing of each child (22, p. 112).

Beginning in October, those children who had been observed in four of the seven behaviors on the Prewriting Checklist, began daily participation in the key vocabulary approach as developed by Trietsch and Monk (22, pp. 119-128). In addition to the individual word boxes, a log was kept of the phrases and sentences written by each child.
Behaviors on the Key Vocabulary Concepts Checklist by Trietsch were recorded at the end of each month (22, p. 114).

In addition to the information collected from the key vocabulary approach, each child was evaluated during the third week in October using Pflaum's Checklist for Assessing Syntactic Maturity (17, pp. 70-71). The evaluation for each child was updated once a week ending in May. Interviews were conducted with each child's regular classroom teacher during the year to assess the verbal interaction of the child with English-speaking children. The data from the three checklists, the number and kinds of words added to the key vocabulary, and information from the teacher interviews were compiled on charts for each language group.

This study was descriptive in nature. The data collected were used to describe the progress of the key vocabulary, the expressive language of the child, and the verbal interaction of the child with other English-speaking children. At the end of the school year, two comparisons were made for each child. One comparison was between the progress of the key vocabulary and the progress of expressive language. The other comparison was made between the progress of the key vocabulary and the progress of interaction with other English-speaking children.

**Definition of Terms**

**ELD class.**--This class was conducted for a part of the school day for those students who were learning to speak
English as a second language. The development of vocabulary and the ability to communicate was emphasized in the instruction given to students in this class.

**Language group.**--A language group is a group of subjects who speak the same language as their first language.

**Key vocabulary approach.**--As defined by Trietsch this is "the method developed by Sylvia Ashton-Warner to elicit emotionally charged words from children and the resultant reading and writing of those words" (22, p. 13).

**Key word.**--A key word is an individual word in the key vocabulary of a subject.

**Function word.**--A function word is a word that is not a part of the key vocabulary of a subject but is used by the subject to write sentences.

**Writing.**--The term writing denotes the construction of phrases and sentences from key words and function words as well as the printing or copying of words, phrases, and sentences by the subjects.

**Expressive language.**--The expressive language of a subject is the language spoken by the subject.

**Limitations**

Certain limitations should be considered for the data collected for this study. First, the information gathered concerns the expressive language and writing of the subjects and not their receptive language. Second, the observation of
the behaviors on the three checklists was recorded either when observed or on a monthly basis. These dates do not necessarily indicate the time the subject was first capable of exhibiting the behavior. Also, the investigator had no way of knowing if the utterance of a subject was a memorized statement or an original phrase or sentence that the subject had never heard before.

The information gathered in interviews of classroom teachers is subjective and was influenced by the teacher's experience in observing children, memory, and the amount of time available for the direct observation of the subjects. Also, the interviews of classroom teachers were limited to observations of the interaction of the subjects with other English-speaking children. The influence of personality and individual learning styles was not investigated. Finally, information was not available on the educational level of the parents and their attitudes toward schools and education. The kinds of experiences the subjects had with reading and writing before coming to school were also unknown.


17. Pflaum, Susanna Whitney, "Implications for Early Childhood Education," The Development of Language and Reading in the Young Child, Columbus, Ohio, Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1974, pp. 66-82.


CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Research on the acquisition of language and literacy in English as a second language by young children is examined in this review. Research on the second language acquisition of children includes subjects of many different ages and numerous second languages (17, pp. 3-9). The studies in this review are limited to those including children who are seven years of age and younger and who are learning English as a second language. The emphasis of this review is on the process and sequence of English language development including the development of morphemes and syntax. Studies of beginning literacy are limited to those studies concerning the language experience approach and the key vocabulary approach.

Acquisition of English as a Second Language

During the latter part of 1973 and 1974, Courtney Cazden and her associates at Harvard conducted an observational study of two adults, to adolescents, and two children. Of the children, the boy was five years of age and the girl was four and a half years of age. All six subjects were native Spanish speakers and recent immigrants to the United States. They were learning English without any formal instruction.
Each subject was visited twice a month by an investigator and a transcriber who was fluent in both English and Spanish. During these visits, speech samples were recorded involving spontaneous conversation, conversations elicited with the Bilingual Syntax Measure and the Ilyin Oral Interview, games, and other experimental techniques. Samples were also recorded in prearranged social situations such as a party or dinner in a restaurant (5, pp. 9-25).

Ten months after the study began, Cazden and her associates made a final analysis of the data. Sequences of development for the negation of the verb within the sentence, wh-questions, and yes or no questions were identified. Auxiliary verbs were listed in the order in which they appeared in the speech of the subjects (5, pp. 50-51). In addition to the study by Cazden, three other observational studies have included a detailed description of the development of both negation and questions (1, 12, 30). Adams observed ten Spanish-speaking children over a two-year period by keeping a journal of their classroom conversations. The children ranged in age from four years eleven months to five years nine months at the beginning of the study. Several of the children spoke some English while the others relied on translations (1, p. 280).

Gerbault and Ravem observed their own children at home (12, 31). Gerbault kept notes on the spontaneous use of English by her daughter from age four years nine months to
five years eight months (12, pp. 3-4). Ravem recorded the spontaneous speech of his six-and-a-half-year-old son Rune over a three-month period and also administered a translation test at regular intervals (30, pp. 177-178).

The development of negation and questions as described by Cazden, Adams, and Gerbault has many similarities even though stages of development of these structures are outlined differently by each investigator. Children in the three studies began forming yes or no questions by using a simple declarative sentence with rising intonation at the end. When the inversion of the subject and auxiliary verb began, the subjects used the new form with variable accuracy (1, pp. 285-286; 5, p. 40; 12, pp. 5-6). Cazden and Adams noted the use of routine statements beginning with do (1, p. 285; 5, p. 36). Gerbault reported the presence of memorized yes or no and wh- questions in the speech of her subject (12, p. 5).

The development of wh- questions followed a similar pattern in all three studies. In the beginning the subject and auxiliary verb were not inverted at all resulting in questions such as "What you study?" (1, pp. 286-287; 5, p. 38; 12, p. 6). In the next stage, variable inversion is reported by Cazden and Gerbault (5, p. 38; 12, p. 6). The subjects in the study by Adams used inversion in sentences containing be, either in copula or auxiliary form (1, p. 287). Cazden and Gerbault observe the overgeneralization of inversion to
imbedded wh- questions. Gerbault's daughter said, "I don't know where is it" (12, p. 5). One of Cazden's subjects remarked, "I know where are you going" (5, p. 38). The next stage of development involves a period of differentiation for subjects in both studies. Non-imbedded wh- questions were inverted and imbedded wh- questions were not inverted (5, p. 38; 12, p. 5).

In analyzing the negative utterances of their subjects, Gerbault and Adams found that the children first formed this structure for a short period of time by placing no before the sentence as in "no drink milk" (1, p. 284; 12, p. 8). The form of the first negative statements made by the subjects in a study of first language learning by Klima and Bellugi was similar (20, p. 341). In the next stage of this sequence, the subjects observed by Gerbault and Adams placed no and not between the subject and main verb (1, p. 284; 12, p. 9). The subjects observed by Cazden began making negative statements by placing no and not between the subject and the main verb (5, pp. 29-30). All three investigators reported the use of don't in routine memorized statements during this stage. In the final stage, other auxiliary verbs such as can appeared with the negative and don't was inflected for tense (1, pp. 284-285; 5, pp. 29-30; 12, pp. 8-9).

Ravem's analysis of the questions and negative statements of his son Rune centers on the use of the auxiliary word do (30, pp. 175-177). In the first two samples of Rune's
speech the contraction *don't* was judged by Ravem to be another form of *not* and was placed before the verb as in "I don't talking to you" (30, p. 182). Wh- questions requiring *do* remained uninverted as in "What you reading to-yesterday?" (30, p. 181). However, subject and verb inversion was observed in yes or no questions such as "Like you food?" (30, pp. 180-182). In sample three, Rune began to use *do* to indicate both present and past tense in both wh- questions and yes or no questions (30, pp. 182-183).

In an extensive study of the development of negation in a seven-year-old Japanese boy, Milon reported a sequence that resembles the one described in the study of first language learners by Klima and Bellugi. Ken, the subject, was videotaped weekly during informal sessions in an English as a Second Language (ESL) class for six months. The data included 321 negative utterances. At first, Ken placed negative words before the sentence as in "no my turn" (24, p. 139). Later Ken began to place negative words between the subject and main verb and use auxiliary verbs such as *can* or *do*. He produced sentences such as "You no can go" (24, p. 140). Finally, Ken began to expand his use of auxiliary verbs to include the designation of tense. Such statements as "I never saw yours" occurred during this stage of development (24, pp. 141-142). Although a few differences exist between the formation of negative statements by Ken and those of the
subjects studied by Klima and Bellugi, the basic sequence was the same (24, p. 142).

Wode studied the development of English plural endings in the language development of four German children whose ages were from three years four months to nine years six months (33, pp. 103-104). Three stages of development for this form were identified from the data. First, the children used singular nouns to convey both singular and plural meanings. Second, they began to use plural inflections and continued to use singular nouns to express both singularity and plurality. Finally, the children used singular nouns for singular intention and plural nouns for plural intention (33, pp. 107-108).

