English as a Second Dialect: A Handbook for Teachers

by

Stephen Larre
B.A., University of Victoria, 1999

An M.Ed. Project Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF EDUCATION

in the Faculty of Education, Department of Curriculum and Instruction.

© Stephen Larre, 2009
University of Victoria

All rights reserved. This thesis may not be reproduced in whole or in part, by photocopy or other means, without the permission of the author.
Supervisory Committee

English as a Second Dialect: A Handbook for Teachers

by

Stephen Larre
B.A., University of Victoria, 1999

Supervisory Committee

Deborah L. Begoray, PhD. (Department of Curriculum and Instruction)
Supervisor

Sylvia Pantaleo, PhD. (Department of Curriculum and Instruction)
Departmental Member
Abstract

Many students enter school speaking nonstandard dialects of English. Because Standard English is expected in institutions like schools and businesses, mastery of the standard dialect is important for nonstandard dialect-speaking students. The English as a Second Dialect (ESD) program is intended to teach students mastery of Standard English through culturally responsive pedagogy. This handbook reviews the research related to second-dialect teaching, then outlines suggestions for classroom use. The target audience is classroom teachers, administrators, and ESD specialist teachers. (Contains 65 references).
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Introduction

“My son is real mischief.”

This statement was the warning that greeted me as I stepped off the boat and onto the dock at an isolated fly-in community on the west coast of Vancouver Island. It was late August, 2003, and I had just arrived to begin a high school humanities teaching assignment at the local public school. Everything about the experience was new to me. It was my first time teaching in a very small school (about 50 students in Grades 1-12), and my first time teaching in a First Nations community (more than 90% of the students were from the local First Nation). The speaker was a local person of First Nations ancestry, the mother of two children whom I would soon be teaching. While the content of the mother’s warning was unexpected (though as I soon discovered, it was quite accurate), I was struck by the unusual way that she expressed herself. Being somewhat shy, I resisted the urge to say “really mischievous,” but the English teacher inside me cringed just a little bit.

In my first few weeks at school I encountered a number of issues involving cross-cultural communication. I was struggling to generate discussion in my English classroom; after asking a question, I was often greeted with silence and a dozen sets of raised eyebrows. Initially, I found this silence unsettling, and tried as best I could to break questions down into more manageable chunks for the students. It wasn’t until one particular encounter with a student where the communication breakdown became obvious.

“S____,” I asked, “did you read the poem?”
She did not reply, just looked up at me and raised her eyebrows. I thought she might not have heard my question. “Have you finished reading the poem?”

Again, she just looked at me and raised her eyebrows, this time with an annoyed look on her face. I assumed her lack of response meant that she hadn’t read it yet, so I asked her to read the poem.

“I did,” she replied, clearly frustrated with me.

“I asked you twice and you didn’t say anything!”

She groaned. “Well, I raised my eyebrows, didn’t I?”

I was beginning to realize that my students had a different way of communicating from the style to which I was accustomed. They used words, phrases, and sentence structures that I thought were unusual (and, at least initially, off-putting) to my ear. Also foreign to me was the notion that conversation was not simply the words that came out of one’s mouth. Students might answer a question non-verbally, with raised eyebrows to indicate agreement or a positive response and a scrunched nose to indicate disagreement or a negative response. In the story above, my student was not ignoring my question; she had been answering my question all along, and I had simply failed to understand her response.

I found the difference in language use obvious in students’ written work. Students’ writing often contained many grammatical errors, though I soon noticed that these same “errors” were also present in the students’ speech (I use the word errors because that is what I believed them to be at the time. If one starts from the assumption that Standard / School English is “correct” English, as I did at the time, then instances of nonstandard dialect seem to be errors). I asked students to re-read certain parts of their writing, asking
them if it “sounded right” or if that “is the way we say it.” To my surprise, the students did not find these prompts very helpful.

These were some of my first encounters with dialect difference in the classroom. As a middle class white teacher, raised in a home speaking the Standard English dialect, teaching students who spoke differently from me was a challenge. Not only were there linguistic differences between myself and my students, there were also obvious cultural differences. One exchange that opened my eyes to the impact of these cultural differences occurred in my senior (Grades 10-12) English class. We had begun a novel study the previous week (William Golding’s *Lord of the Flies*), and students were resisting, albeit passively, engagement with the novel. One student in particular, M__, a bright young man who was usually engaged in class, was not participating to the level that I had come to expect from him. My senior English class had about a dozen students in Grades 10-12, taking a combination of English Language Arts and Communications courses. Having grown up in southern Vancouver Island, in a mostly white high school of about 500 students in Grades 8-12, this classroom experience was very different to any I had ever experienced.

The novel to be studied in class was one that I had read in high school. As a young English teacher, I drew upon my personal experiences as a student when planning my courses. The novel is one that is frequently used in high schools across North America; I remembered enjoying it as a student, and thought it a good choice for the classroom. Because of these reasons, I was surprised by the resistance that I encountered to the novel.

After class one day, I asked M_____ why he wasn’t reading the novel. M____ could be counted on to tell me the truth. After some hesitation, he finally said to me:
"Man, Larre ... what has this book got to do with me?"

These words stung me, and caused me to reflect on some of the assumptions I was bringing to the classroom; this conversation was the first time I started to think about the issue of culture in the classroom. As a student, I was able to connect to the novel, as I found the characters and situations relevant to my experience. But this student was telling me that he could find nothing in it to connect with. These experiences, as well as countless others, in my first years as a teacher of First Nations students led me to wonder about cultural and linguistic differences between teachers and students in the classroom. Clearly, something was going on with regards to language that was outside my experience and expertise.

In the months and years that followed, I became more aware of the achievement gap existing between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal students in British Columbia. Like First Nations students provincially, many students in our school and district were not experiencing success in school. I believed that most of the students in our school were very bright, and capable of achieving much higher results than what had been demonstrated. This belief led me to wonder about why First Nations students, both in my school and in the wider education system, were not experiencing success in school. I wondered about cross-cultural communication, and cultural differences between teachers and students. I felt that my university training had not prepared me for issues of cultural and linguistic difference in the classroom. I did not know enough to be an effective teacher of English Language Arts for these students, so I enrolled in the Language & Literacy M.Ed. program at the University of Victoria to increase my understanding.
Goals and Audience

My goal in writing this handbook is to raise awareness of the role of dialect difference in education in myself and in my fellow teachers, both classroom teachers and ESD specialists. My current school district introduced the English as a Second Dialect program in the 2005-06 school year. It was seen as a way to help close the achievement gap between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal students in the district. I was one of the first teachers of ESD in our district, and received some training from a neighbouring district that had been running an ESD program for a number of years. The training focused on Ministry reporting requirements and a few classroom activities; however, the rationale and philosophy that provide the foundation of the program were only briefly explained. Having been involved in the introduction of the English as a Second Dialect program in School District 84, I was aware that many teachers in the district (including myself) had little understanding of the issue of dialect difference. The only fact that most of us knew was that this program was for struggling First Nations students. Upon my move to a district position in 2007-08, I came to realize that the level of awareness in the district had not changed. Classroom teachers knew that they had students who were registered for the ESD program, and knew that the ESD teacher would work with these students a few times a week. But few classroom teachers were aware of the influence of dialect in the classroom. One of the purposes of this handbook is to introduce teachers to the concept of dialect difference, with some culturally responsive ideas for classroom practice that will help nonstandard dialect speakers to master Standard English.

I hope that this handbook will also provide some background knowledge and instructional ideas for ESD specialist teachers. Each school in our district has a part-time
teacher dedicated to ESD support; however, to my knowledge, none of these teachers has had any education or training for ESD. In many schools, the ESD acronym has come to stand for “English Skills Development,” bypassing the notion of dialect altogether. In order to ensure that resources and time are used effectively, it is important that our ESD teachers have some understanding of the issues of dialect difference, and some strategies to employ with students. ESD teachers have been asking for some support and direction in terms of program delivery; my hope is that this handbook will be one piece of support for these teachers.

In my coursework for the M. Ed at UVic, the subject of dialect emerged from time to time. As I had some ESD teaching time in my then-current role of teaching principal in Kyuquot, I brought up the subject of ESD instruction. I was surprised to learn that most of my colleagues were unaware of the ESD program, a program that I was sure was taking place in their districts and schools. Though the program was relatively new to our district, I expected teachers, especially those involved in graduate studies in language and literacy, to at least be aware of the program. Perhaps these expectations were unreasonable, as I started to notice that very few teachers in my own district were aware of the ESD program, its purpose, and its relevance to their classrooms (almost half of the students in our district are First Nations).

My school district has recently signed an agreement with representatives of local First Nations called an Enhancement Agreement. The Enhancement Agreement is a five year partnership to raise the achievement of Aboriginal students in the district; in the process of forming the agreement, local First Nations people were asked to identify their goals and hopes for students in the school system. One of the four major strands in our
Enhancement Agreement is called “Skills for Learning,” and its focus is on ensuring that First Nations students have the skills necessary to participate meaningfully in an academic program, and to have the option of pursuing post-secondary education if they desire it. Though not stated explicitly in the Enhancement Agreement, mastery of Standard English is a critical component of this goal. If this handbook helps to improve the ESD support that First Nations students receive, allowing them greater mastery of the dialect of power, then this handbook will be helping to further the goal as expressed in the Enhancement Agreement.

Perhaps my most important goal in writing this handbook has been to expand my own understanding of the ESD program. In the past four years, I have had some teaching time dedicated to ESD support. When I began these assignments, I had no background knowledge about good professional practice in an ESD program. With no expertise in the district, ESD teachers were largely left to invent the program for ourselves. Though at times this approach has been effective, I wanted to know more about effective ESD instruction, including both theory and practice. The process of writing this handbook has led me to a much greater level of personal understanding.

Limitations of the Handbook

The major limitation of the handbook is that it is written by a single author. The research that was used as the basis of the handbook was selected solely by the author, and the information has passed only through the filter of my limited experience. As such, this work is subject to the author’s bias. A more complete handbook would be written by a group of ESD teachers who could interpret and apply the research based on a much broader range of experience.
The research base of this handbook may be seen as a limitation. Because of the scarcity of research on the issue of First Nations English dialects in the classroom, the majority of research used is based on other cultural and linguistic groups. By far the majority of the research available on dialect difference is based on African-American Vernacular English in the United States, with Aboriginal English dialects in Australia also providing some material. Another significant limitation of the handbook is the lack of linguistic expertise about local nonstandard dialects in School District 84. Without a background in linguistics, and unable to find any research specifically about the English dialects of Northern Nuuchahnulth people, in this handbook I deal with dialect difference generically. Without specialized knowledge about the specifics of local dialects, I was forced to talk about dialect differences without providing many explicit examples of how the local dialect(s) are different from Standard English. However, it is my belief that the theories of culturally responsive teaching and additive bidialectalism are relevant to all cultures. However, the handbook would certainly be strengthened by more research into the dialects of First Nations people, particularly the Nuuchahnulth peoples of the West Coast of Vancouver Island.

**Future Plans**

The handbook will be given to School District 84. My hope is that the district will accept the handbook and use it to assist ESD teachers in the district. Though each school has a teacher assigned to the ESD program, most ESD specialists in our district have very little experience, training, or background information about the program. With this handbook, ESD specialists will have some of the research around dialect difference and instructional strategies to help ESD students succeed.
As noted above, one of the limitations of the handbook that I hope will be overcome in the future is the lack of specific information about the English dialects of Northern Nuuchahnulth people. As teachers begin to understand the role of dialect in the classroom, there may be an opportunity for a research partnership between a teacher and the local First Nations’ community to document the features of a local dialect. With more specific knowledge about local dialects, instruction can be fine-tuned to help students see the differences between their home dialect and Standard English. In order for ESD instruction to be its most effective, schools need to be working with their local communities to tailor the instruction to local needs, and to make the program as culturally responsive as possible.
English as a Second Dialect

Imagine yourself as a child born and raised in Canada who has immigrated to Manchester, England before the start of Grade 1. Like your peers, you look forward to the start of a new school year, and are eager to learn who your new teacher is, and excited to meet the children in your class.

