This article was downloaded by: *[University of Miami Library]*
On: *15 December 2008*
Access details: *Access Details: [subscription number 795151475]*
Publisher *Routledge*
Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK

Multicultural Perspectives
Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:
http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/title~content=t775653675

"You Give Me Idea!": Collaborative Strides Toward Bilingualism, Biliteracy, and Cross-Cultural Understanding in a Two-Way Partial Immersion Program

Mileidis Gort [a]
[a] University of Miami,

Online Publication Date: 01 October 2008

To cite this Article Gort, Mileidis(2008)'"You Give Me Idea!": Collaborative Strides Toward Bilingualism, Biliteracy, and Cross-Cultural Understanding in a Two-Way Partial Immersion Program',Multicultural Perspectives,10:4,192 — 200
To link to this Article: DOI: 10.1080/15210960802526086
URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15210960802526086

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Full terms and conditions of use: http://www.informaworld.com/terms-and-conditions-of-access.pdf

This article may be used for research, teaching and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, re-distribution, re-selling, loan or sub-licensing, systematic supply or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

The publisher does not give any warranty express or implied or make any representation that the contents will be complete or accurate or up to date. The accuracy of any instructions, formulae and drug doses should be independently verified with primary sources. The publisher shall not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of this material.

Multicultural Perspectives, *10*(4), 192–200
Copyright © 2008 by the National Association for Multicultural Education
ISSN: 1521-0960 print / 1532-7892
DOI: 10.1080/15210960802526086

Downloaded By: [University of Miami Library] At: 16:19 15 December 2008

"You Give Me Idea!": Collaborative Strides Toward Bilingualism, Biliteracy, and Cross-Cultural Understanding in a Two-Way Partial Immersion Program

Mileidis Gort
University of Miami

This study analyzes the nature of spontaneous bilingual peer interactions across Spanish/English integrated learning contexts, as well as the roles played by Spanish-dominant and English-dominant peers in mediating each others' bilingual, biliteracy, and cross-cultural learning in a two-way partial immersion (TWpI) program. Implications for designing and implementing effective language, literacy, and cross-cultural learning environments for bilingual children from minority- and majority-language backgrounds are addressed.

As the K-12 student population across the nation becomes increasingly multicultural and multilingual, schools must find ways to ensure the success of *all* learners, including attention to their academic, linguistic, and cultural development. Two-way bilingual immersion (TWI) education offers opportunities for dual language/literacy and academic content learning for English learners and English speakers within a multicultural education framework that promotes the value of linguistic and cultural plurality and provides positive intergroup educational experiences for both groups of students (Howard, Sugarman, & Christian, 2003; Potowski, 2007). For English *learners*, TWI provides an additive bilingual environment where students' native languages are considered resources for learning, and maintenance of those native languages is as much a priority as the development of English. For English *speakers*, TWI provides a unique immersion experience in which majority-language students learn a second language in integrated settings with native speakers of that language, many of whom are members of a different cultural group. The interactions among children, particularly across the two languages and various cultures, are seen as essential to the success of these programs in promoting bilingual development and cross-cultural understanding (Christian, Montone, Lindholm, & Carranza, 1997; Lindholm, 1990). Thus, the TWI model represents both a language/academic development program and a multicultural education program.

Research on TWI generally focuses on program organization and implementation as well as student academic and second language achievement (Alanis, 2000; Howard, Christian, & Genesee, 2004; Lindholm-Leary, 2001). A few studies provide insight into the processes of language and literacy development within these programs (Gort, 2006; Pérez, 2004a; Potowski, 2007). While much of this work suggests that cooperative learning and peer interactions provide important opportunities for dual language, literacy, and cross-cultural learning, few studies have specifically examined the nature of the collaboration that occurs between students in TWI classrooms.

Theoretical Framework

The interactive and social nature of young children's learning has long been recognized across different academic disciplines. Vygotsky's (1978) theory of learning as a sociocultural process postulates that social interaction with a more competent other is the means by which children actively co-construct the teaching/learning process within a zone of proximal development. Children are viewed as cultural novices who appropriate patterns of thinking and communicating through joint activity with more expert members of their cultures (Rogoff, 1990).