Natalicio and Natalicio examined the development of plurals in a cross-sectional study of 144 males. The subjects were divided into four equal groups of first, second, third, and tenth graders. Each group contained an equal number of native Spanish speakers and native English speakers. Each subject was given a test requiring him to form plurals for nonsense words. Although the average proportion of correct responses was lower for native Spanish speakers, they seemed to acquire the different forms of English pluralization in the same order as native English speakers (25, pp. 1302-1304). Wode reported a similar sequence of acquisition by his subjects. The first plural ending used was -s followed by -es, -z, and -ez (33, p. 108).
Russell and Snow charted the development of English auxiliary verbs and other verb inflections, within the grammatical context of interrogative and declarative sentences, in the language of Spanish-speaking children. Initially, twenty-one kindergarten children were interviewed and data were collected from the speech of twelve who were able to complete the English portion of the interview. Five of that group were interviewed later in first and third grades (31, pp. 1-2). The researchers developed their own elicitation procedures designed to evoke both interrogative and positive and negative declarative sentences requiring the use of different verb endings and auxiliary verbs. Some responses were constructed by the children, and others were imitations of sentences presented by the investigators (31, p. 7). The same procedure was followed in both the first and third grade follow-up although the elicitation device was modified each time to include different auxiliary verbs and, in third grade, relative clauses (31, pp. 17, 23).

Initially, the kindergarten children tended to omit auxiliary verbs and tense and agreement inflections, -ed for past tense and -s for third person singular present tense. On the basis of their longitudinal data from sentence imitation, Russell and Snow suggested an order of acquisition for five auxiliary morphemes beginning with -ing followed by is, did not, has or have, and -ed or -en (31, p. 29). In a longitudinal study of a Vietnamese kindergarten child,
Kessler and Idar reported the early acquisition of the -ing inflection and the copula (19, p. 9). Adams, Cazden, and Gerbault also reported either the early appearance of acquisition of these two morphemes in the speech or their subjects (1, p. 281; 5, pp. 41-42; 12, p. 14).

With the early appearance of the present progressive tense in the English language development of so many first and second language learners, Wagner-Gough and Olshtain examined the function of this structure as well as its form (26, pp. 2-3; 32, pp. 156-157). Wagner-Gough observed a nursery school child, five years and eleven months of age, who spoke both Assyrian and Persian and who was beginning to learn English after a recent move to the United States (32, p. 155).

Olshtain conducted a two-month study of her daughter, who was six years and nine months of age. The child had been exposed to English during a previous visit to the United States and also in Israel (26, p. 4). In addition to written records of spontaneous conversation, Olshtain asked her subject to answer specific questions and to describe pictures designed to elicit specific verb tenses, simple present and past tense and present and past progressive tense. A translation test and a written fill-in-the-blank test were also used to determine the understanding of the function of the progressive tense by the child (26, pp. 5-8).
At the beginning of each study, the form of the progressive was unstable in the speech of both subjects (26, p. 13; 32, p. 158). Occasionally, the auxiliary verb was omitted in the speech of Wagner-Gough's subject, a common omission in the language of first language learners (4, p. 259; 32, p. 158). By the tenth session, Olshtain's subject was using the progressive form correctly in 90 per cent of obligatory contexts in her speech but continued to use this form to express both simple present and past tense (26, pp. 93-97). Wagner-Gough's subject never achieved 90 per cent accuracy in form and used the progressive in reference to four different time periods. In addition to describing immediate intention and ongoing activity, he used the progressive in speaking of the distant future, the past, and also in the imperative (32, pp. 158-159). By the end of the two-month period, Olshtain's subject was distinguishing the simple from the progressive form correctly (26, p. 97). The subject observed by Wagner-Gough never made such a distinction and used the progressive tense in contrast with any other verb form (32, p. 158).

In studying the development of the form and function of morphemes, investigators have questioned the similarities in first and second language acquisition. In some instances the sequence of development appeared to be the same as in the study of the negative utterances of a Japanese child by Milon (24). Other data revealed differences as did the
examination of the development of negation in the English language development of Spanish-speaking children by Cazden (5, p. 28). Cazden and her associates concluded that advanced cognitive development and the first language of the learner affect second language acquisition and cause differences in the sequence of development (5, p. 54).

Due to the advanced cognitive development of second language learners, Wagner-Gough cautioned that the development of structure may be similar to first language acquisition, but the development of function may differ greatly (32, p. 162). Subjects in a study of first language acquisition by Brown used the present progressive form to express present temporary duration of an event (4, p. 317). The subject observed by Wagner-Gough used the same form to describe events of the past as well as the distant future (32, pp. 158-160).

Dulay and Burt investigated the order of acquisition of morphemes for second language learners in order to find a common sequence. Three groups of Spanish-speaking children were included in the first study. One group was from Sacramento, California; another group was from Ysidro, California; and a third group was from East Harlem in New York City. These three groups differed in both the amount of their exposure to English and their level of proficiency in English. The sample included 151 children who came from schools where the **Bilingual Syntax Measure** was used to assess English
language development. The Bilingual Syntax Measure was designed to elicit eight of the fourteen morphemes investigated by Brown. These morphemes are: present progressive, plural, past irregular, possessive, articles, third person regular, contractible copula, and contractible auxiliary (10, pp. 251-253). Each morpheme was scored according to its correct usage, mere presence, or absence in an obligatory context. A group ratio was computed to compare usage to the total number of obligatory occasions. The data indicated a common sequence of acquisition for the three groups, a sequence that differed from the one identified by Brown (4, p. 271; 10, pp. 254-256).

In a later study conducted by Dulay and Burt, the order of acquisition of eleven morphemes by sixty Spanish-speaking children was compared to that of fifty-five Chinese-speaking children. The Bilingual Syntax Measure was used to elicit natural speech containing the morphemes for investigation. The acquisition sequences were similar for both groups (9). The order of acquisition for the five morphemes examined by Kesslar and Idar in their observations of a Vietnamese kindergarten child was similar to the order of acquisition identified by Dulay and Burt in this second study (19, p. 13). Gerbault also reported a significant correlation in the order of acquisition of morphemes by her daughter and the subjects studied by Dulay and Burt (12, p. 16).
The morpheme acquisition order of second language learners was investigated by Mace-Matluck in a cross-sectional study of 442 elementary school students in kindergarten through grade four. The four first-language groups represented were Spanish, Cantonese, Tagalog, and Ilokano. The MAT-SEA-CAL Oral Proficiency Test was administered to each child in his native language and in English. From the English version of the test, twenty-six items, containing ten morphemes analyzed by Roger Brown in his study of the first language acquisition, were selected for study (21, p. 6). Mean percentages of correct answers were computed for each morpheme according to home language background, English language proficiency level, and grade level.

An order of acquisition for the ten morphemes was then determined for each group and compared to the order of acquisition for first language learners. The correlation between the order of acquisition for the groups and first language learners was not significant. However, there was a significant correlation between the order of acquisition for each of the four language groups represented in the population (21, pp. 6-8).

In addition to identifying an order of acquisition of morphemes for second language learners, Dulay and Burt were also concerned with the role of first language interference in second language learning. They questioned the habit formation theorists who see language as a habit to be formed
by drill and practice. Habit formation theorists predict the occurrence of errors when the first language of the child and the second language he is acquiring differ (10, pp. 246-247). As Dulay and Burt relate this theory, errors "are believed to be the result of the child's transferring the structures of his L1 (his old habit) onto the structures of the L2 (the new habit he is trying to acquire)" (10, p. 247).

On the basis of the research by Roger Brown at Harvard and the linguistic theory of Noam Chomsky, Dulay and Burt investigated the possibility of a creative construction process in second language learning. Proponents of this theory recognized the ability of the child to form new sentences he had never heard and to reconstruct the immature forms of his language to match the more mature forms heard in the environment (10, pp. 246-247). Chomsky stated:

In particular, it seems to me impossible to accept the view that linguistic behavior is a matter of habit, that it is slowly acquired by reinforcement, association, and generalization. . . . Language is not a "habit structure." Ordinary linguistic behavior characteristically involves innovation, formation of new sentences and new patterns in accordance with rules of great abstractness and intricacy. This is true both of the speaker, who constructs new utterances appropriate to the occasion and of the hearer who must analyze and interpret these novel structures (6, pp. 43-44).

In a study of 145 Spanish-speaking children, ranging from five to eight years of age, Dulay and Burt analyzed 388 language errors. Each error was classified as either
similar to first language acquisition errors, due to the interference of Spanish, or unique. Errors that could have been due to both interference and development were not counted. In the analysis of the data, 85 per cent of the errors were classified as developmental; 12 per cent of the errors were unique; and only 3 per cent of the errors were due to interference from Spanish (10, pp. 248-249). On the basis of their findings in this study and their identification of a common acquisition order for Spanish-speaking children, Dulay and Burt concluded that second language acquisition by young children involves a creative construction process (10, p. 256).

The Role of Interaction with Children and Adults

Another aspect of second language acquisition is the influence of the verbal interaction of the child with other children and adults. Observations of a seven-year-old Spanish-speaking child, in a study by Peck, revealed a possible difference between what is learned in interaction with children and what is learned in interaction with adults. Interaction with children seemed to affect the phonology and syntax of the second language learner. Although the subject learned new words from his English-speaking friend, he also engaged in a lot of sound play that involved the repetition of both meaningful and nonsense words and phrases. The
subject was also teased by his playmate when words or sentences did not sound correct (28, pp. 390-398).