However, unlike most of the other children in your class, you speak differently; your language is different from most of the students in the class, and different from the language of the teacher. You speak standard Canadian English, the same form of English that your parents speak and the form that you have grown up with. Your language seems perfectly normal to you, though some of your classmates have commented that you “talk funny” or that you don’t speak “proper English.” The teacher, the principal, and most of the other students in the class speak a different form of English. They pronounce words differently than you. They use words that you have never heard, and some words that are the same have different meanings to them. They use some phrases and expressions that you recognize as English, and that they all seem to understand, which do not make sense to you. When instructing you not to go to leave school grounds at recess, the teachers tells you that “yer munna do it.” You are immersed in this alternate form of English throughout the school day, but when you come home to your parents, they speak “Canadian” English. Though you teacher tries her hardest to correct your speech and eradicate your use of “Canadian” in your writing, the features of Canadian language don’t seem to be disappearing. The teacher’s continual attempts to correct your language leave you confused, as you are using the language you have known since infancy; it is the language of your parents and your home community.
This scenario is illustrative of the struggles faced by many students in British Columbia. Though English is their first language, and the language of their parents, these students enter school speaking a different form of English (a nonstandard dialect) from mainstream English (which is simply another dialect). Just like Canadian English in the example above is not inferior to Manchester English (a Lancashire dialect), the dialects that many students are raised with are not deficient or inferior to school English; they are simply different. This difference can be a source of difficulty for many students. The English as a Second Dialect (ESD) program is intended to bridge the gap between the dialect of home and the dialect expected at school.

This handbook is intended to assist classroom teachers and ESD specialists in meeting the needs of ESD students. It provides an overview of research relevant to the ESD program, including the nature of dialects and the impact of dialect difference on student achievement. The latter half of the handbook provides examples of culturally responsive classroom activities for ESD students, divided into the realms of reading, writing, and oral language. Teachers of ESD students will also find a glossary of terms and Ministry of Education reporting requirements, including templates for required documentation. Though this handbook is targeted specifically for the English as a Second Dialect program, the broader concepts (such as culturally responsive teaching) and instructional ideas are relevant to all students.

“It must be difficult to face a learning situation where you are not understanding everything, where expectations are different, where you may be being put down because you’re speaking in a different way, and where you and many others are not realizing that you are speaking in an alternate English dialect.”

Colleen Bovaird Wawrykow (in Ball, Bernhardt, & Deby, 2006. p. 67)
What is ESD?

Many students enter school speaking a version of English that is different from the language of instruction. The English as a Second Dialect (ESD) program supports students whose home dialect is different from school English. Language is the foundation of success in school and beyond; when a student’s home language is in conflict with the language of school, the student may not achieve to her full potential.

The ESD program is intended to teach students mastery of “standard” or “school” English. Though linguists assert that no dialect of English, including standard school English, is objectively superior to other dialects (Godley, Sweetland, Wheeler, Minnici, & Carpenter, 2006), mastery of Standard English is critical for access to career and educational opportunities in the Canadian mainstream culture. If schools are to provide all students with the skills necessary to fulfill their potential, then mastery of Standard English is a critical goal. However, the ESD program also recognizes the validity of the dialects that students bring to school; while Standard English may be critical in school and the workplace, students’ home dialects are the more appropriate dialect for use in many social contexts. The ESD program does not seek to replace students’ home dialect with Standard English; rather the program aims to develop mastery of Standard English in addition to the home dialect, so that students are able to appropriately code-switch, or choose between dialects depending on the situation.

The British Columbia Ministry of Education (2009c) sets criteria for student eligibility for English as a Second Dialect support. In order to be eligible for the ESD
program, students must speak a dialect of English that is different from Standard English. This dialect difference must be shown to affect their language learning (through oral language, reading and/or writing). If students meet these basic criteria, they are eligible for ESD support. The Ministry funds ESD support for up to five years per student. In School District 84, the vast majority of non-standard dialect speakers are First Nations students (though not all First Nations students are ESD students).

Support services for ESD students should be founded on the principles of culturally responsive teaching, namely “using the cultural characteristics, experiences, and perspectives of ethnically diverse students as conduits for teaching them more effectively” (Gay, 2002, p. 106). Teachers must be respectful of the linguistic and cultural differences that students bring to the classroom. Going beyond mere understanding, culturally responsive ESD support brings aspects of the students’ culture into the classroom as a bridge between the worlds of home and school. Australian researcher Ian Malcolm presents the “ABC’s of bidialectal education,” (Malcolm, 2001) which provide an outline of the guiding principles of culturally responsive ESD instruction.

In this handbook, readers are introduced to the concept of dialect difference and how it affects student achievement. Within the framework of culturally responsive teaching, the reader is presented with some ideas for teaching ESD students in culturally responsive ways.

**The A, B, C’s of Bidialectal Education**  
(adapted from Malcolm, 2001)

- **Accept students’ home dialect**
- **Bridge to Standard English**
- **Connect to students’ home experiences**
What is Dialect?

A dialect is a variety of a language that is characteristic of a particular group of speakers. Dialects may develop on the basis of geography (e.g., Southern English), ethnicity (e.g., African American Vernacular English), and/or class (e.g., working class English) (Ball, Bernhardt, & Deby, 2006). While some dialects are very similar to “mainstream,” or Standard English, it is important to note that everybody speaks a dialect. Though there are some differences between dialects of the same language, there are far more similarities, allowing communication across dialects.

A language is a system of communication made up of elements, like words (vocabulary) and sounds (pronunciation), governed by rules (grammar) for combining those elements. However, within every language are dialects with slightly different rules or elements. For the English language, it may be helpful to think of the differences in language between a Newfoundland fisherman and a wealthy Londoner, or the differences between an African American from Georgia and a white working-class resident of Boston. Each speaks English, yet there are significant differences between their patterns of speech. The difference goes beyond accent, affecting pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar.

Sociocultural Theory and Dialect

According to Lev Vygotsky, social experiences shape our ways of thinking and interpreting the world - “social relations or relations among people genetically underlie all higher functions and their relationships,” (Vygotsky, as cited in Berk & Winsler, 1995, p. 8)
Language is the bridge between the socio-cultural environment and individual mental functioning; it is a tool of the mind that people use to make sense of the world. First used for communication and social interaction, children later develop language for self-regulation, to structure their thinking. Because of the social nature of language and cognition, both are heavily influenced by our family and social network. As stated by Porter and Samovar,

> what we talk about; how we talk about it; what we see, attend to, or ignore; how we think; and what we think about are influenced by our culture … [and] help to shape, define, and perpetuate our culture,” (Porter & Samovar, 1991, as cited in Gay, 2000, p. 77).

Thus, language, culture, and cognition are intertwined and overlapping; it is very difficult to discuss any of the three concepts in isolation.

The variety of language that we use goes beyond the words that come out of our mouths; language is intimately connected to one’s identity. Gee (1989a) refers to the connection between language and identity as a Discourse. He contends that a Discourse is more than a way of speaking; a Discourse is an identity kit used to identify affiliation with a particular group. Discourses integrate “words, acts, values, beliefs, attitudes, and social identities as well as gestures, glances, body positions, and clothes,” (pp. 6-7). Gee (1989b) refers to the way a person first learns to use language as a primary Discourse. Everyone has a primary Discourse, and it is this discourse that is used in face-to-face communication with close friends and family. Our identities are closely tied to our home-based, primary Discourse, as it is through this lens that we first learn to make sense of the world.
A great number of Discourses exist. People from different socio-cultural groups will acquire different primary Discourses due to the different social, cultural, historical, and economic influences to which they are exposed. While primary Discourses are a birthright, other discourses, such as those required in the workplace or education, are learned later through scaffolding with expert users of that discourse. There are a wide variety of secondary Discourses, such as those for the legal profession, for academia, for social classes, for sports fans, and for street gangs. Each of these secondary Discourses is not simply a way of speaking, but a way of “being” in a given social situation. As people become associated with various institutions, they are expected to acquire the appropriate Discourse; if these Discourses conflict with one’s primary Discourse, the conflict may prevent the person from fully acquiring the secondary Discourse (and thus never “fitting in” to the institution).

An example of conflicting Discourses can be found in the work of Heath (1982a; 1982b), who demonstrated how mismatches in communication styles between home and school can contribute to a students’ lack of success. Heath studied the different ways that families used language (in particular questioning styles and preschool literacy events) that children were raised with in white middle-class, white working class, and black working class homes in the Piedmont Carolinas. As might be predicted from Vygotsky’s sociocultural theory, each of the three communities (representing a different social / cultural group) varied in its use of language.

Heath (1982a) found that the styles of parent-child questioning were very different in the Maintown (white middle-class) and Trackton (black working class) communities. Parents asked different types and quantities of questions of their children. When
examining the types of questions asked in the classroom, Heath found that the style of questioning used by teachers was very similar to that used by middle-class white parents. As a result, the middle-class white children entered school already familiar with the style of questions they would face; however, the Trackton children had more difficulty answering questions in class, as the style of question was unusual to them.

Similarly, Heath (1982b) found that preschool literacy experiences were very different in middle-class white, working-class white, and working-class black families. Once again, the early experiences of middle-class white children most closely resembled their future classroom literacy experiences. As a result, the middle-class white children entered school already familiar with the “ways of taking” from the environment that were expected in the classroom. Heath’s ethnographic work illustrates the sociocultural nature of language and literacy learning, and the differences that exist between the language of different cultural groups. It also highlights the struggles that can occur when children arrive in a classroom where language use is very different from the language with which they have been raised.

**Standard English**

Heath’s Maintown families spoke a standard dialect of English. A “standard” dialect is a variety of language that has been adopted for use by institutions of power (such as business, government, and education). It is important to note that all dialects are rule-governed and have their own grammar; nonstandard dialects are as coherent, complex, systematic, and logical as Standard English (Adger, Christian, & Taylor, 1999). Standard dialects are representative of the social and cultural groups in power; in North America, Standard English closely represents the dialect of the white upper and middle
class. Though this dialect is not superior to other dialects, it is considered a necessity for participation in institutions such as businesses, higher education, and government (Ball & Bernhardt, 2008). As a consequence of Standard English’s association with institutions of power and prestige, nonstandard dialects tend to be looked down upon as inferior by general society.

Standard English is significant to students and teachers because of its social prestige. It is the dialect students are expected to master in order to pass government examinations, to gain entrance into post-secondary education, and to communicate in the world of business. Though linguists assert that all dialects are equally rule-governed and capable of eloquence, many people do not share this insight. Speakers of nonstandard dialects are likely to experience discrimination because of their dialect difference. Whether consciously or subconsciously, many people associate nonstandard dialects with low status, low intelligence, and relative incompetence (Ball, Bernhardt, & Deby, 2006). As evidenced by the Ebonics debate in the 1990’s, the majority of North Americans consider nonstandard English dialects (such as African American Vernacular English or Ebonics) to be substandard varieties of language, despite linguists’ arguments to the contrary (Adger, Christian, & Taylor, 1999).

While teaching all students to master Standard English is an important goal, teachers must be careful not to denigrate students’ home dialects. When students hear that their way of speaking is “wrong,” they are also hearing that their family and community are “wrong” (Malcolm, 2001). When told that their community’s way of speaking is incorrect, students can be torn between the dialect of their homes and that of school. Rather than telling students that non-standard dialects are wrong, teachers should
emphasize that people use different dialects for different situations; in some instances (such as a job interview) Standard English is preferred, while in others (such as talking to a friend) the non-standard dialect is preferable. For more on teaching students the difference between dialects, see the section on contrastive analysis (p. 71) and School Talk / Friend Talk (p. 45).

**The Dialect of Power**

The rules and norms of the culture of power reflect the norms of the cultural groups who hold power (Delpit, 2006). These norms include particular ways of speaking, writing, dressing and interacting; thus, the dialect of the white middle class has come to be accepted as Standard English. Access to these institutions is guarded by various gatekeepers (high school examinations, university entrance applications, job interviews); at each of these gates, a person is expected to conform to the expected norms, including the use of Standard English. Mastery of Standard English, therefore, is crucial for one to gain access to these institutions of power.