Within an interactionist framework, ideal second language (L2) learning classrooms provide environments that encourage communication and authentic opportunities to use the target language and provide exposure to proficient speakers of the target language who tailor their

Correspondence should be sent to Mileidis Gort, Univeristy of Miami, School of Education, Department of Teaching and Learning, 5202 University Drive, Merrick 222, Coral Gables, FL 33146. E-mail: mgort@miami.edu

language to make themselves understood (Baker, 2006; Lessow-Hurley, 2000). Related research in bilingual language and literacy development further highlights the importance of social interaction for learning, the transfer of skills across languages, variations in patterns of learning for native language (L1) and L2 learners, and the embeddedness of language and literacy in children's immediate and broader contexts (Gort, 2006; Manyak, 2001; Pérez, 2004b).

This study's focus on the naturally-occurring interactions within TWI classrooms provides rare insights into the day-to-day peer teaching and learning strategies that may facilitate at least two of the goals of TWI programs: bilingual/biliteracy development and sociocultural integration.

Research on the role of peers as resources for young L2 learners (Kenner, 2004; Olmedo, 2005) suggests that peers use a range of teaching strategies to scaffold language and literacy learning, as well as social and communicative strategies that facilitate general classroom participation. A few studies of teaching/learning interactions among bilingual children go beyond a Vygotskian *expert-novice* model to suggest that these roles can be fluid and negotiable depending on children's varying abilities at different times in different situations, in which all are extending children's language abilities (Chen & Gregory, 2004; Fassler, 1998). Fassler (1998), for example, proposed a "reciprocal model of peer scaffolding" in which "children collaborated with peers of both like and different backgrounds to help each other do many things with language they could not originally do on their own" (p. 403). Chen and Gregory (2004) similarly suggest that the peer scaffolding process may move beyond scaffolding toward synergy, a unique reciprocity whereby children act as agents in each other's learning.

The study described here builds upon this literature and extends it in several ways. First, while a great deal of TWI research has focused on issues of implementation, program design, and students' academic success, this study's focus on the naturally occurring interactions within TWI classrooms provides rare insights into the day-to-day peer teaching and learning strategies that may facilitate at least two of the goals of TWI programs: bilingual/biliteracy development and sociocultural integration. Second, the study adopts a multilingual/multicultural lens to the study of bilingual learner collaboration by looking at the nature of peer interactions across parallel integrated learning contexts that privilege both English and Spanish. The following research questions guided the study:

1. What is the nature of spontaneous peer interactions across Spanish/English integrated learning contexts?
2. What role do Spanish-dominant and English-dominant emergent bilingual peers play in mediating each other's dual language and literacy learning in a two-way partial immersion (TWpI) program?

Method

Setting

The study was situated in two first grade classrooms in a Spanish/English TWpI program in an urban, culturally diverse, K-5 elementary school in the northeastern United States. At the time of the study, the school served the highest percentage of English language learners (42%) in the district. The ethnic make-up of the student body was 45% Caucasian of European descent, 53% Latino, and 2% African-American. Forty-one percent of the school's 300 students participated in the free/reduced lunch program. Students in the TWpI program reflected the district's cultural, linguistic, and socio-economic diversity.

The TWpI program is a controlled choice program that attracts English- and Spanish-speaking students from the neighborhood and other parts of the district. While the main goals of the TWpI program reflect those documented in the TWI literature, the distribution of languages of instruction differs from commonly researched models. The language of instruction ratio is approximately 75% native/dominant language to 25% second language for each group of students. This means that all students receive more instruction in their stronger language initially and increasing amounts of their L2 at each new grade level until reaching a 50/50 ratio by grade 4. There are two classrooms per grade, a Spanish classroom and an English classroom. At times classes are scheduled to be composed of all native/dominant speakers, all second language speakers, or integrated native/dominant and second language speakers.

The study focused on peer collaborations within the Writing Workshop (WW) in each of the two classrooms, an integrated 45- to 60-minute period of the day in which students wrote in either Spanish or English. The

Downloaded By: [University of Miami Library] At: 16:19 15 December 2008

particular classroom in which the activity occurred (i.e., English or Spanish room) determined the language of instruction and, therefore, the language of children's texts. Although adults spoke in the target language and encouraged children to do the same, the children used both languages flexibly depending upon their particular proficiency level in each language. The process writing approach employed in the WW stressed the notion of writing as a craft in which the writer engages in a number of individual and interactive stages to develop an idea and express it in writing (Calkins, 1986; Graves, 1983). Due to their highly collaborative nature and structure, the parallel WWs provided ideal contexts to study peer collaboration in integrated settings.