Peck and Wagner-Gough detected similar responses by their subjects to the language input from English-speaking children. Some words and phrases were imitated with either a similar or varied pattern of intonation. The subjects also expanded the phrases and sentences of their playmates or incorporated their utterances to form questions or responses (29, pp. 5-6; 32, pp. 163-168). Peck also observed the substitution of words for words of the same grammatical form (29, p. 6).

Huang discovered that imitation was the only method of language learning evidenced by his five-year-old subject during the subject's first month in an English-speaking environment. Huang observed almost every encounter the subject had with English-speaking children and adults for nineteen weeks. After the subject memorized some English words and phrases, he began to apply those words and phrases to similar situations. These memorized utterances seemed to have a global meaning for the subject. By using those phrases inappropriately in certain situations, the subject gave evidence that he did not understand the individual parts of those phrases. During the third month of observation, the subject took parts of memorized questions such as where's and what's and began to form new questions of his own (18).
The Acquisition of Literacy

The acquisition of written language is another task facing the young second language learner. Yetta Goodman questioned the need of the child to develop oral language before written language is introduced (15). Based on their investigation of the oral reading miscues of four English dialect groups and four English second language groups, Goodman and Goodman strongly recommend an experience based program that builds on the existing language of children (14, p. 632).

Goodman and Goodman view reading and writing as language processes that children acquire for the same reason they acquire oral language. "The reason is need. Language learning, whether oral or written, is motivated by the need to communicate, to understand and be understood" (13, p. 138). Because communication is the primary purpose of language, they concluded that the function of language precedes the form in language development (13, pp. 137-139).

Since we view language as a personal-social invention, we see both oral and written language as learned in the same way. In neither case is the user required by the nature of the task to have a high level of conscious awareness of the units and system. In both cases control over language comes through the preoccupation with communicative use. . . . In reading, as in listening, preoccupation with language itself detracts from meaning and produces inefficient and ineffective language use (13, p. 139).

Goodman and Goodman assume that children enter school as competent language learners who have not only learned how
to communicate orally but have also become aware of print and some of its functions (13, pp. 138-142). This observation is supported by data from the investigation of the language development of children from three different ethnic groups in New Zealand by Marie Clay. The Samoan children had higher reading scores than the Maori children, but their control of the English language was much less advanced. Clay offered a possible explanation for this difference by observing that the Samoan children have more contact with written material before coming to school (7, pp. 335-338).

Goodman and Goodman reported that children of all language backgrounds have abilities and strengths that can be used as a starting point for reading instruction (14, p. 633). They also gave evidence that children try to make sense out of what they read. In most of the groups investigated by Goodman and Goodman, 50 per cent or more of the miscues were either corrected or semantically acceptable (14, p. 86). They concluded that children need instruction that not only builds on existing strengths and understandings but that also has meaning and relevance for them (14, pp. 631-633).

Marie Clay reported the use of language experience reading with young children during their first months in the culturally diverse classrooms of New Zealand. The children began by reading and writing their own messages and stories before any formal instruction took place. Many of these
children spoke a first language other than English. A flexible plan of organization allowed them to continue language experience reading until they acquired enough English to move on to book reading (7, p. 335). Clay comments that

It becomes obvious why the child's own dictated sentences or stories have frequently been recommended. . . . What the child can produce he can also anticipate. This provides a fluency that gives him time to attend to cues, and to relate several cues to one another (8, p. 32).

In her colorful description of a workshop for teachers of bilingual children, Feeley illustrates the experiences a teacher can use to expand the vocabulary and concepts of children. The children who participated were involved in reading and writing through cooking experiences and children's literature (11). Birlem and Wiesendanger gave other examples of supporting language growth through writing stories and using words for categorization. They also explained methods for using children's stories to teach word attack skills (3).

One of the earliest investigations of the use of the language experience approach with Spanish-speaking children was reported by Meriam in 1933. In the program he examined, children in grades one through three were involved in games, songs, hand work, and story telling activities for the entire school day. The effectiveness of the program was measured by comparing the number of months in school to
the number of months progress in reading, writing, and arithmetic as measured by standardized tests. The children made sizeable gains from October, 1931 to June, 1932, although a control group was not used for comparison. Meriam concluded that a program such as this is a workable solution to the problem of teaching children who speak English as a second language (23).

In 1966, McCanne investigated the effectiveness of the language experience approach as compared to a traditional basal reader approach and a modified English as a Second Language (ESL) approach. The study included twenty-nine teachers in fifteen Colorado school districts. Each class contained between ten and twenty Spanish-speaking children. The children taught by the basal reader approach scored the highest in achievement of reading skills as measured by standardized tests. McCanne theorized that the teachers' lack of experience in using the language experience and ESL approaches and the reluctance of the children to participate in expressive language activities may account for the results. However, the language experience approach and the ESL approach were not viewed by McCanne as being detrimental to learning to read (22). Children in these groups developed "particular strengths in oral vocabulary and writing fluency, respectively" (22, p. 674).

Sylvia Ashton-Warner's key vocabulary approach has also been used as a variation of the language experience approach
for teaching children who speak English as a second language. In using this approach, the teacher writes words requested by the child on individual cards. After the child acquires a certain number of cards, he is encouraged to use them to write sentences and, later, stories (2, pp. 40-53).

Packer examined the use of the key vocabulary approach with kindergarten and first-grade children in four school districts across the United States. Although children who spoke English as a second language were not identified, five ethnic backgrounds were represented in the population. Lists of words requested by the children in each district were compared to vocabulary lists from basal pre-primers and primers and with each other. The most significant finding was the great difference between the personal key vocabulary of the children and the vocabulary of the basal readers (27).

In her review of the research on the language experience approach for culturally disadvantaged children, Hall discusses some of the limitations of the research methodology. First, implementation of the language experience approach varies widely. In comparing the results of different studies, a careful examination of teaching techniques is necessary. Some reports lacked detailed descriptions of classroom organization and procedures (16, pp. 24-25).

Second, the standardized tests used to measure reading achievement are not always adequate for evaluating the reading abilities of children from low socioeconomic groups and
language backgrounds other than English (16, p. 25). In their analysis of children's reading miscues, Goodman and Goodman reported that the children in their study were more proficient readers than their IQ or standardized test scores indicated (14, p. 625). They suggested that miscue analysis is more useful than standardized tests in monitoring progress because it reveals the growth and competence of the reader instead of mere performance (14, pp. 32-34). Yetta Goodman gave a further explanation of the value of children's errors by saying that

They have to make their own mistakes and we have to realize . . . that mistake making is part of risk taking. It's part of trying out a new experiment. It's trying hard at working something out.

. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

Are we interested in development, or are we interested in perfection? Are we interested in children making the letters right, spelling right, from the beginning; or do we believe that children need time to develop control over spelling, handwriting, all the things that we spend so much time doing (15).

Summary

In the research conducted to investigate the acquisition of English as a second language by young children, common sequences appear in the development of interrogative and negative statements, the development of plurals, and the use of auxiliary verbs. A common sequence also appears for the order of acquisition of morphemes by children of different first language groups. The advanced cognitive development and first language of the second language learner seem to
affect both form and function in second language acquisition. The interaction of children with other English-speaking children and adults also has a role in the acquisition of English as a second language.

The language experience and key vocabulary approaches can be used to incorporate the experiences of children in beginning literacy instruction and to expand the experiential background of children. These approaches also provide a way for the teacher to begin reading and writing instruction in a second language before the child has fully acquired that language.


10. __________, "Should We Teach Children Syntax?" Language Learning, XXIII (June, 1973), 245-258.


CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

Procedures for selecting a sample and collecting and analyzing data are presented in this chapter.

Selection of Subjects

The four subjects were selected from students in English Language Development (ELD) classes. After returning a copy of the Texas State Parental Survey of Home Language signed by a parent or guardian, kindergarten and first-grade children were tested with parts four and five of the Language Assessment Scales for kindergarten through fifth grade (LAS I). Part four of LAS I was used to evaluate sentence comprehension, and part five was used to assess oral production. Possible scores ranged from a high of five for total fluency to a low of one for a non-English speaker. Students who scored a three or less were assigned to the ELD class for at least one hour each day.

The subjects for this study were selected from a group of nine kindergarten and first-grade students for three reasons. First, the subjects were involved in beginning reading and writing instruction in the regular classroom. Second, they spoke only a few words of English. One subject scored a 1 on LAS I. The other three subjects were unable
to take the test because they were unable to understand and respond to the instructions. Finally, the ELD class for these four subjects was scheduled at a time when they could be observed without interruption from other students.

As Table I indicates, two children who were born in Vietnam and two children who were born in Mexico were included in the sample. The first subject (S1) was enrolled in kindergarten and was six years and three months of age at the beginning of the study. Both Vietnamese and Chinese were spoken in her home. According to remarks made by a translator and another Vietnamese student, S1 understood and spoke Chinese as well as Vietnamese. The degree of her fluency in these languages was not known. Information on her previous school experiences and the length of time she had lived in the school district was not available.