Most people from upper and middle class white backgrounds (including most teachers) are raised with the norms of the culture of power, including Standard English. They have been immersed in the rules and expectations of power; in fact, many take these cultural norms as “natural,” and are not aware that they are just one of many ways of being. Students from non-dominant cultures enter school having been raised with other cultural norms, including different dialects. Such students must be taught these rules of power, not because these norms are superior to the ones they were raised with, but because they are expected in education and the workplace. Delpit (2006) argues that these rules and conventions cannot be passively acquired; they must be explicitly taught.
Teachers hold tremendous power within the classroom, over their students and the implementation of the curriculum. They decide which areas of the curriculum will be emphasized and which will not, whose voices will be heard and whose will be silenced. It is the teacher who determines whether other cultures and dialects will be respected, rejected, or ignored in the classroom, and the teacher who decides whether to explicitly teach or take for granted the norms of Standard English. Teachers must recognize the diverse cultural backgrounds of their students and teach all students the tools they need, such as Standard English.

**First Nations English Dialects**

The existence of First Nations’ dialects of English has been established for a number of years (Toohey, 1986). While there are differences between the English dialects of diverse First Nations, there are some dialect features that appear in many First Nations English dialects. It is important to remember that these features are broad representations of trends amongst many people; they do not necessarily represent the dialect of any particular community or individual. Dialect differences below are categorized according to components of language:

**Phonology** is related to the sounds of a language. Within a language there are a limited number of sounds used to compose words (called phonemes); some sounds are meaningful, while other sounds (e.g. “kbx”) are meaningless. Other aspects of phonology include volume, pitch, intonation, rhythm, and use of pauses. Dialect variation can affect the phonological component of language in the pronunciation of words (accent), the expected volume of speech, and the rhythm of speech. Some of the ways that many First Nations’ dialects of English vary phonologically from Standard English include:
• Restrictions on consonants at the end of words. For example, the word *hunt* may be pronounced as “hun” (Ball & Bernhardt, 2008).

*Morphology* relates to the composition of words. A morpheme is the minimal meaningful unit of language, and can be a whole word or a word part, such as a prefix or suffix. Nonstandard dialects may compose words differently from Standard English. One way that First Nations’ dialects of English may differ morphologically from Standard English include:

• Lack of suffix to show possession (Mary’*s*) or verb tense (*walked*). For example, instead of the Standard English sentence *Mary’s dog walked down the street*, the ESD student might say, “Mary dog walk down the street” (Ball & Bernhardt, 2008)

*Syntax* refers to the organization of language, commonly referred to as sentence structure. Nonstandard dialects often have different structural rules (grammar) than Standard English; as a result, nonstandard dialects are often classified as “poor grammar” by Standard English speakers. Some of the ways that First Nations’ dialects of English can differ syntactically from Standard English (Ball & Bernhardt, 2008) include:

• Copula deletion – may not use the verb “to be.” For example, the Standard English sentence, “*The elders are just going by the old ways*” may be said by an ESD student as, “The elders just going by the old ways.”

• Multiple negation / double negatives. For example, a student may say, “I don’t have no oranges,” instead of “*I don’t have any oranges*.”

• “Gots” for “has got.” For example, “He gots a lot of money.”

• “Ain’t” for “isn’t.” For example, “She ain’t going to give you any of her snack.”
• Nonstandard pronouns, especially plural (“theirself”). For example, “The boys bought some lunch for theirself” (Ball & Bernhardt, 2008).

Semantics refers to the meaning of the language (words or sentences). While the meaning of some words may be easy to explain (e.g., “window”), some words and phrases have multiple meanings, or meanings that may not be obvious (figurative language, euphemisms, idioms). Dialect difference can affect meaning particularly where the speaker of one dialect uses a word / phrase whose meaning is not obvious, and where that word / phrase is not used in the listener’s dialect.

Pragmatics refers to the use of language that is appropriate to the social and cultural context of the communication. Language use is varied depending on the purpose of the communication (to inform, to inquire, etc.), and the audience, and follows a number of rules, many of which are tacit. Some of these rules concern turn-taking in conversation, techniques for changing topics, use of verbal and nonverbal signals, proximity and eye contact. These rules vary across cultures, and as a result, speakers of different dialects may have different understandings of the pragmatics of language. Some of the pragmatic differences between many First Nations dialects’ of English and Standard English are:

• Verbal response time lag. Many First Nations students will pause for thought for as long as 10 seconds before responding in conversation.

• Avoiding eye contact. Many First Nations students will look down or to the side while listening, rather than making eye contact with the speaker. This behaviour may be more pronounced when the speaker is an authority figure.

• Not accustomed to known answer questions. Many of the questions that are asked in school are ones where the questioner (usually the teacher) already
knows the answer (“What is the capital of Alberta?”). Many students may be used to “authentic” questions where the questioner is actually seeking information from the answer.

- Humour. Many First Nations cultures place high value on the use of humour, and humour may be considered appropriate in some contexts that are considered inappropriate in mainstream culture.


The purpose of describing these differences between the dialects of many First Nations students and Standard English is to increase awareness of some of the features of the dialects that students may bring to school. As described in the following section, differences in dialect can lead to misunderstanding and underachievement when teachers do not recognize the dialect of the student.

*Deficit or Difference?*

Despite linguists’ assertions that all dialects are equally rule-governed (Ball, Bernhardt, & Deby, 2006; Rickford, 1999; Wolfram, 1999) many people, including educators, continue to view nonstandard dialects as substandard or faulty English. Most schools operate from a deficit standpoint, aiming to remediate or correct their students’ faulty language, or to get them the language skills that they consider to be “missing” (Malcolm, 2001). This deficit-thinking can be a major obstacle to addressing the needs of ESD students.
There are many myths about dialect difference that can interfere with teachers’ abilities to provide appropriate instruction for ESD students:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Myth</th>
<th>Reality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students who speak a nonstandard dialect have a language deficiency.</td>
<td>Students who speak a nonstandard dialect are proficient language users of their home dialect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonstandard dialects are sub-standard English.</td>
<td>All dialects are equally rule governed and capable of communication and eloquence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonstandard dialects are “poor grammar.”</td>
<td>All dialects are rule-governed and have grammatical rules. The rules may be different from mainstream dialect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonstandard dialects are “slang.”</td>
<td>Slang is a form of language that exists for a relatively short period of time and changes rapidly. Dialects exist for long periods of time and evolve slowly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard English is “proper” or “correct” English.</td>
<td>Standard English is appropriate in some contexts; other dialects are more appropriate in other contexts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When teachers do not understand dialect difference, they may believe that students come to school with language deficits. Rather than recognizing the strength of the language that First Nations students bring to the classroom, much of the focus is on the aspects of “proper English” that students are lacking. Heeding these myths can have consequences that reach far beyond a misunderstanding of linguistics; this deficit thinking
on the part of teachers and administrators can exacerbate the achievement gap of First Nations students.

Bowie and Bond (1994) have shown that some teachers tend to judge speakers of non-standard dialects as less academically capable. This finding does not imply that teacher attitudes are the sole problem affecting ESD students’ achievement, though the link between teacher expectation and student performance is well established (Cooper, 1979; Tauber, 1997, as cited in Rickford, 1999; Gay, 2000). Teacher attitudes mirror those found in the larger society; job interviewers hold similar negative attitudes towards speakers of non-standard dialects. Fogel and Ehri (2006) also reported that many teachers rate nonstandard dialect speakers as less intelligent, less confident, and less likely to succeed than Standard English speaking counterparts. When evaluating student work with equivalent content, the teachers judged the work produced in Standard English to be superior to work containing nonstandard dialect. The teachers were also likely to view nonstandard dialects as illogical or containing faulty grammar, and nonstandard dialect speakers as lazy or sloppy in their speech. Delpit (2006) has shown that difference in dialect often results in lowered teacher expectations for student achievement.

The consequences of this deficit thinking on the part of educators are many. The first is the critical notion of teacher expectations. When teachers hold low expectations

“Aboriginal students are competent, fluent speakers of their own dialect, but their ultimate success or failure may depend largely on the teacher’s ability to distinguish between ‘dialect difference’ and real or perceived learning difficulties, and to act accordingly” (Hanlen, 1998 as quoted in Ball, Bernhardt, & Deby, 2006, p. 85).
for students, as many teachers of nonstandard dialect speaking students have been demonstrated to do, these lowered expectations can result in lower student motivation, lower confidence, and lower academic self-efficacy (Fogel & Ehri, 2006). Teacher expectations for student achievement are often a self-fulfilling prophecy; students will often live up, or down, to the expectations that teachers hold for them. When teachers hold low expectations for students based on a lack of understanding of dialect difference (such as believing that nonstandard dialect is faulty grammar), there can be negative consequences for student achievement.

A second consequence of educators mistakenly perceiving dialect difference as language deficit is inappropriate assignment of students to special services such as Special Education and speech-language services. When teachers are not aware of dialect difference, they may refer nonstandard dialect speakers for assessment. Language traits, such as nonstandard dialect features, are often used as primary objective evidence of the need for Special Education (Adger, Christian, & Taylor, 1999). Most norm-referenced assessments that are used for placement in special services are normed for speakers of Standard English (Ball, Bernhardt, & Deby, 2006). Because of this assessment bias, nonstandard dialect speakers are more likely to be mistakenly referred and assessed as requiring remedial support. As a result, some nonstandard dialect speakers are placed in support programs that do not meet their needs; inappropriate support programs are at best unnecessary, and at worst ineffective or even detrimental to student learning.
Dialect Difference and Student Achievement

When students speak a variety of English that is different from the language of the classroom, it is not surprising that those students often struggle. Standard English is the language of instruction in B.C. schools; it is this dialect that most teachers speak, in which textbooks are written, and by which student writing is usually evaluated. Mastery of language is essential for success in almost all school subjects; to achieve high success in school, a student must master Standard English. For students who speak a dialect different from the dialect of school, the difference can interfere with school achievement.

Differences between children’s language and socialization in the home, and the language and socialization of the school, can contribute to misunderstanding and to conflict (Garcia & Guerra, 2004). Children’s primary attachment is to their parents and their home; it is through interaction with family and community that children acquire language (including their home dialect). Because we learn our dialect from those with whom we most identify, our dialects are closely tied to identity and community attachment. Unfortunately for students whose home dialect is not Standard English, their dialect is often not recognized or represented in school. In fact, in an effort to help students learn Standard English, teachers often “correct” students’ nonstandard dialect in order to teach them “proper English.” Often, teachers do not recognize that Standard English is simply another dialect of English, and that students’ nonstandard dialects are not examples of poor speech or bad grammar. As many First Nations students learn that

“Language is the medium through which teaching and learning take place, whether it is through oral or written language, visual literacies, multiple literacies, or verbal and nonverbal symbolic system.” (Ball, 2002, p. 84).
their way of communicating does not apply in school, insecurity with the language demands of school is increased. Because students’ home dialect is connected to family and community, when students are told (explicitly or implicitly) that their dialect is not appropriate for school, they may also sense that their home and community is at odds with the school (Malcolm, 2001).

Dialect interference can inhibit students’ ability to acquire fluency in Standard English. This area is one where ESD and ESL have significant differences. For English as a Second Language students, the learners are very aware of their ability (or inability) to communicate in English. The students’ fluency in the second language is obvious to both speaker and listener, and their proficiencies are readily apparent. However, because ESD students are already fluent speakers of English, the need to acquire the second dialect (Standard English) is not as apparent. ESD students can communicate with speakers of Standard English (the dialects are mutually intelligible), and the differences between them are subtle. Often, neither the speaker of a nonstandard dialect, nor the listener in the conversation, will be aware of the speaker’s use of a nonstandard dialect. However, though the listener may not be aware of the presence of a nonstandard dialect, the negative stereotypes associated with these dialects will likely be consciously or subconsciously present. Because of their ability to communicate with speakers of Standard English, ESD students may think that they “know the system” (Malcolm & Konigsberg, 2001, p. 16). Unfortunately, as they get
older, many ESD students find out that their knowledge does not get them where they want to go.

Though it is difficult to assign responsibility for educational failure to one factor, such as dialect, there is strong evidence that non-standard dialect speaking students are significantly less successful in school than their standard dialect speaking peers. Toohey (1986) reported that lower class, black and First Nations students are more likely to experience lower achievement in school and more likely to drop out of school. In the United States, Garcia and Guerra (2004) reported that after 30 years of education reforms, the significant achievement gap between White students and students from other cultures persists.