The second subject (S2) was also enrolled in kindergarten and was six years and five months of age at the beginning of the study. Vietnamese was spoken in his home. S2 had attended a local private kindergarten during the previous school year. The assumption was made that he lived in the school district or in the surrounding area at least one year prior to the study. The exact date of the family's move to the area was not available. Both S1 and S2 were able to participate in the study for the entire eight months.

The two children who were born in Mexico were siblings, brother and sister. The third subject (S3) was five years
TABLE I
DESCRIPTION OF THE SUBJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Age in Years/Months</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Place of Birth</th>
<th>First Language</th>
<th>Length of Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>6/3</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>8 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>6/5</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>8 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>5/10</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>3 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>7/6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>3 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and ten months of age at the beginning of the study and was enrolled in kindergarten. The fourth subject (S4) was seven years and six months of age at the beginning of the study and was enrolled in first grade. Spanish was spoken in their home, and their mother did not speak English. Information on previous school experiences and the date the subjects moved into the school district was not available. The subjects moved to another city at the end of the third month of the study. Progress was only evaluated for three months.

Collection of Data

Data for this study were collected over a period of eight months by the teacher of the ELD class during the 1980-1981 school year. On October 1, permission to collect the data was granted by the Assistant Superintendent for Instruction
in a north Texas area school district. Approval of the proposal was based on the agreement that the subjects would not be identified, that classroom instruction would not be interrupted for the collection of data, and that the subjects would not be treated differently from the students in other ELD classes (Appendix). The following week, the principal of the elementary school where the study was to be conducted also approved the proposal.

Demographic data were collected for each subject from school registration forms, the Texas State Parental Survey of Home Language, and the student score sheets for LAS I (Appendix). Information on the date and place of birth, previous school attendance, present grade level, and the date the subjects moved into the school district was obtained from the registration forms. The language spoken in the homes of the subjects was identified by the Texas State Parental Survey of Home Language. The ability of the subjects to speak and understand English was determined from their scores on LAS I as well as from observations.

Writing of the Key Vocabulary

During the last week of September, the writing capabilities of the subjects were evaluated using the Prewriting Checklist developed by Trietsch (3, p. 112). Children who were observed in four of the seven behaviors on the checklist
were then involved in writing of the key vocabulary (Appendix). Thereafter, the subjects were required to write each day with exceptions for illness, early dismissal, and special school activities. Each subject read his words to the teacher at least once a week, usually on Friday. The words in the personal key vocabulary which the subject could not recall were discarded.

The procedures for the writing of the key vocabulary developed by Trietsch and Monk were used as a guide for classroom organization and direction of the work of individual children (3, pp. 119-128). Four unique procedures were followed in this study. The subjects began by writing single words and progressed to writing phrases and sentences at their request. Inflections of words and the syntax of sentences were accepted as they were spoken by the subjects. Suggestions for more accurate forms were made from time to time. Those suggestions had to be repeated spontaneously by the subject in conversation with the teacher before the teacher wrote the word or phrase for the subject to copy. If the subject did not accept the suggestion, he was given the exact phrase or sentence he requested. All words used by the subjects in the writing of the key vocabulary were kept in individual packs and, later, in file boxes with alphabetical guides. Phrases and sentences written by the subjects were written daily in individual logs.
At the end of October and each month thereafter, the progress of the writing of the key vocabulary of each subject was evaluated using the Key Vocabulary Concepts Checklist (3, p. 114). The words used in the writing of the key vocabulary for the first time were counted and classified for each child. Each different word was counted once. The words were placed in categories similar to those used by Nelson in her classification of the vocabulary of young children who were learning English as a first language (1, pp. 16-17). The four categories are: nominals, action words, modifiers, and function words (Appendix). Nouns, action verbs, adjectives, adverbs, and the pronouns I and me were counted as personal key vocabulary words. Other pronouns, auxiliary verbs, forms of to be, prepositions, articles, conjunctions, and abstract adjectives and adverbs were regarded as function words necessary for writing but not as personal key vocabulary words.

**Progress in Expressive Language**

The expressive language of the subjects was evaluated with a checklist adapted from the Checklist for Assessing Syntactic Maturity by Pflaum (2, pp. 70-71). This checklist was designed to keep a record of the progress of specific syntactic structures that appear in the speech of first language learners ages three to six. For this study, the items were listed in the same order, but they were not
divided according to age groups. Also, the descriptions of
the structures were either reworded or shortened for the form
for the monthly collection of data and tables for the analysis
of data (Appendix).

Beginning the third week in October, segments of conver-
sation for each subject were recorded. The first time a
structure appeared in the speech of a subject during each
month, the date and the utterance were recorded on the check-
list for each subject. This procedure was continued until
the last week of February when the investigator began record-
ing one hour of conversation per week on cassette tape. The
tape recordings of the conversations were evaluated each week.
Syntactic structures appearing for the first time each month
were recorded in writing, and the date of the conversation
was recorded on the checklist.

To maintain consistency in the collection of data,
specific definitions were used in evaluating language with
the Checklist for Assessing Syntactic Maturity. A date was
recorded for the presence of subject-verb-object sentences
and sentences with a subject and an intransitive verb when
nouns and verbs appeared in the proper order in the speech of
each subject. Sentences with understood subjects were also
noted. Dates were recorded for inverted yes or no questions
and inverted wh- questions only when an auxiliary verb
appeared before the subject noun. Contractions such as what's
at the beginning of inverted wh- questions were also accepted.
A date was recorded when a wh-word appeared at the beginning of a question whether a verb was included or not.

The sentences produced by the subjects were evaluated for the presence and order of the required nouns and verbs and not for agreement between subject and verb. However, a date was recorded for the appearance of subject and verb agreement in present tense. The presence of present progressive tense, past tense, and future tense of verbs was noted when the forms of those verb tenses were observed in the speech of the subjects. Also, the subjects were required to use the auxiliary verb will for future tense and the -ing ending on verbs of present progressive tense. The presence of auxiliary verbs was recorded when they appeared in either questions or declarative sentences. A date was also recorded when to be was observed, either in copula or auxiliary form.

The appearance of clauses, infinitives, and prepositional phrases was also noted even though subjects did not always use a preposition with the correct meaning for the idea they were trying to express. A date was recorded for the appearance of relative clauses when any form of dependent clause was used by a subject. Simple, compound sentences joined by and and but were also noted.

Speech samples were examined for the presence of certain morphemes and parts of speech. The form for possession and negation was not considered important. Possession was expressed with pronouns and names placed before the subject
noun. The 's was not always present. Negation was noted when negative words were inserted in the middle of a sentence or when forms of do not and cannot were used. The presence of plural nouns was recorded when the irregular plural form or -s and -es endings on nouns were used by the subject. The use of adjectives to qualify nouns was recorded when adjectives appeared either before or after the noun. The case of pronouns used in the speech of the subjects was not considered important as long as they occurred in the correct position in the sentence.

Interaction with English-Speaking Children and Adults

Classroom teachers were interviewed to determine the ability of the subjects to follow directions, to participate in group activities, and to interact with other children in the regular classroom. One teacher was interviewed in November. The other teacher was not available for an interview until January. After these initial interviews and the withdrawal of two subjects in December, the investigator had three additional informal discussions with the remaining classroom teacher to ask about the progress of the subjects.

Data from the first interview were recorded on a form for each subject (Appendix). Individual anecdotal records were kept on informal conversations with the classroom teacher and with faculty members and other personnel who had contact with the subjects during the school day. All
interviews and conversations were brief and were conducted in an informal manner so that they would be similar to inquiries about other students in the ELD classes.

Analysis of Data

Progress in attaining literacy in English as a second language was described with the Prewriting Checklist, the Key Vocabulary Concepts Checklist, and the monthly count and classification of words used in the writing of the key vocabulary. Observations from the Prewriting Checklist were summarized. Tables were constructed for each language group to display the month-by-month development of concepts from the key vocabulary and the number and types of words used in writing for each subject.

Progress for each subject in expressive language was represented in demographic data and the Checklist for Assessing Syntactic Maturity. A demographic description of the subjects was summarized. The syntactic development of English was presented in tables representing the appearance of syntactic structures used in the speech of the subjects. The verbal interaction of each subject with other English-speaking children and adults was described by summarizing anecdotal records and data from interviews with classroom teachers.

A comparison of the progress in expressive language and the writing of the key vocabulary was made for each language group. Structures appearing in the log of writing recorded
for each subject were evaluated according to the Checklist for Assessing Syntactic Maturity. The monthly appearance of syntactic structures in the writing of the subjects was indicated. A comparison of the observed verbal interaction of each child with other English-speaking children and adults and progress in the key vocabulary was summarized for each subject.
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CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The data obtained from observations of the subjects and interviews and conversations with their teachers and other faculty members are used to describe their progress in expressive language, progress in the writing of the key vocabulary, and interaction with English-speaking children and adults. Then, progress in the key vocabulary is compared to progress in expressive language and to interaction with English-speaking children and adults for each child.

Vietnamese-Speaking Subjects

The Vietnamese-speaking subjects, S1 and S2, were described in detail in Chapter III. When S1 was visited in her classroom during the first week in September, she did not speak or seem to understand much English. S1 was unable to take the Language Assessment Scales (LAS). S2 made a score of one on LAS, indicating that he was a non-English speaker.

Research Question 1

What is the progress for each child in attaining literacy in English as a second language through the key vocabulary approach?
The description of the progress of S1 and S2 in attaining literacy in English as a second language begins with a summary of the prewriting behaviors of the subjects. The subjects exhibited the same four behaviors from the Prewriting Checklist. Both subjects drew, made letters, and wrote their own names. S1 omitted vowel letters when writing her name during the first observation, but she was able to write it completely within a few weeks.

The progress of S1 and S2 in their understanding of the concepts of the key vocabulary is illustrated in Table II. The understanding of S2 shows the most progress during the first month of the study. The understanding of the concepts of the key vocabulary by S1 grew to the same level as that of S2 by the end of the second month. During the first month of the study, S1 requested words by pointing to pictures in a picture dictionary. During the second month, she began to talk and ask for the words she wanted. Both subjects begin filing words used for writing in alphabetical order during the fourth month of the study because the necessary materials were provided at that time.

As is indicated in Table III, new words appeared each month in the writing of the subjects. The number of new words in each category increased during some months and decreased during other months. The number of nominals, action words, and modifiers recognized by the subjects at the end of the study was less than the total number of new
TABLE II

PROGRESS IN THE UNDERSTANDING OF KEY VOCABULARY CONCEPTS
BY VIETNAMESE SUBJECTS OVER A PERIOD OF EIGHT MONTHS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Vocabulary Concepts</th>
<th>Subject 1</th>
<th>Subject 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Makes request for words</td>
<td>X - - - -</td>
<td>X - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remembers words requested</td>
<td>- X - - -</td>
<td>X - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writes key words</td>
<td>X - - - -</td>
<td>X - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructs sentences from key words</td>
<td>- X - - -</td>
<td>X - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writes sentences constructed from key words</td>
<td>- X - - -</td>
<td>X - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reads sentences constructed from key words</td>
<td>- X - - -</td>
<td>X - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates ability to point to each word as read</td>
<td>- - X - -</td>
<td>- - X - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates ability to change verb tense</td>
<td>- - - X -</td>
<td>- - - X -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates ability to put key words into an alphabetical file</td>
<td>- - X - -</td>
<td>- - X - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writes simple story using key words</td>
<td>- - - X -</td>
<td>- - - X -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

words in those categories acquired over the entire period of eight months. This lack of equivalence indicates that some words from the key vocabulary were discarded.

Different nominals were added to the words used in writing during each month of the study. New action words and function words appeared in the writing of S1 during six months.
TABLE III
MONTHLY COUNT OF DIFFERENT WORDS USED IN WRITING BY VIETNAMESE-SPEAKING SUBJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Vocabulary Words</th>
<th>Subject 1</th>
<th>Subject 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 FC</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 FC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominals</td>
<td>3 1 2 1 4 1 1 7 4 2 3 4 7</td>
<td>9 8 1 0 1 4 8 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Words</td>
<td>- 1 2 1 1 2 1 - 4</td>
<td>1 3 2 1 2 4 1 - 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modifiers</td>
<td>- - - - - 5 1 - 2</td>
<td>- 2 - - 2 2 - - 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function Words</td>
<td>- 4 1 - 3 6 1 5 2 0</td>
<td>- 8 1 3 5 4 1 4 2 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Final count of different words used in writing.

Of the study and in the writing of S2 during seven months of the study. Different modifiers appeared only two or three times in words added to the key vocabulary of either subject. Although new function words appeared almost every month, the number of words in the key vocabulary of the subjects at the end of the study was greater than the number of function words at the end of the study. Among the three categories of words in the key vocabulary, the number of nominals is the largest group for both subjects at the end of the study. More action words than modifiers are present in the key vocabulary of S1 at the end of the study. Only one action word and one modifier are present in the key vocabulary of S2 at the end of the study.

**Research Question 2**

What is the progress for each child in expressive language?
The syntactic structures that appear each month in the speech of the subjects are displayed in Table IV. New structures appeared in the speech of S1 during the second, fifth, sixth, and seventh months of the study. Different structures appeared in the speech of S2 during the first six months of the study. Twelve of the structures in the speech of S1 and eight of the structures in the speech of S2 continued to appear each month following their first appearance. Six structures appeared intermittently in the speech of S1. Eleven structures appeared intermittently and one structure appeared only once in the speech of S2. Three structures did not ever appear in the expressive language of S1 while one structure did not ever appear in the expressive language of S2. The future tense of verbs did not appear in the expressive language of either subject.

The syntactic structures that appear in the speech of the subjects are arranged in the order of their first appearance by month in Table V. Fourteen structures appeared in the speech of S2 before they appeared in the speech of S1. Only two structures appeared first in the speech of S1. The use of negative words, adjectives, and the conjunctions and but occurred during the same months for both subjects. Four other structures that appeared at the beginning of the sequence for both subjects are possessives, pronouns, subject-verb-object sentences, and subject-verb agreement in present tense. Plural nouns, infinitives, wh-questions, and past
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syntactic Structures</th>
<th>Subject 1</th>
<th>Subject 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject-verb-object sentences</td>
<td>- X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X</td>
<td>X  -  -  X  X  X  X  X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject-intransitive verb</td>
<td>- - -  X  X  X  X  X  X  X</td>
<td>- X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of copula and be used in habitual action</td>
<td>- X  -  X  X  -  X</td>
<td>- - - - -  X  X  X  X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past tense when appropriate</td>
<td>- - - - X  X  X</td>
<td>- - - -  X  -  X  X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs ending in -ing when appropriate</td>
<td>- - - - X  X  X  X</td>
<td>- X  -  -  X  X  X  X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative word inserted in the middle of sentences</td>
<td>- X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X</td>
<td>- X  -  X  X  X  X  X  X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wh- word in questions</td>
<td>- - - -  X  X  X  X</td>
<td>- - - -  X  X  X  X  X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural inflection</td>
<td>- - - - X  X  X  X</td>
<td>- - - -  X  X  X  X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession</td>
<td>- X  -  X  X  X  X  X  X  X</td>
<td>X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject-verb agreement in present tense</td>
<td>- X  -  X  X  X  X  X  X  X</td>
<td>X  X  -  X  X  X  X  X  X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of auxiliary verbs</td>
<td>- - - - - - - - - -</td>
<td>- - X  -  -  X  X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negatives attached to do and can</td>
<td>- - - -  X  X  X  X</td>
<td>- X  -  X  X  X  X  X  X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverted yes or no questions</td>
<td>- - - - - - - - - -</td>
<td>- X  -  -  X  X  X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronoun used appropriately</td>
<td>- X  -  X  X  X  X  X  X  X</td>
<td>X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjectives to qualify nouns</td>
<td>- X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X</td>
<td>- X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infinitives used where appropriate</td>
<td>- - - - - -  X  X</td>
<td>- - - -  X  X  X  X  X  X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE IV
MONTHLY PROGRESS IN EXPRESSIVE LANGUAGE
BY VIETNAMESE-SPEAKING SUBJECTS
### TABLE IV--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syntactic Structures</th>
<th>Subject 1</th>
<th>Subject 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Future tense used</td>
<td>- - - - - - - -</td>
<td>- - - - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepositional phrases used</td>
<td>- x - x x x x x</td>
<td>- x x x x x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverted wh- questions</td>
<td>- - - - - x x x</td>
<td>- - - x - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple sentences joined with and and but</td>
<td>- - - - x x x</td>
<td>- - - x - x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative clauses used</td>
<td>- - - - x x x</td>
<td>- x - x x x x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

tense appeared during the last five months in the speech of both subjects.

The development of wh- questions appeared in a similar sequence for both subjects. First, a wh- word occurred at the beginning of a sentence. An auxiliary verb did not always appear before the subject noun or may not have been present at all in questions such as "What you make that one for?" During the month following the first appearance of a wh- word at the beginning of a question in the speech of each subject, inverted wh- questions such as "Who is this?" and "Where's that?" began to appear.

The two types of negative statements listed on the checklist occurred in a particular sequence in the speech of Sl. During the second month, Sl used negative words in
TABLE V
THE SEQUENCE OF THE FIRST APPEARANCE OF SYNTACTIC STRUCTURES IN THE EXPRESSIVE LANGUAGE OF VIETNAMESE-SPEAKING SUBJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject 1</th>
<th>Subject 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>October</strong></td>
<td><strong>November</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession</td>
<td>Possession negative word inserted in the middle of sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronoun used appropriately</td>
<td>Adjectives to qualify nouns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject-verb-object sentences</td>
<td>Subject-intransitive verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject-verb agreement in present tense</td>
<td>Verbs ending in -ing when appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative word inserted in the middle of sentences</td>
<td>Negatives attached to do and can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjectives to qualify nouns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepositional phrases used</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of copula and be used in habitual action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>December</strong></td>
<td><strong>January</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepositional phrases used</td>
<td>Plural inflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverted yes or no questions</td>
<td>Infinitives used where appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of auxiliary verbs</td>
<td>Wh- word in questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative clauses used</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>February</strong></td>
<td><strong>February</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple sentences joined with and and but</td>
<td>Simple sentences joined with and and but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wh- word in questions</td>
<td>Inverted wh- questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural inflection</td>
<td>Past tense when appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negatives attached to do and can</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject-intransitive verb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs ending in -ing when appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the middle of sentences to form such statements as "My Mommy no powder." During the fifth month, forms of do not began to appear in sentences such as "Don't put on the orange." Both types of negative statements appeared in the speech of S2 during the second month of the study.