Achievement data from the province of British Columbia mirrors the research from other geographical regions. According to the Ministry of Education’s Foundation Skills Assessment 2006-07 (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 2008a), a standardized assessment of reading, writing and numeracy for Grades 4 and 7 students, 77% of non-Aboriginal students were meeting or exceeding expectations for reading comprehension, compared to only 59% of Aboriginal students. The achievement gap between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal students persists across domains and grade levels, and has been consistent for a number of years (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 2008a). Though one should always view one-time standardized assessments cautiously, and Rickford (2001) notes that high-stakes tests often obscure what culturally and linguistically diverse students know, the persistence of the achievement gap is troubling.
Other data from the British Columbia Ministry of Education’s *Aboriginal Report 2002/03 – 2006/07: How are we doing?* (2008a) report reveals an even more dire scene in high school. Participation and success rates in English 12 are an indicator of students’ success in the school system. English 12 is the most senior of the Language Arts courses, and is a good representation of students’ cumulative literacy achievement throughout their school careers. The provincial examination for English 12, worth 40% of each student’s final mark, assesses students’ abilities to analyze and respond to literature as well as compose an essay; students and teachers have been developing these abilities for a number of years. High school students who struggle with Language Arts in high school are often streamed into Communications 12, which is acceptable for graduation but usually not for university entrance. English 12 acts as a “gate-keeper” course for entrance to post-secondary schools. Thus, participation and success in English 12 is a good indicator of students’ cumulative literacy achievement and preparedness for post-secondary education (achievement of C+ or better is considered successful completion of English 12). Of the First Nations students who entered Grade 8 in 2001-02, only 68% of Aboriginal students progressed to Grade 12 by 2005-06; amongst these students, only 42% took the English 12 course. For all First Nations students enrolled in English 12, 49% passed the course with a C+ or better. Thus, for First Nations students who entered Grade 8 in 2001-02, only 14% passed English 12 with a C+ or better (the non-Aboriginal results were three times higher, see Table 1) within 5 years. When one considers the relationship between education level and income level, and between income and health, this failure to prepare students for the possibility of post-secondary education has far-reaching consequences for First Nations students.
Table 1: Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal Success Rates for English 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Aboriginal</th>
<th>Non-Aboriginal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 8’s, 2001-02</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% who made it to Gr. 12 within 5 years</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Grade 12’s who took English 12</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of English 12 students who achieved C+ or better</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Grade 8’s who would pass English 12 with a C+ or better within 5 years</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: British Columbia Ministry of Education, 2008a

It should be emphasized that dialect difference alone cannot be attributed as the source of underachievement for First Nations students in B.C. Other factors, such as socio-economic status, home support for education, and academic self-concept can certainly play a role for some students (Adger, Christian, & Taylor, 1999). However, conflict between a student’s home dialect and school dialect can contribute to educational failure.
Culturally Responsive Teaching

Culturally responsive teaching is the use of the “cultural characteristics, experiences and perspectives of ethnically diverse students as conduits for teaching them more effectively” (Gay, 2002, p. 106). Through activities that connect to the values, knowledge, and patterns of interaction that students bring from home, culturally responsive teaching can foster engagement (Au, 2001). When academic knowledge can be connected to students’ cultural frames of reference, it becomes more meaningful, relevant, and interesting, and can be learned more easily and thoroughly.

Research supports the effectiveness of culturally responsive pedagogy for culturally and linguistically diverse students. Ladson-Billings’ (1994) study of highly effective elementary teachers of African-American students supports a culturally responsive approach for minority students. These successful teachers were selected through community nomination, meaning that the teachers were effective at meeting the students’ needs as identified by the local community. In a study of two effective teachers who employed very different teaching methodologies, Ladson-Billings (1992) found that the common denominator was a culturally relevant approach, as the teachers celebrated students’ cultures, and made connections to these cultures, and promoted academic excellence for all students. These teachers also incorporated students’ nonstandard home dialects into the classroom without correction, though instruction was delivered in Standard English. Vocabulary terms and concepts were translated from Standard English to the students’ home dialect, allowing students to understand the concepts while legitimizing the nonstandard dialect. In Hawaii, the Kamehameha Early Education Project (KEEP) has developed and refined a culturally responsive approach to education since the
1970’s (Calfee, Cazden, Duran, Griffin, Martus, & Willis, 1981). Since its inception, the aim of KEEP has been to design an educational program that is congruent with the local Hawaiian culture and manageable within the context of a public school. Classrooms in KEEP incorporate Hawaiian patterns of communication (known as talk-story) and peer interaction in the classroom (Au, 1997). KEEP has been lauded as a successful example of culturally responsive early education, though it should be noted that KEEP also employs a number of pedagogical strategies that have been shown to be widely effective for all students (such as direct instruction of reading comprehension strategies, collaborative learning, positive classroom management, and balance between word recognition skills and comprehension instruction), not just culturally and linguistically diverse students (Goldenberg, 2003).

In order to be able to connect to students’ cultural experiences, it is important that teachers develop and expand their understanding of these cultures. It is critical for teachers to recognize how cultural characteristics impact the classroom environment; for example, protocols around interactions between adults and children can greatly influence students’ participation in classroom activities. The more teachers understand about their students, the more they can plan for instructional strategies that are respectful of these characteristics.

“If what I am given to read in no way touches or recognizes my experience (or my expression), if the background knowledge it assumes (of the world, but also of language) is not mine, I will have difficulty making sense of print. If what I write about is also foreign (again, in content as well as form) to my teacher, we cannot have a conversation about my work,” (Toohey, 1986, p. 140-141).
In order to make the curriculum relevant to students’ lives, teachers must also develop their understanding of students’ cultures, both historical and modern. In this way, teachers can incorporate content that is relevant to all students. Take, for example, a Social Studies unit on resources. The textbook may cover major resource industries in British Columbia and Canada, such as forestry and mining. A culturally responsive approach to this unit might incorporate study of First Nations uses of salmon or cedar, both past and present, to complement the textbook. In this way, the learning outcomes would be enhanced for all students, and the content made relevant for First Nations students in the classroom.

The learning environment is also an important aspect of culturally responsive practice. Without words, the physical environment speaks volumes about what is and is not valued; we display the things we value, while we hide that which we do not value. Classroom walls, bulletin boards, books on display, statements of behavioral expectations, and awards are all public displays of the values of the teacher and the class. Culturally responsive teachers ensure that their learning environment is reflective of the diversity of their students, and display work and images reflecting a variety of ages, ethnicities, genders, and social classes.

Another critical factor in culturally responsive teaching is caring. Teachers must care deeply about the success of all students; however, this caring cannot take the form of gentle nurturing or coddling. Over-nurturing can lead to benign neglect, where standards are lowered for ESD students, as teachers may allow students to make their own way or move along at their own pace. Culturally responsive caring is founded upon high expectations for the learning of all students (Gay, 2000). Teachers must genuinely believe
that all ESD students are capable of deep learning, and from this belief create strategies that enable each student to achieve the high expectations. Believing in the intellectual potential of ESD students, culturally responsive teachers take responsibility for facilitating this potential by building on the strength inherent in the students’ cultural identities. High expectations are critical if ESD students are to be given an equitable opportunity to compete with their mainstream peers.

A fourth component of culturally responsive teaching is effective cross-cultural communication (Gay, 2002). As noted earlier, different cultural groups have different ways of using language that go beyond vocabulary and grammar. Some of the characteristics of communication amongst First Nations students include avoidance of eye contact and use of humour and teasing. Though not all First Nations students share these communicative characteristics, many do. It is important that teachers observe and understand the communicative characteristics of ESD students so that these characteristics can be accounted for in teaching. With this knowledge, teachers can avoid making negative assumptions about students whose patterns of communication are unlike their own. Teachers can also use this knowledge to help identify with students the differences between communication styles, and the appropriate context for each pattern.

Ultimately, the goal of culturally responsive teaching is to integrate knowledge and understanding of students’ culture into the instructional program. By using instructional strategies that complement students’ cultural and communicative strengths, and incorporating culturally relevant resources and materials, teachers can build upon the knowledge and experiences that students bring to the classroom.
**Culturally Responsive ESD Instruction**

When teaching English as a Second Dialect students, a culturally responsive approach is a powerful way to meet students’ learning needs. Based on the central aim of the ESD program – academic success through mastery of Standard English – a culturally responsive approach to ESD recognizes, respects, and builds on the language and experiences of students. Recognizing what students already know, the ESD program then acts as a bridge to acquiring mastery of Standard English. While aiming for students to master Standard English, one does not want to do so at the expense of the home dialect; rather than replace the home dialect, the goal is to add another dialect to students’ linguistic toolkits. In many social contexts, the students’ home dialect may be more appropriate than Standard English; students must learn to recognize which contexts call for each dialect. The ultimate goal of the ESD program is additive bidialectalism – providing students with the tools to be able to effectively code-switch between dialects.

The International Reading Association and the National Council of Teachers of English (1996) support the development of code-switching abilities in students. In the *Standards for the English Language Arts*, Standard Four states the goal that students will “adjust their use of spoken, written, and visual language (e.g. conventions, style, vocabulary) to communicate effectively with a variety of audiences and for different purposes” (International Reading Association and National Council of Teachers of English, 1996, p. 24). The importance of adjusting language (which may include switching dialects) to meet the context of the communication is apparent. The IRA and NCTE also stress the importance of mastery of standard English - “all students need to learn what we refer to as the ‘language of wider communication’ – forms of our language
that are commonly recognized as standard English” (p. 24). While recognizing the importance of learning Standard English, the *Standards for the English Language Arts* places importance in respecting nonstandard dialects – “students develop and understanding of and respect for diversity in language use, patterns, and dialects across cultures, ethnic groups, geographic regions, and social roles” (p. 29). Looking at standards 4 and 9 together, it becomes clear that the IRA and NCTE support the development of code-switching between dialects. Nonstandard dialects are respected and valued, while students learn to master the standard form of the language.

Various studies have demonstrated that code-switching is an effective tool for Standard English acquisition. Godley, Sweetland, Wheeler, Minnici, and Carpenter (2006) reported the results of a teacher who implemented a code-switching methodology over a two-year period. In those two years, students’ “pass rates on the state standardized assessment for writing increased from 60% to 79% to 94%” (p. 35). Ladson-Billings’ (1992) study of two successful teachers of African-American students provides support for the practice of teaching students to code-switch between dialects. Though the two teachers in this case study had very different teaching methodologies, one similarity that contributed to their success was a culturally responsive approach that encouraged code-switching. While instruction in both classrooms took place in Standard English, students freely used nonstandard dialect in classroom conversation without correction from the teacher. When vocabulary terms or academic concepts were introduced, they were often translated into nonstandard dialect; this practice enabled the students to understand the meaning, while legitimizing the use of nonstandard dialect. “Students experience[d] the
usefulness and appropriateness of the Black linguistic style as they learn[ed] about a standard form of English,” (p. 317).

Blake and Van Sickle’s (2001) case study of nonstandard dialect-speaking high school students in South Carolina showed that development of code-switching strategies (facilitated by the use of dialog journals, vocabulary development, and writer’s workshop) yielded positive results for the students. The two students discussed in the study were selected based on the criteria of dialect diversity, retention in Special Education, and limited exposure to English literature courses. One of the students had previously failed the South Carolina Exit Exam, a test all Grade 12 students must pass in order to graduate high school in South Carolina. After the intervention, both students could effectively code-switch between their home dialect and Standard English, and both passed the South Carolina Exit Exam, earning a full graduation diploma.

Studies of the code-switching, or bidialectal, approach have also demonstrated its effectiveness in increasing both reading and writing achievement as measured by standardized tests. Harris-Wright (1999, as cited in Rickford, 2001) performed an experimental study with fifth and sixth grade students. A group of students who primarily spoke African American Vernacular English received instruction that explicitly compared their home dialect to Standard English, while a control group did not explicitly compare dialects. The experimental group showed gains of 2.68, 2.68, and 3.89 on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills over a three year period (while the control group had a loss of 0.37, a gain of 2.0, and a loss of 0.05 in the same years). Maddahian and Sandamela (2000, as cited in Rickford, 2001) showed that a similar experimental group who explicitly compared
dialects during writing instruction gained 2.5 points on the SAT-9, while a control group gained 1.7 points.