The subjects seemed to make only a limited amount of progress in acquiring two of the syntactic structures from the checklist. First, possession occurred more often in the form of possessive pronouns. In the speech samples from S1, a possessive noun is used without the 's ending during the fifth month of the study and with the proper ending during the seventh and eighth months of the study. Second, the past tense form of verbs seemed to occur as a memorized statement when first appearing in the speech of S2. Only one statement in past tense was made by S2 during the fifth and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject 1</th>
<th>Subject 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>March</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverted wh- questions</td>
<td>Use of copula and be used in habitual action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past tense when appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative clauses used</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>April</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infinitives used where appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
seventh months of the study. He said, "I forgot." During the eighth month of the study other verbs in past tense appeared.

**Research Question 3**

What is the progress of the observed verbal interaction of each child with other English-speaking children?

The initial interview with the classroom teacher was conducted at the beginning of the fourth month for both subjects. In that interview, the teacher reported little progress for S1 in verbal interaction with other English-speaking children and adults. S1 looked to see what the other children were doing before attempting to follow instructions herself. She seldom talked to the other children in the class and usually sat and watched group activities instead of participating in them.

During the week of the initial interview with her teacher, S1 began to show progress in her ability to interact with other people by speaking to a visiting supervisor in the ELD class. The following week, S1 was able to follow the directions of the school nurse while taking vision and hearing tests. The first-grade teacher who took S1 to lunch each day reported that the subject was beginning to talk more often. The secretary from another school called to say that S1 was acting as a translator for her family. By the end of the fifth month, S1 was beginning to interact more freely
with her kindergarten teacher and the other children in her class. The subject continued to make progress throughout the school year.

The ability of S2 to interact with other children and adults seemed to remain constant from the time of the first interview until the end of the school year. At first report, he followed the instructions of the teacher easily, joined the other children in group activities, and talked to the other children as well as the teacher. In the three other discussions, his classroom teacher did not add much information to this initial description. From other observations it was evident that S2 enjoyed playing with other children and went eagerly with the first-grade classes for afternoon recess. When his older brother was on the playground, S2 liked to join in playing with the older boys.

Research Question 4

How does the expressive language of each child compare with the progress in the key vocabulary?

The progress of S1 and S2 in the key vocabulary is compared with their expressive language in Table VI. Of the twenty-one syntactic structures listed, nine did not occur in the writing of S1, including the three structures that did not appear in her expressive language. Five structures did not occur in the writing of S2, including the structure that did not appear in his expressive language. All twelve
TABLE VI
MONTHLY APPEARANCE OF SYNTACTIC STRUCTURES IN THE WRITING OF THE KEY VOCABULARY BY VIETNAMESE-SPEAKING SUBJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syntactic Structures</th>
<th>Subject 1</th>
<th>Subject 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject-verb-object sentences</td>
<td>- X X X X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject-intransitive verb</td>
<td>- - - - - X X</td>
<td>- - X X X - X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of copula and be used in habitual action</td>
<td>- - - - - X - X</td>
<td>- X - X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past tense when appropriate</td>
<td>- - - - - - - -</td>
<td>- - - X X X -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs ending in -ing when appropriate</td>
<td>- - - - X - - -</td>
<td>- - - - X - - X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative word inserted in the middle of sentence</td>
<td>- - - - - - X</td>
<td>- X - - - X -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wh- word in questions</td>
<td>- - - - - - - -</td>
<td>- - - X X - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural inflection</td>
<td>- - - - - - - -</td>
<td>- X - - X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession</td>
<td>- X X X - X X X</td>
<td>- X - X - - X -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject-verb agreement in present tense</td>
<td>- X X X X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of auxiliary verbs</td>
<td>- - - - - - - -</td>
<td>- - - - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negatives attached to do and can</td>
<td>- - - - - - - -</td>
<td>- X - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverted yes or no questions</td>
<td>- - - - - - - -</td>
<td>- - - - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronoun used appropriately</td>
<td>- - - X X X X X</td>
<td>- X X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjectives to qualify nouns</td>
<td>- - - X X X X X</td>
<td>X X - X X X X X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- indicates the appearance of the syntactic structure
structures in the writing of S1 occurred during the same month or after they occurred in her expressive language. Thirteen of the sixteen structures in the writing of S2 occurred during the same month or after they occurred in his expressive language. Of the twelve structures appearing in the writing of S1, nine appeared more times in expressive language than they did in the writing of the key vocabulary. One structure appeared the same number of times in both expressive language and writing. Of the sixteen structures appearing in the writing of S2, nine appeared more times in expressive language; and three structures appeared the same number of times in writing and in his expressive language.
Subject-verb-object sentences, subject-verb agreement in present tense, and possessive pronouns were three of the first structures to appear in both the writing of S1 and S2 and in their expressive language. The possessive pronoun was the only form of possession used in writing by either subject. The use of verbs in past tense by S2 was also limited. Each sentence written in past tense contained the verb hit, which remained in the same form for both present and past tense.

Research Question 5

How does the observed verbal interaction of each child with other English-speaking children compare with the progress in the key vocabulary?

The number of words added to the key vocabulary of S1 during the second and sixth months of the study coincided with observations of progress in her ability to interact with English-speaking children and adults. During the second month, S1 began to ask for words instead of pointing to pictures in a picture dictionary. She added four times as many words to her key vocabulary during the second month as she did the first month. At the end of the fifth month of the study, S1 began to talk and interact more freely with teachers, children, and other school personnel. During the sixth month, S1 added three times as many words to her key vocabulary as she did during the fifth month.
S2 interacted freely with other children and adults at the beginning of the study; and his ability to communicate, as indicated in Table V, progressed steadily during the first six months of the study. S2 also made progress in the writing of the key vocabulary. New words were added to his key vocabulary each month, and a new syntactic structure appeared in his writing each month for the first five months of the study.

Spanish-Speaking Subjects

Demographic data describing the Spanish speaking subjects, S3 and S4, were presented in Chapter III. Neither child spoke nor understood English well enough to complete LAS at the beginning of the school year.

Research Question 1

What is the progress for each child in attaining literacy in English as a second language through the key vocabulary approach?

Subjects S3 and S4 demonstrated the same behaviors from the Prewriting Checklist. Both subjects drew and scribbled, made letters and letter-like figures, and wrote their own names. The understanding of key vocabulary concepts by S3 and S4 also progressed simultaneously as indicated in Table VII. During the first month, both subjects requested, wrote, and remembered words in their own key vocabularies. During the second month, they constructed and wrote sentences and
TABLE VII
PROGRESS IN THE UNDERSTANDING OF KEY VOCABULARY CONCEPTS
BY SPANISH-SPEAKING SUBJECTS OVER A PERIOD OF
THREE MONTHS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Vocabulary Concepts</th>
<th>Subject 3</th>
<th>Subject 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes request for words</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remembers words requested</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writes key words</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructs sentences from key words</td>
<td>- X - X</td>
<td>- X - X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writes sentences constructed from key words</td>
<td>- X - X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reads sentences constructed from key words</td>
<td>- X - X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates ability to point to each word as read</td>
<td>- X - X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates ability to change verb tense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates ability to put key words into an alphabetical file in correct order</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writes simple story using key words</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

read those sentences while pointing to each word. Both subjects were ready to put their key words into an alphabetical file, but they withdrew from school before those materials were supplied.

The number and classification of new words used each month in the writing of the key vocabulary are displayed in
Table VIII. The number of new words used in the writing of the key vocabulary varied from month to month for both subjects. The number of nominals, action words, and modifiers comprising the key vocabulary of the subjects at the end of three months was less than the total number of different words added in those categories over the same period of time. The only exception was the modifier used by S4 during the first month, which remained a part of his key vocabulary for the entire three months.

TABLE VIII

MONTHLY COUNT OF DIFFERENT WORDS USED IN WRITING BY SPANISH-SPEAKING SUBJECTS

| Key Vocabulary Words | Subject 3 | | | | Subject 4 | | | |
|----------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
|                      | 1 2 3 FC* | 1 2 3 FC  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Nominals             | 6 13 2 14 | 8 7 7 15  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Action Words         | - 2 - 1   | - 3 3 3   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Modifiers            | - - - 1   | - - 1     |           |           |           |           |           |
| Function Words       | - 1 1 2   | 2 6 1 7   |           |           |           |           |           |

*Final Count of different words used in writing.

Different nominals were added to the words used in writing during each of the three months for both subjects. Action words were used by S3 during the second month and by S4 during the second and third months. Only one modifier was used by S4, who also used more function words compared to a total of two used by S3. In the final count of words used in the
writing of the key vocabulary, the number of words in the key vocabularies of both subjects was greater than the number of function words used in writing by both subjects. Nominals comprised the largest category of words in the key vocabulary for both subjects, followed by action words and modifiers.