Though the ESD program is classified under the same category as ESL by the Ministry of Education, it is important to note that many ESL materials and approaches are inappropriate for ESD students (Epstein & Xu, 2003). Many ESL materials focus on acculturation to life in Canada; First Nations students in the ESD program already have this knowledge. Similarly, many ESL materials stress communicative fluency – the ability to be understood in the second language. Again, ESD students are already fluent speakers of English, and do not require practice to be understood. Similarly, while immersion in a new language may be an appropriate strategy for learning a second language, this strategy may not be effective with second dialect acquisition. Because of the significant overlaps in vocabulary, grammar, and phonology between dialects, nonstandard speakers may miss the subtle – yet socially significant – differences between their own dialect and Standard English (Adger, Christian, & Taylor, 1999).

While the program is classified as a branch of ESL, teachers of English as a Second Dialect should examine ESL materials with a critical eye to determine whether they are appropriate for their students.

Because ESD students are already fluent English speakers, the need to acquire mastery of a second dialect may not be immediately apparent to the student (Malcolm, 2001). In order to make explicit the reason for ESD instruction, it is recommended that teachers engage students in a study of

“All we can do is provide students with exposure to an alternate form [dialect], and allow them the opportunity practice that form in contexts that are nonthreatening, have a real purpose, and are intrinsically enjoyable,” (Delpit, 2006, p. 54).
different dialects. As students become aware of the existence of dialect difference, they should examine specific dialect features where there is difference between Standard English and the nonstandard dialect. Once students have an understanding of the features that separate dialects, they can begin to incorporate the features of Standard English into their speech and writing where appropriate (Hagemann, 2001).

**Working with Aboriginal Communities**

The English Language Arts IRP’s (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 2006; 2007) discuss considerations for working with Aboriginal communities. In order to ensure that material is presented in a way that is responsive and respectful of the unique local culture, teachers should consult and seek advice from local First Nations community representatives. In School District 84, the Nuuchahnulth Education Workers (N.E.W.’s) are valuable sources of information and links to the local First Nations community.

**Oral Language for ESD Students**

The goals for oral language for ESD students mirror the goals for all students, as presented in the in the K-7 and Grades 8-12 English Language Arts IRPs:

- The Aim of the English Language Arts is to provide students with opportunities for personal and intellectual growth through speaking, listening, reading, viewing, writing, and representing to make meaning of the world and to prepare them to participate effectively in all aspects of society, (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 2006, p. 2; 2007, p. 2)

In designing oral language activities for ESD students, teachers should be mindful of the following English Language Arts curriculum organizers:
The challenges faced by ESD students affect all of the above facets of oral language. With regard to the broad aim of the English Language Arts, helping students to master the Standard English dialect is essential if students are to participate effectively in all aspects of society, particularly the job market. Dialect difference affects the purpose of oral language, as students require mastery of Standard English in order to be able to interact and present their thoughts in the worlds of business and education. Teaching students to code-switch between dialects, choosing an appropriate dialect for the context and audience, is a powerful strategy. In order to effectively apply the code-switching strategy, students need to reflect on, self-assess, and set goals for their acquisition of Standard English (thinking organizer). In this way, students will be able to recognize and
apply the *features* and patterns of Standard English in order to effectively communicate in the institutions of power.

The following principles should be applied when determining the approach to oral language development to use with ESD students:

- Non-standard dialects are not incorrect or poor grammar.
- Different dialects are appropriate for different purposes and audiences.
- Student exploration of dialect difference is preferable to over-correction.

**Register**

One of the critical concepts for students to understand is the pragmatics of language – how we adjust language according to social context. All speakers alter their language depending on their purpose and audience; for example, we speak differently when telling stories to our friends than when interviewing for a job. An easy way to conceptualize registers is the different ways that a child might say goodbye to his teacher, his mother, and his friend. To a teacher, the child might say “Goodbye, Mr. Larre.” To his mother, the same child might say “See you later, Mom.” To his friend, the child might say “Catch ya later, man,” (Elgin, 1980). There are commonly accepted registers for many purposes including engaging in academic discourse, producing scientific writing, giving instructions, requesting information, talking to babies, and conversing with a lover. Registers, then, are varieties of language that are chosen by the speaker for a specific situation.

Registers and dialects are related concepts in that both are varieties of language. Irvine (2001) explains that while dialect varies according to the user, a register varies according to the use (or purpose) of the communication. A person’s dialect indicates
social affiliation, while the person’s register indicates her present social situation. Like dialect, however, the use of an inappropriate register for a given situation can be disastrous for the speaker. One need only imagine the results if one were to use academic discourse when wooing a lover, or use a register suitable for the pub when interviewing for an executive position. It is important, then, that in addition to learning the standard dialect, students also learn about the variety of registers and their appropriate uses.

The following activities can be used to illustrate the idea of context and social expectations for students. To give students a relevant example of context and audience, the teacher may have students observe the clothing that they and their classmates are wearing. Discussion should be focused on the similarities and differences between students and teacher clothing:

- What are the differences?
- What impression does each set of clothing give to an observer?
- What would students think if the teacher came dressed in their clothing?
- What would people likely think if students came to school dressed in teacher clothes?

Once students have grasped the idea that different styles of dress are appropriate for different social situations, the teacher can guide the discussion towards the concept of purpose. When we choose clothing, it is often for a specific purpose. To help illustrate this idea, the teacher could show examples of job-specific uniforms (e.g., surgical scrubs, construction worker, hockey player) and have students discuss the purpose of the uniform. What would happen if someone showed up for a hockey game wearing teacher clothes? What would happen if the teacher arrived at class wearing surgical scrubs?
The key ideas to emphasize in this analogy are that there are many different types of clothing, and each is suited to a particular purpose. Different social contexts call for different styles of dress; what may be appropriate in one situation may be inappropriate in another. This concrete example of different styles of clothing might help students understand the concept of different dialects; choosing a style of dress for a particular purpose is similar to purposefully code-switching between dialects.

To relate the ideas of context and audience to oral language, the teacher may ask students to conduct a role-play that involves shifting registers (Hagemann, 2001). In pairs, one student will ask their partner questions related to a topic (for example, students’ plans for the weekend), while the other student answers. Students should repeat the process, this time switching roles. After both students have taken both roles, the students will assume different roles (personas) to discuss the same topic. The teacher will instruct the class that they are going to repeat the conversation; this time, however, the person asking the questions is going to role-play as the answering student’s grandmother. The class can then discuss how some words / phrases / expressions that were used when talking to a friend might not be appropriate when talking to a grandparent. The teacher can provide suggestions as to how some common phrases might be re-worded to be more appropriate for the grandmother audience. Then have students practice asking and answering the question with the new audience.

As students practice role-playing questions and answers, the topics and the roles of both the questioner and answerer can be varied. Topics should be open-ended to allow all students the opportunity to access them. Suggested roles that could be taken are teacher-student, employer-employee, student-principal, politician-voter, etc. Students could also
assume roles from literature or film that has been read or viewed recently. The core concept to re-emphasize with students is that the audience and context of a conversation affects the way we use language, including dialect. In most situations that call for a formal register, such as job interviews, Standard English will be the expected dialect.

**School-talk / Friend-talk**

The School-talk / Friend-talk activity can be used to illustrate the idea of selecting appropriate language (register) for a given social situation (Hagemann, 2001). The teacher should note some common occurrences of inappropriate dialect use, such as slipping into home dialect when making a formal presentation to the class. With a short list of some common dialect-slips, teachers can lead students in a comparison of how one can say something to a friend, compared to how one would say the same thing in a more formal setting (a T-chart may an efficient graphic organizer for this activity).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Friend-Talk</strong></th>
<th><strong>School-Talk</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A rabbit gots big ears.</td>
<td>A rabbit has big ears.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I gots real lots of Pokémon cards.</td>
<td>I have a lot of Pokémon cards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important when leading a “Friend-Talk / School-Talk” activity that teachers keep the following ideas in mind:

- Keep the activity short. Two or three examples is usually enough to cover the concept.
- Focus on one area of dialect-difference per session. In the example above, the teacher is attempting to focus on the home-dialect word “gots,” which is not used in Standard English.
- Home dialects are not incorrect or grammatically wrong. Within the context of a conversation between friends who speak the same home dialect, it may be perfectly correct to say, “I gots real lots of Pokémon cards.” Emphasize that people speak differently for different audiences and contexts.
- Use the term “code-switching” with students so that they become aware of their ability to consciously choose between dialects.

**Rephrasing**

Rephrasing should be used in place of correction when students use an inappropriate dialect for their purpose (Wheeler & Swords, 2004). Consider the following example from a group discussion about owls:

*Johnny: “An owl is a good hunter because it gots eyes that can see in the dark.”*

The common teacher response of correction – “We don’t say it that way” – risks alienation of the student. After all, the student *does* say it that way, as do many of his closest friends and family. Correction implies that Standard English is correct, and nonstandard dialects are incorrect. Delpit (2006) argues that constant correction of dialect can cause students to react against the standard dialect, inhibiting acquisition of Standard English.

Instead of overtly correcting the use of a non-standard dialect, the teacher can rephrase the statement in Standard English, providing a model of the standard dialect without creating linguistic conflict in the student. When rephrasing, the teacher maintains the meaning of the student’s utterance while rewording it to conform to the conventions of Standard English (Wheeler & Swords, 2004).
Teacher: “You’re right, the owl is a good hunter because it has eyes that can see in the dark.”

By rephrasing, rather than correcting, the teacher provides a model of Standard English to the ESD student, but is not denigrating the student’s home dialect. The teacher has not told the student that the nonstandard dialect is “wrong,” but has provided a model for using the standard dialect.

**Media Examples of Dialect Difference**

In order to illustrate the wide variety of dialects of English, teachers can make use of multimedia sources. Movies can provide many examples of different dialects. Prior to viewing a film, the teacher might select a brief example of a character speaking in nonstandard dialect (particularly a nonstandard dialect that is different from both Standard English and local home dialects, such as Appalachian English). Students can discuss their initial impressions of the character speaking the nonstandard dialect, then revisit the discussion after the students have viewed the film and know more about the character – did their assumptions about the character change? For older students, this discussion can be guided to a critical analysis of stereotyping and dialect.

While viewing the film, teachers can pause the film on occasion to do a quick exploration of dialect difference. Teachers can use a T-chart to translate between the dialect spoken in the film and Standard English (and/or the local nonstandard dialect). Teachers can have students discuss how the use of a different dialect impacts the viewer’s impression of the scene.
Many films include examples of dialect. *Hank Williams First Nation* (Sorenson, 2004), a film recommended for English 12: First Peoples, has many examples of Northern Cree dialect, including the following speech by the chief:

> Oh it’s a lot of work Adelard. Tough work. People don' know. As I see it, that's my main job as Chief of the Nation - is to get the fundin'. That is my ad'genda. And tell the federal government we don't take "no" for an answer. Whatever it takes... 'f it takes a roadblock; then that's what we'll have to do. Just hired a Director of Com'unications – that is what I told him he better look into.

> If they won't listen to us we'll get the newspapers. Look at Ominiyak, s'got colle'dge studints mart'ching in the city for him, putting up posters all over – rock stars doin' tv commercials. That is what we need cousin. I have a lot of meetin's lined up already. I'm in the city nearly every week going to meetin's. Of course I'd rather stay home – but... it's all for the people. The members'ip. If the members'ip wants me to go to all these meetin's then that's where I'll be. That is my djob... my mandate. (Sorensen, 2004)

Some children’s stories appropriate for elementary students also contain examples of nonstandard dialects. *The Three Little Pigs and the Fox: An Appalachian Tale* (Hooks, 1997, as cited in Van Duinen and Wilson, 2008) provides a familiar tale written in nonstandard Appalachian dialect:

> “It wasn’t long ‘fore Rooter and Oinky got so fat they just about filled up the whole house. What a squeeze it was to get everybody in.

> Finally it was so tight that Mama Pig spoke to Rooter. “Rooter, you’re the oldest. Time’s come for you to go out and seek your fortune...
… Rooter swallowed a big chunk of hoecake and looked around. There was mean, tricky old drooly-mouth fox grinning at him.

“Have some hoecake,” said Rooter, real scared.

“Don’t like hoecake,” said the fox.

“Well, how about some turnips or corn?” said Rooter.

“Don’t like none of them,” said the fox.

“Well, what can I offer you?” asked Rooter. (unpaginated)

After listening to stories containing nonstandard dialects, young students can engage in discussion about some of the unusual words and phrases that they heard, and their impressions of the characters who used nonstandard dialects.

There are also authentic examples of different dialects recorded on the internet. On the website http://web.ku.edu/idea/index.htm, researchers have recorded a number of American English dialects. Students can use this website to compare and contrast various dialects with both Standard English and local nonstandard dialects.

*Drama / Role Play*

The use of drama and role play can be an effective way for students to practice using Standard English without the stigma of having a teacher correct their speech. Part of effective dramatic presentation is memorization of lines; as students practice their roles, they repeatedly practice speaking in Standard dialect. Through repeated practice (one that serves a real purpose) students will be exposed to and become familiar with some of the syntax, vocabulary, and grammar of Standard English. Hagemann (2001) used role play with university students to effectively illustrate the concept that different social situations require different forms of language (registers).
For a simplified version of drama that is accessible for primary students, teachers can use Reader’s Theatre, which requires no special costumes or props for production.

**Student News**

The production of a student news broadcast can provide an authentic purpose for practicing Standard English. To introduce the idea, show students examples of news broadcasts, directing their attention to the language (Standard English) used by the newscasters.

After students brainstorm ideas for news stories, the teacher can model writing a news story in Standard English. Working from this model, students can generate ideas for other stories and write draft newscast scripts. The teacher provides scaffolding to help students use Standard English. Once news stories have been written in Standard English, the students should practice reading the stories with appropriate expression and phrasing. Rehearsal readings can be recorded to allow students to use self- and peer-assessment of their use of language. After students have had time to memorize their scripts, they can record the newscast to be played for fellow students. Teachers can also use the recording to provide detailed feedback to students on their performance and Standard English usage.

**Reading Instruction for ESD Students**

The ability to read is a cornerstone for success in school and in life. It is important to develop capable readers who are knowledgeable about the reading process, who are able to successfully make meaning from text, who enjoy reading, and who regularly choose to read, (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 2006, p. 20).
It is only in the last few years that a body of research has focused on the complex interactions between adolescent learners, texts, and their contexts. This research describes the importance of multiple literacies and societal trends on literacy development and the ways that those from non-dominant groups need to have opportunities to learn dominant (i.e., Western) literacy practices while still having opportunities to develop and maintain their indigenous and/or culturally-specific literacies, (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 2007, p. 27).

There may be conflict between ESD students’ home dialects and the language of the texts used in the classroom, as the texts in schools are almost exclusively written in Standard English. A reader’s level of mastery of Standard English is positively correlated with measures of reading achievement (Fogel & Ehri, 2006); as such, many ESD students are struggling readers. This section provides some instructional ideas and key points of understanding of reading and ESD students.

**Authentic Multicultural Literature**

It is important that students see themselves, and their culture, in the books that they read. However, the majority of the literature used in classrooms is written by and about people from the dominant culture (Glazier & Seo, 2005; Stallworth, Gibbons, & Fauber, 2006). For First Nations students and students from other non-dominant cultures, this mono-cultural canon means that the majority of the literature they are asked to read in school does not reflect their lives, culture, or experience. Not seeing themselves reflected in literature can cause students to feel marginalized and disconnected from the school, from the classroom, and from the act of reading itself.
In order to help ESD students find cultural relevance in the literature that they read in school, teachers should ensure that there is a variety of literature authentically representing diverse cultures. Cultural authenticity – accuracy in the language, history, customs, and values of the culture being represented – is important to ensure that literature does not stereotype or make false portrayals of a culture.

The definition of “authenticity” in multicultural literature is the subject of debate. Howard (1991) suggests that an authentic text is one where an insider of the culture will identify with the story and know that the representation is true, while cultural outsiders will be able to identify with the story, will learn something new, and will feel that the representation is true. There is substantial debate over the question of whether literature written by a cultural outsider can be considered authentic; can an author write authentic literature about an “other”? Apart from this question, the following criteria may be used to help determine a text’s cultural authenticity (Short & Fox, 2003):

- Accuracy of cultural details
- Avoidance of stereotyping
- Representation of cultural values and beliefs
- Use of cultural words and phrases (dialect) integrated in natural language

The English 12 First Peoples IRP (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 2008b), defines authentic First Peoples literature as texts that:

“My belief is that there is room in the world for all stories, and that everyone has one. My hope is that those who write about the tears and laughter and the language in my grandmother’s house have first sat down at the table with us and dipped the bread of their own experience into our stew,” (Woodson, 2003, p. 45)
• Present authentic First Peoples voices, having been created by First Peoples (or through the substantial contribution of First Peoples)

• Depict themes and issues important to First Peoples cultures

• Incorporate aspects of the language of First Peoples (i.e., story-telling techniques) (p. 71)

Various studies have shown that the use of quality multicultural literature can help culturally and linguistically diverse students connect with the curriculum. Nathensen-Mejia and Escmailla (2003) conducted a study with preservice elementary teachers during teaching practicums; these preservice teachers (about 75% of whom were white) used authentic Latino children’s literature when teaching their students (about 70% of the students were Latino). After conducting the unit, participating teachers reported greater understanding of, and connections to, their students’ cultures. Glazier and Seo (2005) examined the use of the novel The Way to Rainy Mountain (written by Kiowa author N. Scott Momaday) in a ninth grade classroom, and found that culturally and linguistically diverse students were able to connect with the novel, and were much more engaged in class activities than had been previously observed.

Souto-Manning (2009) demonstrated that even primary age children can critically engage with quality multicultural literature. In an action research study, she guided first grade students through an examination of children’s literature related to the American civil rights movement. Through critical examination of this literature, Souto-Manning’s
students began to question the racial and socio-economic nature of the pull-out programs that took place in their school (with gifted programs generally serving rich, white students and remedial programs serving children from lower socio-economic status and culturally and linguistically diverse students). Though one might assume that such critical analysis is beyond the capability of 6 and 7 year olds, this study showed that the use of quality multicultural literature, and critical questioning, can lead young students to critically examine their own society.

Authentic multicultural literature is also beneficial for students from the dominant culture. The dominant culture is often taken for granted; many white students assume that they are “cultureless.” By reading about and examining other cultures, the norms of the dominant culture become more apparent in contrast. In this way, authentic multicultural literature is both a window to view other cultures and a mirror to view oneself (Glazier & Seo, 2005).

For teachers who are unfamiliar with an author, or with a particular culture, determining cultural authenticity can be a difficult task. To ease this difficulty, teachers can use the following three distributors of Aboriginal literature:

www.corelearningresources.com

www.goodminds.com

www.oyate.org

Each of these book distributors has information for consumers about the authenticity of the books they sell. Also, see Appendix B – Recommended First Nations Literature - for a list of recommended books by First Nations authors.
Teachers may also utilize students’ own writings as sources of authentic multicultural literature for classroom libraries. By using students’ own stories, teachers can be sure that the content is both authentic and relevant to students’ experiences. Publishing, reading, and having others read their stories can also provide young writers with an authentic purpose and audience for their writing.

**Word Identification**

Dialect difference can have an impact on students’ decoding of text, and on teachers’ subsequent responses. Many ESD students translate text that is written in Standard English into their home dialect (Delpit, 2006; Van Duinen & Wilson, 2008). For example, where the text states, “Johnny has a pet dog named Jasper,” a student might read orally, “Johnny gots a pet dog named Jasper.”

Technically, the substitution of “gots” for “has” is a miscue, as the student has not correctly identified the word as printed on the page. However, the translation of a sentence from one dialect (Standard English) to another (non-standard dialect) while retaining meaning indicates a high level of comprehension of the text (Delpit, 2006; Van Duinen & Wilson, 2008). Rather than indicating that the student is struggling to decode the text, this dialect-related miscue actually indicates that the student has decoded and understood the text very well.

While dialect-related miscues like those presented above indicate that students are comprehending text, studies have shown that teachers are as much as three-times more likely to correct a dialect related miscue than a non-dialect-related miscue (Delpit, 2006; Fogel & Ehri, 2006). Perhaps because the nonstandard dialect is unexpected and thus jarring to the teacher’s ear, or because of the negative associations that many people,
including teachers, hold towards nonstandard dialects, teachers often “correct” students when dialect emerges during oral reading. This constant correction, despite a high level of understanding, can interfere with ESD students’ reading processes and create reluctance towards reading (Van Duinen & Wilson, 2008). In fact, Piestrup’s 1973 study (as cited in Rickford, 1999) demonstrated that students in classroom where use of nonstandard dialect was negatively sanctioned by the teacher actually increased the frequency of dialect-related miscues. Teacher correction of dialect-related miscues can actually create the opposite effect that the teacher intended.

It is important that teachers of ESD students learn to recognize dialect-related miscues so that they do not “correct” students when they translate text from one dialect to another. When analyzing the miscues on a running record, teachers should adhere to the principle that dialect-related miscues are not significant (Vacca, Vacca, & Gove, 2000, p. 539). Dialect-related miscues generally maintain the meaning of the text and sound like language, so they are semantically and syntactically acceptable. At first glance, they may appear to have low graphic-sound similarity (the word as read does not look like the sounds as printed on the page), until one remembers the complex processes that must take place for a student to translate text into nonstandard dialect. In order to differentiate dialect-related miscues from meaningful miscues, teachers must learn to identify some common features of local nonstandard dialects (see Increasing Awareness of Local Dialects, p. 77). By examining multiple examples of running records for ESD students, teachers may begin to recognize patterns and some frequent dialect-related miscues.
**Fluency**

Reading fluency is critical to producing proficient readers. Fluency has been shown to have a significant relationship with reading comprehension; some have equated fluency to a bridge that connects decoding and comprehension (Rasinski & Mraz, 2008). The National Reading Panel (2000) found that fluency is a critical factor in reading comprehension; if reading is slow and laborious, then students may have a difficult time remembering what has been read and can struggle to make connections to prior knowledge. If too much mental energy is required to decode, then the reader will have less attention to put towards comprehension (Rasinski & Hoffman, 2003, p. 513). Dowhower (1989, 1994 as cited in Rasinski & Hoffman, 2003) has shown that increased fluency through the strategy of repeated reading was related to improvements in both literal and higher level comprehension.

Fluency is composed of three factors:

- **Accuracy** – the ability to decode the words
- **Automaticity** – the ability to recognize words automatically, without exerting mental effort (leaving cognitive resources available to make meaning from the text)
- **Prosody** – the ability to read with expression and phrasing.

A key goal of reading instruction is to develop accurate word identification to an automatic level, so that the reader can focus attention on comprehension. Prosody also affects comprehension, as prosodic features (such as rate, rhythm, stress, and intonation) are important in the construction of meaning (Rasinski & Hoffman, 2003).

Some instructional approaches that promote fluency include:
Vocabulary

The differences between the vocabulary of nonstandard and standard dialects can impact reading, as vocabulary knowledge is a significant predictor of reading comprehension (Tierney & Readance, 2000, p. 375). The relationship between vocabulary and comprehension is complex, with multiple hypotheses (Vacca, Vacca, & Gove, 2000). The first hypothesis is that both vocabulary and comprehension are representative of one’s general intellectual ability. The second is that vocabulary and comprehension are both indicative of general knowledge (students with larger vocabularies about a topic know more about that topic, and thus will comprehend more). The third hypothesis is that vocabulary is an instrument in comprehension; in order to comprehend text, readers must have knowledge of the words printed on the page. Research has found that a vocabulary knowledge gap exists between high and low socio-economic status children, beginning in
Many ESD students come from low socio-economic backgrounds, often beginning school with less exposure to academic vocabulary than their mainstream peers.

Blachowicz, Fisher, Ogle, and Watts-Taffe (2006) identify several key features of effective vocabulary instruction. Word learning should be integrated across grade levels and subject areas throughout the day. In classrooms with exemplary vocabulary instruction, teachers create language and word-rich environments where students are constantly exposed to new words through the use of read-alouds, wide-reading, and playing with words. Such an environment creates interest in and enthusiasm for word learning. In effective vocabulary instruction, teachers intentionally select terms for students to actively study. Rather than passively receiving the definition of words, students are actively involved in generating meaning by integrating their prior knowledge with new information and making semantic connections as they actively construct meaning for new words. Students must also be taught word-learning strategies so that they can obtain meaning from new terms when reading independently. Context clues, word structure, and outside sources are all tools that effective readers can use to understand previously unknown words.