Research Question 2

What is the progress for each child in expressive language?

Progress in expressive language for S3 and S4 is displayed in Table IX. Subject-verb-object sentences and negative words inserted in the middle of sentences occurred in the expressive language of S4 each month. Of four structures appearing twice in succession for S3 and six structures appearing twice in succession for S4, pronouns and subject-verb agreement in present tense appeared during two successive months for both subjects. Of three structures appearing once in the speech of S3 and four structures appearing once in the speech of S4, plural inflection appeared only once in the speech of both subjects. Twelve structures did not appear in the expressive language of S3, and nine structures did not appear in the expressive language of S4. Past tense, verbs ending in -ing, auxiliary verbs, inverted yes or no questions, infinitives, prepositional phrases, conjunctions, and relative clauses did not appear in the expressive language of either subject.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syntactic Structures</th>
<th>Subject 3</th>
<th>Subject 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject-verb-object sentences</td>
<td>- X -</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject-intransitive verb</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- X -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of copula and be used in habitual action</td>
<td>X X -</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past tense when appropriate</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs ending in -ing when appropriate</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative word inserted in the middle of sentences</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wh- word in questions</td>
<td>X - X</td>
<td>X X -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural inflection</td>
<td>- X -</td>
<td>- X -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession</td>
<td>- X X</td>
<td>- X -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject-verb agreement in present tense</td>
<td>- X X</td>
<td>- X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of auxiliary verbs</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negatives attached to do and can</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverted yes or no questions</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronoun used appropriately</td>
<td>- X X</td>
<td>- X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjectives to qualify nouns</td>
<td>- - X</td>
<td>- X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infinitives used where appropriate</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future tense used</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- X -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepositional phrases used</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverted wh- questions</td>
<td>X - X</td>
<td>X X -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple sentences joined with and and but</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative clauses used</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As is indicated in Table X, subject-verb-object sentences and adjectives appeared in the expressive language of S4, age seven, a month before they appeared in the expressive language of S3, age five. Inverted wh- questions occurred in the speech of both subjects during the first month. Possessive pronouns, pronouns, subject-verb agreement in present tense, and plural inflection occurred in the speech of both subjects during the second month. The possessive pronoun was the only form of possession observed in the expressive language of both subjects.

In the first negative statement of S4, the word *no* was inserted in the middle of the sentence "I no like that letter." The following month, S4 used forms of *do not* as in "Don't touch my cards." S4 was also the only subject to use future tense. This structure occurred only one time in the expressive language recorded for S4.

**Research Question 3**

What is the progress of the observed verbal interaction of each child with other English-speaking children?

The interaction of S3 with other English-speaking children and adults was reported in an interview with her teacher at the beginning of the fourth month of the study. S3 could follow some classroom instructions; but from time to time, she became confused and had to be shown what to do. She joined the other children in group activities and talked to
TABLE X

THE SEQUENCE OF THE FIRST APPEARANCE OF SYNTACTIC STRUCTURES IN THE EXPRESSIVE LANGUAGE OF SPANISH-SPEAKING SUBJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject 3</th>
<th>Subject 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>October</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of copula and <strong>be</strong> used in habitual action</td>
<td>Negative word inserted in the middle of sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wh-word in questions</td>
<td>Subject-verb-object sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverted wh-questions</td>
<td>Wh-word in questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverted wh-questions</td>
<td>Inverted wh-questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>November</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject-verb-object sentences</td>
<td>Possession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession</td>
<td>Pronoun used appropriately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronoun used appropriately</td>
<td>Subject-verb agreement in present tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject-verb agreement in present tense</td>
<td>Negatives attached to <strong>do</strong> and <strong>can</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural inflection</td>
<td>Adjectives to qualify nouns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>December</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject-intransitive verb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural inflection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future tense used</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjectives to qualify nouns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

them often. She tried to ask questions if she wanted something and pointed to the object she was talking about if she
could not think of the correct name. She was described as being very verbal.

The interaction of S4 with other English-speaking children and adults was reported in an interview with his teacher during the second month of the study. S4 had some trouble following directions at the beginning of the year, but he learned quickly and was following most directions without help at the time of the interview. He participated eagerly in the regular classroom and received satisfactory grades from the music teacher who took the class several times a week. S4 was well accepted by his classmates. He talked and played with them as if there were no language barrier at all.

Research Question 4

How does the expressive language of each child compare with the progress in the key vocabulary?

In a comparison between expressive language and progress in the key vocabulary for S3 and S4, three structures appeared in the writing of each subject that did not appear in their expressive language. However, five structures appeared in both the speech and writing of S3, and eight structures appeared in both the speech and writing of S4. In the writing of S3, three of those five structures appeared during the same month that they appeared in expressive language. In the writing of S4, three of those eight structures appeared in
his expressive language before they appeared in his writing. Four more structures in the writing of S4 appeared during the same month that they appeared in his expressive language.

As indicated in Table XI, eight different structures appeared in the writing of S3. Of those eight structures, four structures appeared in expressive language as many times as they appeared in the writing of the key vocabulary. Of the eleven structures used by S4, three structures appeared more times in his expressive language than they did in the writing of the key vocabulary. Five structures appeared the same number of times in his expressive language and in his writing of the key vocabulary. The possessive pronoun was the only form of possession used by either subject in the writing of the key vocabulary.

**Research Question 5**

How does the observed verbal interaction of each child with other English-speaking children compare with the progress in the key vocabulary?

The interaction of S3 and S4 with teachers and children was described as being lively and industrious. Progress in the writing of the key vocabulary is revealed in the data for both subjects. New words were added to the key vocabularies of S3 and S4 each month. Both subjects demonstrated their understanding of different concepts in the writing of the key vocabulary during the first two months of the study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syntactic Structures</th>
<th>Subject 3</th>
<th>Subject 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject-verb-object sentences</td>
<td>- X X</td>
<td>- X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject-intransitive verb</td>
<td>- X -</td>
<td>- - X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of copula and be used in habitual action</td>
<td>- - X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past tense when appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs ending in -ing when appropriate</td>
<td>- - X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative word inserted in the middle of sentences</td>
<td>- X -</td>
<td>- X -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wh- word in questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural inflection</td>
<td>X - - X -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession</td>
<td>X X - - X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject-verb agreement in present tense</td>
<td>- X X - X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of auxiliary verbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negatives attached to do and can</td>
<td>- X - - X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverted yes or no questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronoun used appropriately</td>
<td>- X X - X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjectives to qualify nouns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infinitives used where appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future tense used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepositional phrases used</td>
<td>- X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverted wh- questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple sentences joined with and and but</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative clauses used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Different syntactic structures appeared for the first time in the writing of S3 during the first two months of the study and in the writing of S4 during the first three months of the study.

Summary

When the two language groups are compared, similarities appear in demography, progress in the key vocabulary, and progress in expressive language. All four subjects came from homes where languages other than English were spoken. Three subjects were unable to speak or understand enough English to take parts four and five of LAS. A score of one on LAS was recorded for S2, which indicated that he was a non-English speaker at the beginning of the study.

Before writing of the key vocabulary began, all subjects were observed drawing, making letters and letter-like figures, and writing their own names. At the end of three months, all subjects were reading sentences constructed from key words. S3 and S4 could also point to each word as they read. New words appeared in the key vocabulary of each subject each month. In the final count of words, nominals comprised the largest category of words in the key vocabulary of each subject, followed by action words and modifiers. The final number of words in the key vocabulary of each subject was greater than the number of function words used in writing
and less than the total number of words added to the key vocabulary each month. The number of words added to the key vocabulary of each subject varied from month to month, and the key vocabulary of each subject changed over time as words were added and discarded.

Similarities also existed in the progress of the four subjects in expressive language. Subject-verb-object sentences, possessive pronouns, subject-verb agreement in present tense, pronouns, and adjectives were structures that appeared in the expressive language of the subjects during the first three months. Negative words appeared in the middle of sentences for S1, S2, and S4. The negative word in the middle of a sentence spoken by S2 was attached to the auxiliary can. Negatives attached to do and can appeared in the expressive language of S1 and S4 during the following months.

The acquisition of inverted wh- questions by S1, S2, and S4 illustrates another similarity in the progress of the subjects in expressive language. After the first appearance of inverted wh- questions in the speech of the subjects, S2 and S4 reverted back to forming wh- questions by placing a word such as where before a noun as in the question "Where Amy?" Both forms of wh- questions appeared in the expressive language of S1 on the same day. In addition to the instability of the mature form of wh- questions in the speech of S1, S2, and S4, certain structures appeared
intermittently in the speech of all four subjects. The progress of the four subjects in expressive language does not seem to be constant or consistent.

In addition to the similarities in the progress of the subjects in expressive language, differences in the progress of the two language groups in expressive language exist. Prepositional phrases, past tense, infinitives, and conjunctions only appeared in the expressive language of the Vietnamese-speaking subjects. Prepositional phrases appeared during the first three months. The other three structures appeared during the last five months. In the expressive language of Spanish-speaking subjects, inverted wh-questions appeared during the first month; and plural inflections appeared during the second month. Plural inflections did not appear in the speech of Vietnamese-speaking subjects until the fourth and fifth months. Vietnamese-speaking subjects began using wh-words in questions during the fourth and fifth months and progressed to forming inverted wh-questions during the fifth and sixth months.