Because effective teaching of vocabulary can take time, teachers must be selective about which words to spend time teaching. Flanigan and Greenwood (2007) suggest a four-tiered framework for selecting words for vocabulary instruction:
By taking the time to carefully consider the individual needs of ESD students, as well as the instructional goals for the content area, teachers can ensure that they invest an appropriate amount of time and energy where it matters most. Once the critical words requiring in-depth understanding are identified (Level 1 words), some effective vocabulary teaching strategies, such as the following, can be used with students.

**Semantic feature analysis.**

Semantic feature analysis is an instructional technique that emphasizes categorization while helping students understand the similarities and differences between related words (Tierney & Readence, 2000). This instructional activity is best utilized for critical “before” and critical “after” words (Levels One and Three).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1: Critical &quot;before&quot; words</th>
<th>• In-depth understanding of these words is essential to understand the text. • Few words in this category, but great deal of time devoted to these critical concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 2: &quot;Foot in the door&quot; words</td>
<td>• Reader needs familiarity with these words before reading • Few words, but do not require depth of understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3: Critical &quot;after&quot; words</td>
<td>• Important words that can be defined during, or after, reading • Meaning often gained from context; shades of meaning can be discussed after reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4: Words not to teach</td>
<td>• Words that are already known, or that can be defined through rich surrounding context • Words that do not match the teacher’s instructional goals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In a unit on elections (Social Studies 11), the teacher might provide the following semantic feature analysis chart (Figure 1):

**Figure 1: Semantic Features Analysis Chart for Electoral Systems**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current system in British Columbia</th>
<th>One representative elected per riding</th>
<th>Number of seats gained reflects party’s % of popular vote</th>
<th>Voters choose one candidate</th>
<th>Voters rank candidates</th>
<th>Recommended by Citizens Assembly on Electoral Reform</th>
<th>Tends to produce minority government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Past the Post</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Transferrable Vote</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each of the key terms, either a “+” (indicating that the term possesses the trait) or a “-” (indicating the term does not possess the trait) is placed in each box. Other semantic feature analysis charts might use “yes / no” or a Likert rating scale (e.g., 1, 2, 3). The purpose is to illustrate some of the key differences between terms. Semantic feature analysis can be completed either as a group or independently; in either case, it is important that discussion of the terms take place to ensure that students understand the concepts. Students should discuss how the key terms are related, and how they are unique.
**Semantic mapping.**

Semantic mapping is an instructional activity that emphasizes connecting to background knowledge, categorization, connections, and differentiating between main ideas and details (Vacca, Vacca, & Gove, 2000). This instructional activity is best utilized for critical “before” and critical “after” words (Levels One and Three). In a unit on nutrition, the teacher might begin by asking students to access their prior knowledge about the subject. Student ideas are recorded in a web (see Figure 2).

**Figure 2: Webbed Recording of Student Discussion of Nutrition**
After students’ concepts about the term nutrition are recorded, the ideas are then sorted into categories (see Figure 3). Depending on the age and ability of the students, teachers can provide support by giving students the category headings; to keep the activity open-ended, teachers can have students to create their own categories. Categorization is best done in small group or partners, to keep all students engaged.

**Figure 3: Categorized Semantic Map on Nutrition**
Once the students have categorized their ideas, students can then read the selection of text about nutrition. During or after the reading, students can then add new information (micro- and macro-nutrients, protein, carbohydrate, vitamins, etc.) and re-categorize existing information. Students should discuss their semantic maps and the connections they have found between new terms and existing knowledge. The teacher should check for understanding, correct any misconceptions, and direct students towards any crucial missing information. Students can then summarize the information contained in the semantic map through writing.

**Contextual redefinition.**

The Contextual redefinition strategy explicitly teaches students the critical skill of using context clues to figure out unknown words (Tierney & Readence, 2000). Because the time invested in each word is minimal, and the level of understanding is not deep, this strategy is best used for Level Two “foot in the door” words.

The teacher selects words to pre-teach prior to reading a particular text. The teacher shows the words to the students who are encouraged to make an educated guess about their meanings (teachers may ask students to explain the thinking behind their guesses). For each word, the teacher then presents a sentence that uses rich context to define the word. If possible, this sentence should be copied from the text that students will later read; if an appropriate sentence is not available in the text, the teacher creates her own.

**Use of Context Clues.**

- Definition – word is directly defined in the sentence
E.g., *Crevices*, narrow opening in rocks, offer shelter from the heat to many desert animals.

- Synonyms – another word with the same meaning is used to illustrate the word’s meaning
  
  E.g., The wolves were *ravenous*, desperately hungry for any scrap of food.

- Antonyms – the word is contrasted with its opposite
  
  E.g. The city streets were *squalid*, quite unlike the neatly kept suburbs where Kate had been raised.

- Inference – word is not directly defined, but can be inferred from context
  
  E.g., The octopus’s ability to squirt ink is an *adaptation* that helps it escape from predators.

The teacher should use a think-aloud to model for students how to use context clues to define unknown words for the first sentence. The teacher think-aloud is a valuable instructional activity for modeling comprehension strategies, including how to use the strategy and when to apply it. Though think-alouds are rarely studied in isolation, they are an important component of many reading approaches that have been proven effective (Duke & Pearson, 2002).

In the example above (squalid), the teacher might say “Squalid – I’m not sure what that word means. But the rest of the sentence says that it is unlike the neatly kept suburbs. So if squalid is unlike something that is neatly kept, squalid might mean messy, or dirty, or something that hasn’t been taken care of.” Students will then
attempt to use context clues to figure out the remaining words. Students will check their contextual definitions with the teacher or with a dictionary.

**Picture Word Inductive Model (PWIM)**

The Picture Word Inductive Model (PWIM) builds on students’ existing oral vocabularies to build early reading and writing skills (Calhoun, Poirier, Simon, & Mueller, 2001). The PWIM is effective for primary grade students and struggling intermediate students, and can be used in Language Arts or the content areas. Calhoun (1999) describes the PWIM as consisting of the following steps (though the strategy can be modified by omitting some activities):

- The teacher selects a picture for the class to view. The picture should have a number of details that students can identify with their existing vocabularies.
- Students identify what they see in the picture.
- The teacher labels the picture as the students identify parts. Labels can be single words or phrases. As the teacher labels, she draw a line to the identified part, says the word / phrase, and writes it on the board. Students say and spell the word.
- After a suitable number of labels have been added, the class reviews the word chart, saying aloud the words / phrases as the teacher points to the labels.
- Words can be transferred onto cards to give to students. Word cards can be used to review sight words and spelling.
- Students sort (classify) the word cards. Categories for sorting can be created by the students, or can be given by the teacher. Some possible ways to categorize
words include spelling patterns, initial consonants, verb sounds, parts of speech, rhyme, etc.

- The teacher and students review the labelled picture; students can create a title.
- Students use the labels to generate sentences about the picture. The teacher models sentence creation using Standard English.
- Students can classify sentences into related groups. This activity can be used to introduce / reinforce paragraph organization.

The PWIM has been shown to be effective at increasing students’ sight word vocabulary and reading comprehension (Calhoun et al., 2001). It can also be an effective bridge between reading and writing. Some of the key features of the PWIM that make it an effective strategy for early readers and struggling intermediate students are the connections to students’ existing knowledge and listening/speaking vocabularies, the linking of oral language to reading, teacher modeling of standard English usage, and categorization of words to inductively or explicitly develop spelling and phonic skills.

The PWIM can also be used with older students, though with some modifications (Calhoun, 1999). When using the PWIM with older students, the focus may shift to focus on specific areas of difficulty, rather than general language development (e.g., the focus might be on words with unusual spelling patterns or unusual plurals). The PWIM can be more relevant to older students if used to supplement the content areas, such as a science or social studies unit. Older students might generate their own photographs for labelling, or use multiple photographs related to a theme. The see-say-spell pattern may not be used with every word / label, but targeted at specific areas of difficulty. Older students will
also benefit from supplemental reading related to the topic of study, both fiction and non-fiction.

**Writing Instruction for ESD Students**

The broad learning outcomes for writing, as defined in the grades K-7 and 8-12 English Language Arts IRP’s, are categorized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purposes</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Thinking</th>
<th>Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Write and represent to create a variety of meaningful personal, informational, and imaginative texts (K-12)</td>
<td>• Use strategies when writing and representing to increase success at creating meaningful texts (K-12)</td>
<td>• Use writing and representing to express, extend, and analyze thinking (K-12) • Reflect on, self-assess, and set goals for improvement in writing and representing (K-7) • Explore multiple perspectives through writing and representing (8-12) • Use metacognition, self-assess, and set goals for improvement in writing and representing (8-12)</td>
<td>• Use the features and conventions of language to enhance meaning and artistry in writing and representing (K-12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(British Columbia Ministry of Education, 2006, p. 2; 2007, p.2)

Dialect difference most clearly affects the *Features* category, as there may be many differences between the features of nonstandard dialects and the features of Standard English. One of the most important *Strategies* for ESD students to employ is to identify these differences, then choose the features of the appropriate dialect for their
writing. Through appropriate instruction, ESD students can be taught to intentionally code-switch to create effective writing (Blake & Van Sickle, 2001).

An effective way to organize the classroom for writing is Writer’s Workshop, as recommended in the English Language Arts K-7 IRP (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 2006) and the English Language Arts 8-12 IRP (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 2007). In Writer’s Workshop, students have large blocks of time for writing, accompanied by teacher modeling and mini-lessons on writing strategies, and individual and small-group conferencing. To keep Writer’s Workshop culturally responsive, teachers can model writing “from the heart” about their own lives; such modeling will encourage students to write about their own lives and experiences, bringing students’ home culture into the classroom (Au, 2001). Mini-lessons can be focused around the specific differences between nonstandard dialect and Standard English; techniques such as contrastive analysis (see below) can be effective in mini-lessons for ESD students.

The writing process involves various stages, including pre-writing, drafting, editing, revising, and publication (see Figure 4). Teachers should keep in mind the recursive nature of the writing process; the stages are not accessed individually in sequential order. Rather, writers constantly move between the various stages before publishing.
Figure 4: The Writing Process

In order to facilitate the writing process with ESD students, the teacher should encourage the use of nonstandard dialect in the pre-writing process. As students generate ideas with peers, they may find discussion in their home dialect more comfortable. However, once students begin drafting they should be encouraged to write in Standard English. As students gain mastery over Standard English, they can then learn to incorporate elements of nonstandard dialect into their writing to create an effect on the reader (see Writing Stories in Nonstandard Dialects, p. 41). When students edit their work, both independently and with peers, they have the opportunity to apply their knowledge of Standard English. Once students understand some of the differences between Standard English and nonstandard dialects, they can begin to identify
nonstandard features in their own writing and the writing of peers. It is important when peer editing that all students, not just ESD students, have some understanding of dialect difference to avoid any dialectally disparaging remarks from peer editors.

**Contrastive Analysis**

Contrastive analysis is a technique supported by many linguists designed to explicitly teach students the distinctions between a nonstandard dialect and Standard English (Hagemann, 2001; Rickford, 2001; Wheeler & Swords, 2004). The rationale for using contrastive analysis to teach Standard English is that many ESD students are not aware of dialect difference; the contrastive method makes dialect difference explicitly clear. In order for students to learn a feature of the standard dialect, they must first become aware of that feature (Hagemann, 2001). Once students are aware that there is a difference, they must compare the new feature with their existing knowledge of the English language to understand how it is different. Finally, once students understand the new feature, they must begin to apply it and integrate it into their spoken and written language where appropriate. A major advantage of the use of contrastive analysis is efficiency; teachers can focus their teaching on specific areas of dialect difference. Contrastive analysis allows teachers to fine-tune their instruction, focusing on specific areas of need rather than attempting to teach English grammar in its entirety (Rickford, 1999).