Individual differences existed in the progress of S2 and S4 in expressive language. Auxiliary verbs and inverted yes or no questions appeared only in the speech of S2. Verbs ending in -ing and relative clauses appeared only in the speech of S2 during the first three months, although these structures also appeared in the speech of S1 during the fifth
and sixth months. Future tense appeared only one time in the expressive language of S4.

The subjects in this study acquired some structures in their expressive language in the same manner as other subjects, whose acquisition of English as a second language has been studied by other investigators. S1 and S4 began forming negative statements by inserting a negative word in the middle of a sentence. Later, both subjects used forms of do not and cannot in statements such as "Don't put on the orange" and "I don't have a pencil." S1 and S2 began forming wh- questions by placing a wh- word at the beginning of a declarative statement as in "What you make that one for?" Inverted wh- questions such "Who is this?" occurred later.

Similarities appear in the comparisons of progress in expressive language and progress in the key vocabulary for both language groups. Of the structures that appeared in both the writing and expressive language of the subjects, 50 per cent or more occurred in the writing of the key vocabulary by each subject during the same month or after they appeared in expressive language. Of the structures appearing in the writing of the key vocabulary, 50 per cent or more appeared the same number of times or a greater number of times in the expressive language of each subject. Some structures appeared intermittently or only once in the writing of the key vocabulary by S1 and S2. Some structures appeared only once in the writing of the key vocabulary by S3 and S4.
Another similarity appears in the comparison of progress in the key vocabulary and interaction of the subjects with English-speaking children and adults. The subjects differed in their manner of interaction. S3 and S4 were very active in their use of English from the beginning of the study. S2 also conversed freely and enjoyed playing with other children during the entire study. S1 was quieter and did not say much during the first month of the study. Although the subjects interacted with other children and adults in different ways, they all made progress in the writing of the key vocabulary.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary

This study was conducted to examine the process and sequence of acquisition of English as a second language by four young children. The study was conducted over an eight-month period in an elementary school in the north Texas area. Progress in the writing of the key vocabulary by young children who are learning English as a second language and its relationship to expressive language and interaction with English-speaking children and adults was investigated.

The sample consisted of kindergarten and first-grade students who were learning English as a second language and who attended an English Language Development (ELD) class for part of the school day. All data, except the interviews with classroom teachers, were collected in the ELD class. Demographic data were collected from school registration forms along with a survey of home language. Scores from LAS I were recorded to establish the ability of the subjects to speak and to understand English at the beginning of the study. The Prewriting Checklist developed by Trietsch was also used to assess the fine motor coordination and interest in writing of each subject.
Beginning in October, those subjects who had been observed in four of the seven behaviors on the Prewriting Checklist, began daily participation in key vocabulary writing. In addition to individual collections of words, a log was kept of the phrases and sentences written by each subject. Behaviors from the Key Vocabulary Concepts Checklist observed in the writing of the subjects were recorded at the end of each month, beginning in October. New words added to the key vocabulary and new function words used in the writing of the key vocabulary were classified and counted at the end of each month.

In addition to the information collected from the writing of the key vocabulary, samples of spontaneous conversation of the subjects were collected each week, beginning the last week of October, and evaluated according to the Checklist for Assessing Syntactic Maturity. From October through January, the conversations were recorded in writing. Beginning in February, two half-hour segments of conversation were tape recorded and evaluated each week.

During the course of the study, four brief interviews were conducted with the classroom teacher of each subject to assess the verbal interaction of the subjects with English-speaking children. Anecdotal records were also kept on the interaction of the subjects with English-speaking children and adults outside the regular classroom. The data from the three checklists, the number and kinds of words used in the
writing of the key vocabulary, and information from the teacher interviews were compiled on data collection forms for each subject.

This study was descriptive in nature. The data collected were used to describe the progress of the key vocabulary, the expressive language of the subjects, and the verbal interaction of the subjects with other English-speaking children and adults. At the end of the eight-month period, tables were constructed to show the month by month progress of each subject in the writing of the key vocabulary and expressive language. Then, two comparisons were made for each subject. One comparison was between progress in writing the key vocabulary and progress in expressive language. The other comparison was made between progress in writing the key vocabulary and the progress of interaction with other English-speaking children and adults.

Findings

The following findings result from the data collected by observation of the four subjects of this study.

1. The number of new words and different syntactic structures used in the writing of the key vocabulary by the subjects varied from month to month, and the key vocabularies of the subjects changed from month to month.

2. Syntactic structures appeared intermittently in the expressive language of the subjects, and the acquisition of some syntactic structures by the subjects was unstable.
3. The subjects differed in their manner of interaction with other English-speaking children and adults.

4. The subjects progressed in both the writing of the key vocabulary and expressive language. Some syntactic structures appeared in the expressive language of the subjects before they appeared in writing, and some syntactic structures appeared intermittently in both expressive language and the writing of the key vocabulary.

5. Although different styles of interaction with English-speaking children and adults were reported for the subjects, all subjects made progress in the writing of the key vocabulary.

Conclusions

Two major conclusions are drawn from the findings of this study and are limited to the small sample in this study and the brief amount of time the Spanish-speaking subjects were available for observation.

1. Through the use of the key vocabulary approach, children who are learning English as a second language can also progress in literacy in English at the same time they are learning the language.

2. Children can progress in both the writing of the key vocabulary and expressive language regardless of the way they interact with other English-speaking children and adults.
Recommendations

The following recommendations are made for future research and are based on the findings and conclusions of this study.

1. Further research is recommended on the progress young children make in literacy and expressive language in English as a second language.

2. The investigation of programs for teaching literacy and English as a second language is recommended to determine whether or not their underlying philosophies are supported by research.

3. The reevaluation of tests used to measure the effectiveness of such programs is recommended to determine their accuracy in describing the abilities of children to use and to understand language.

4. The examination of personality, individual learning styles, and attitudes of the family is recommended to determine their affect on the language and literacy development of the child.

5. The documentation of the progress of non-English-speaking children assigned to classes of English-speaking children is also recommended.

Implications

The key vocabulary approach to beginning literacy should be considered as a viable alternative to the approach that
involves workbooks with an emphasis on learning individual letters of the alphabet and their phonemes. An increasing number of children who speak English as a second language are enrolling in public schools where only English-speaking children have attended in the past. In some cases, only one child in a class may be learning English as a second language. If certain English phonemes do not exist in the first language of the child, learning to read by recognizing those phonemes and using them to decode the unfamiliar words of a second language can be difficult and make reading a meaningless exercise.
APPENDICES
September 29, 1980

Dear

This is a portion of the thesis proposal I submitted for approval this summer at North Texas State University. At the end of this document, you will find a summary of the data I would like to collect.

After two full weeks of ELD classes, I already have four subjects in mind for this study. Let me assure you that I do not intend to report their names or any other information that could identify them or their families. Also, this study will not interfere in any way with the teaching that I do in the ELD class.

I am looking forward to our meeting Wednesday afternoon. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Yours truly,

Barbara Jane Tucker
Demographic Data

Student No. ____

AGR Form
1. Date of Birth ________________________________
2. Place of Birth ________________________________
3. Last School Attended __________________________
4. Present Grade ________________________________
5. Date Student Moved into __________________________ Independent School
District ________________________________

Texas State Parental Survey of Home Language

Language Spoken at Home _____________ LAS Test Score ____

Prewriting Checklist

____ Draws and Scribbles
____ Makes Letter-Like Figures
____ Requests Adult to Write Name
____ Makes Letters
____ Writes Own Name
____ Asks How to Spell Word
____ Asks How to Spell Word Other Than Name
Checklist for Assessing Syntactic Maturity

Date

Structure Observed

- Subject-verb-object sentences
- Subject-intransitive verb
- Use of copula -- "be" used in habitual action
- Past tense when appropriate
- -ing on verbs when appropriate
- Negative word inserted in the middle of sentences
- Wh-word in questions
- Plural inflection
- Possession
- Subject-verb agreement in present
- Use of AUX forms such as "do," "has," "been"
- Negatives attached to "do"
- In yes/no questions, subject and AUX inverted
- Pronoun used appropriately
- Adjectives to qualify nouns
- Infinitives used where appropriate
- Future tense used
- Prepositional phrases used
- Wh-word question subject, AUX inversion used
- Simple sentences conjoined with "and" and "but"
- Relative clauses used

Key Vocabulary Concepts

- Makes request for words
- Remembers words requested
- Writes Key Words
- Constructs sentences from Key Words
- Writes sentences constructed from Key Words
- Reads sentences constructed from Key Words

- Demonstrates ability to point to each word as read
- Demonstrates ability to change verb tense
- Demonstrates ability to put Key Words into an alphabetical file in correct order
- Writes simple story using Key Words

Key Vocabulary Words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominals</th>
<th>Action Words</th>
<th>Modifiers</th>
<th>Function Words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Student No. ___

Teacher Interview

1. Is __________ able to follow your instructions?

2. Does __________ join the other children in singing, finger plays, repetitive stories, etc.?

3. Does __________ talk to the other children in the class?

Other Comments
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