Taylor (1991, as cited in Wheeler & Swords, 2004) conducted a study in a college writing class in Illinois, where two groups of African-American students received writing instruction. In 11 weeks, students who participated in contrastive analysis activities reduced their production of nonstandard dialect in their writing by almost 60% (the
control group increased production of nonstandard dialect by 11% during the same 11 weeks).

In contrastive analysis, the teacher uses examples of nonstandard dialect from student writing that adhere to the same dialect variation. These examples are grouped on one side of a T-chart. In the example below, the samples illustrate the nonstandard use of “much.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Dialect</th>
<th>School English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It’s too dry for much plants to grow in the desert.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The soldiers fought their hardest, but there were too much enemies to overcome.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He doesn’t have very much friends.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The teacher can discuss patterns with the students – what do the sentences on the left have in common? The teacher steers students attention to the nonstandard use of the word “much;” the teacher might provide additional examples if necessary to illustrate the pattern. Once students have grasped the nonstandard feature, the teacher demonstrates how the sentences would be re-written in Standard English:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Dialect</th>
<th>School English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It’s too dry for much plants to grow in the desert.</td>
<td>It is too dry for many plants to grow in the desert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The soldiers fought their hardest, but there were too much enemies to overcome.</td>
<td>The soldiers fought their hardest, but there were too many enemies to overcome.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
He doesn’t have very **much** friends.  

| He doesn’t have very **many** friends. |

The teacher might provide an additional example of the nonstandard use of “much” and ask students to re-write the sentence with a partner. In a case where the difference involves a word that is used in both standard and nonstandard dialects, the teacher should also provide an example of its use in Standard English (e.g., your mother loves you very **much**).

Contrastive analysis lessons should be kept brief and focused around a single nonstandard feature that occurs frequently. By drawing samples from student writing, the teacher will ensure that the nonstandard usage legitimately represents students’ dialect; examples invented by the teacher may be incorrect in the nonstandard dialect.

**Dialect Translation**

Once students are aware of the differences between Standard English and nonstandard dialects (through activities such as contrastive analysis), they can begin to translate between dialects (Van Duinen & Wilson, 2008). When examples of literature that feature nonstandard dialects are found, students can translate those examples into Standard English. Teachers should follow this activity with a discussion of how the change in dialect affects the reader’s reaction. As students share their ideas, the teacher can emphasize the richness that nonstandard dialects possess (thus validating nonstandard dialects), as well as any dialect-related stereotypes brought up by the students. Similarly, text that has been written in Standard English can be translated into nonstandard dialect (Delpitt, 2006). This activity may be particularly relevant when translated dialog (“how might the character say it if he lived in our area?”). Translation across dialects can help
students become more aware of the features of both Standard English and nonstandard dialects.

In Writer’s Workshop, teachers can introduce a specific feature of dialect difference as the focus for a mini-lesson. Examples of this feature should be drawn from samples of student writing. After engaging in contrastive analysis (see above) to illustrate the difference, teachers can ask students to translate writing samples written in nonstandard dialect into Standard English (Edwards, 1980, as cited in Epstein & Xu, 2003). Through the process of dialect translation, students will begin to incorporate the feature of Standard English into their own writing.

**Writing Stories in Nonstandard Dialect**

It is important for teachers to recognize that writing in nonstandard dialect is not incorrect or poor grammar. In fact, many renowned writers use nonstandard dialect in their work to create an impact on the reader. Two notable examples of writers who use nonstandard dialects for effect are the poet Robert Burns and Toni Morrison. A critical difference between the writing of these renowned authors and the writing of most ESD students is that these writers have mastered Standard English, but are purposefully choosing to write in another dialect for effect (code-switching).

Similarly, ESD students can be taught to use nonstandard features in their writing for effect (Wheeler & Swords, 2004). In creative story writing, students might choose to create characters who speak in their home dialect. While the majority of the story is written in Standard English, the dialog of these characters will be written in nonstandard dialect. One of the major advantages of using this approach in story writing is the validation of the students’ home dialects. By encouraging students to write portions of the
story in their home dialect, teachers are validating the students’ dialect. At the same time, the teacher is also showing the student that there are different contexts where different dialects are appropriate, and drawing attention to the differences between the home dialect and Standard English. In this way, the story-writing follows the ABC’s of bidialectal education (Malcolm, 2001):

- Accepting the student’s dialect
- Bridging to Standard English
- Connecting to the student’s home culture

**Dialog Journals**

One way to familiarize students with the conventions of Standard English is through the use of dialog journals (Ball, 2002). Dialog journals are ongoing written communication between the ESD student and a Standard English speaking adult (usually the teacher). The purpose of dialog journals is to provide ESD students with models of Standard English while engaging in writing for a real purpose. The writing in a dialog journal is open-ended and conversational; the teacher does not control the topic. Through the process, ESD students are engaged in reading Standard English (communication from the teacher) for a real purpose – personal communication. The students are free to respond to the teacher’s communication in any way that they prefer. They may answer or ignore questions posed by the teacher; they can stick to the subject of the conversation or switch subjects. In this way, the writing task is personal and relevant with an authentic purpose. The teacher should not evaluate the student’s use of Standard English in a dialog journal; because the purpose is personal communication between two people, nonstandard dialects are perfectly acceptable in the context.
Even without teacher correction, Ball (2002) has found that ESD students engaged in dialog journals demonstrated substantial growth in the quantity and quality of their writing, as well as their familiarity and use of Standard English. This may be a result of the students’ constant contact with models of Standard English usage as provided by their writing partner. Blake and Van Sickle (2001) showed that the use of dialog journals with nonstandard dialect-speaking high school students at-risk of academic failure can lead to greater mastery of Standard English. Staton, Shuy, Kreeft Payton, and Reed (1998, as cited in Ball, 2002) examined the use of dialog journals in an intermediate grade classroom in Los Angeles. By using dialog journals over the course of a year, the researchers noted substantial growth in the quality of written expression, increased detail and elaboration of ideas, and greater fluency and control of Standard English syntax.

**Spelling**

ESD students can struggle with spelling, particularly with dialect-sensitive words (words whose usage in Standard English is different from its usage in the nonstandard dialect) (Terry, 2006). For example, students whose home dialect omits suffixes exhibit more errors spelling words with suffixes, as one might expect. The dialectal difference may be a cause of this spelling difficulty, as ESD students are attempting to spell words that are different from their normal usage. Terry’s study of the spelling skills of nonstandard dialect-speaking students in Grades 1-3 also found a relationship between the frequency of use of nonstandard dialect and number of spelling errors. Children whose oral language featured more frequent use of nonstandard dialect experienced more difficulty in spelling. This study highlights the need for ESD students to explicitly be shown the differences that occur between dialects. If students are aware of the difference
(like omission of suffixes) they will be more likely to identify instances where the
difference affects spelling.

**Increasing Awareness of First Nations Dialects**

In addition to teaching ESD students to master Standard English, ESD teachers
can also play a role in increasing awareness of nonstandard dialects amongst school staff
and administration. In this way, ESD students will experience culturally responsive
instruction in the regular classroom. Some of the advocacy roles of the ESD teacher
include:

- Identifying some of the features of local nonstandard dialects. In order to target
  instruction and help students become aware of dialect differences, teachers must
  understand how local nonstandard dialects differ from Standard English (Sato,
  1989).

- Raising teachers’ and administrators’ awareness of the validity of nonstandard
dialects. Teachers are not immune from the stigma that society associates with
nonstandard dialects. ESD teachers can find opportunities to help change
misconceptions about nonstandard dialects as “poor grammar” or “lazy English”
when these comments arise. Articles from the reference list might also be
distributed as professional reading.

- Advocating that teachers hold high expectations for all students. Teacher
  expectations are a fundamental component of student success; ESD teachers can
  advocate for the abilities of nonstandard dialect speaking students.
Sharing resources with classroom teachers. Many of the instructional ideas that are good for ESD students are also good for mainstream students. Through co-teaching, modeling, or simply passing on resources, ESD teachers can help colleagues incorporate culturally responsive instruction into the regular classroom.

Participating in school based team meetings. When ESD students are discussed amongst the School-Based Team, the ESD teacher should be an active participant. If a student is to undergo a Special Needs assessment, the ESD teacher should ensure that the assessor is aware of the student’s nonstandard dialect, and that nonstandard dialect use does not unfairly influence discussions of the student’s intelligence or ability.

Ministry Reporting Requirements

The Ministry of Education funds up to five years of extra support for students for whom Standard English is a second dialect (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 2009c). This section lists the Ministry requirements for ESD programs:

Designating Students Requiring ESD Support:

Each student that is to be designated in the ESD program requires:

1) Assessment - an annual assessment of English language proficiency that shows that the student’s use of English is significantly different from Standard English.

In School District 84, the following assessments are used:

- Reading: PM Benchmarks for Grades 1-3, DART for Grades 4-9
- Writing: District-Wide Write samples collected in Fall and Spring each year
• Oral Language: a variety of oral language interviews / matrixes are used to evaluate oral language proficiency

2) Documentation, including:

• An annual instructional plan (AIP) designed to meet the language needs of the student
• Records of current assessments of Standard English proficiency
• A schedule of specialized services provided to the student
• Evidence of progress in the acquisition of Standard English
• Reports of learner’s progress at regular reporting periods

3) Support Services. Support for ESD students can involve pull-out classes (individual or small group) and / or adaptation within the regular classroom. The ESD teacher’s role in providing support services can take a variety of forms:

• Direct instruction to individual students, small groups, or whole class
• Support for the classroom teacher
• Direction to a Teacher Assistant / Education Assistant

Assessment and Documentation

The Ministry of Education requires an annual assessment of language proficiency for all ESD students. Results of the language proficiency assessment should be documented on the student’s AIP. School District 84’s Assessment Framework provides the basis of the literacy assessments that all students in the district will complete (unless the teacher deems the assessment too difficult for the student, in which case a more
appropriate assessment will be used). An overview of the literacy assessments used in School District 84 is provided below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading Assessment Grades 1-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Tool</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administration</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timeframe</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Documentation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Assessment Grades 4-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Tool</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timeframe</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Documentation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Assessment: Grades 1-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Tool</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administration</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timeframe</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Documentation</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Annual Instruction Plan**

Student Name: _______________________

PEN:_________________

Grade: _____

Year of ESD Service: ______

Classroom Teacher: _____________________

ESD Teacher: _____________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Areas for Improvement</th>
<th>Instructional Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of ESD Service:
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________

ESD Support Schedule:
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________

Current Standard English Proficiency Assessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Assessment Tool</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Principal Signature: ____________  ESD Teacher Signature: ______________________
**ESD Yearly Progress Report**

Year 1  
School Year: ______

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Tool</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Year 2  
School Year: ______

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Tool</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Year 3  
School Year: ______

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Tool</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Year 4  
School Year: ______

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Tool</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Year 5  
School Year: ______

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Tool</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix A - Glossary

**bidialectalism** – the ability to use two dialects of a language. In ESD, the goal is for students to develop the ability to use both their home (nonstandard) dialect and Standard English.

**code-switch** – the ability to appropriately choose between one language or dialect and another depending on the situation. In ESD, one of the goals is to have students master Standard English, so that they can choose to use the dialect (standard or nonstandard) most appropriate for their social situation.

**dialect** – a variety of language characteristic of a particular group of speakers. All dialects are rule-governed.

**dominant culture** – the established norms of a particular society (language, religion, behaviour, etc.), usually representative of the majority.

**morphological** – related to the patterns of word structure

**nonstandard dialect** – a variety of language that varies from the standard dialect. Though equally rule-governed, nonstandard dialects are often viewed unfavorably by society.

**phonological** – related to the sound system of a language

**standard dialect** – a variety of language that has been adopted for use by institutions of power (business, government, education). Standard dialects usually represent the dialect of the dominant culture.

**Standard English** – the dialect of English expected in institutions such as schools and businesses
syntactic – related to the rules that govern sentence construction

think-aloud – explicit teacher modelling of strategies, making thinking processes apparent to the student
Appendix B – A Sample of Recommended First Nations Literature

Primary levelled readers:


Picture Books:


Novels (Intermediate Grades):


Poetry (Upper Intermediate – Junior High School)

Novels (High School):


Plays / Screenplays (High School):


Essays (Senior High School):


Short Stories:


Poetry (High School):