Participants

Rather than observing all of the students in the parallel WWs, I chose to take a focused look at six students in various pair configurations so that I might understand not only the kinds of collaboration that take place but also obtain a clear picture of contextual factors that are important to understanding children's collaborations. In consultation with the teachers, I identified six students who had a history of working well in pairs/small groups, purposefully including children with varied oral language and literacy abilities in Spanish and English. The focal children included native Spanish-speakers who had early intermediate English skills (Lucy, Brian, & Katherine), a native English-speaker who was in the early stages of acquiring Spanish (Jeremy), and a native bilingual and native Spanish-speaker who were considered to have stronger skills in English (Steven & Barbara, respectively[1]). Based on their language proficiencies at the time of the study, I refer to the children as Spanish-dominant (Lucy, Brian, & Katherine) or English-dominant (Jeremy, Steven, & Barbara). Four of the six children had been enrolled in the TWpI program since kindergarten; Steven and Barbara attended kindergarten in an English-only Head Start program prior to joining the TWpI program at the beginning of the first grade. Table 1 provides a summary of background information for each participant at the beginning of the study.

Data Collection

The current study emerged from a larger study on the writing processes and skills of emergent bilinguals in a dual language program (Gort, 2006). Over the course of six months, I and two research assistants became part of the first grade TWpI community as participant observers and researchers. We shadowed focal participants and documented and audio-recorded what focal children did and said as they developed stories in parallel WW contexts. During 45- to 60-minute classroom visits, researchers wrote field notes about focal students' behavior and dialogue, audiotaped peer interactions, documented informal conversations with the teachers, gathered writing artifacts across all stages of the writing process, and interviewed focal students. The data set included:

- Field notes and corresponding audiotapes from 64 Spanish WW and 62 English WW classroom observations.
- 327 student writing artifacts.
- Audiotapes and field notes from bi-weekly semi-structured interviews (n = 73) with focal participants focusing on peer collaboration in WW.

Data Preparation

The author and research assistants transcribed all classroom and interview audiotapes in preparation for analysis. Data sources were sorted by context and, within each context, were organized and reviewed chronologically. A general review of the data suggested a considerable amount of redundant information. Thus, a subset of data was selected for in-depth analyses that included two transcripts and related data sources in each language for each four-week time period of the study (six periods total) for each participant, for a total of 24 transcripts and related data sources per participant.

Analysis

The method of multi-layering through a combination of ethnographic and ethnomethodological research approaches was used (Bloome & Theodorou, 1987; Gregory, 1998). This took advantage of minute-by-minute analysis of collaboration strategies between focal participants through conversation analysis (Gregory, 1998), coupled with the longitudinal participant observation, interviews, etc., of ethnography. Ethnographic methods provided an overview of the scope and range of bilingual language and literacy practices in the context of WW. Ethnomethodology enabled a detailed analysis of teaching and learning strategies used across and between collaborative pairs/triads.

[1] In the case of these two students, language proficiency assessments and parental choice determined placement in the English homeroom. Because of the TWpI's model of language distribution, this meant that these two students received more instruction in English than Spanish in the earlier grades.

Downloaded By: [University of Miami Library] At: 16:19 15 December 2008

Table 1. Participant information

Name*	Age	Native language (initial language/s learned at home)	Dominant language (language of greater proficiency)	Home language (language/s used at home)
Lucy	6:3	Spanish	Spanish	Spanish
Brian	7:0	Spanish	Spanish	Spanish
Katherine	6:8	Spanish	Spanish	Spanish
Jeremy	6:11	English	English	English (some Spanish support for homework)
Steven	7:1	English/Spanish	English	English/Spanish
Barbara	6:5	Spanish	English	Spanish

*Pseudonyms.

Analysis of the peer interactions and the strategies emergent bilingual children used in the process of dual language/literacy/culture teaching and learning was ongoing throughout the study and influenced subsequent data collection. I made several passes through the data, coding it in a variety of ways. To arrive at a categorization of the range of communicative contexts in the Spanish and English WWs, I began by identifying *collaborative episodes*, defined as a series of moves in which an individual structures or solicits the response of another or reacts to such behaviors initiated by another in relation to the academic task at hand (adapted from Chesterfield & Chesterfield, 1985). Within these interactive episodes, I coded the data in terms of the nature of the activity, language/s used, stage of the writing process, and prevailing participation structures. I coded collaborative strategies for negotiation of shared meaning, defined as "mental and communicative procedures learners use in order to learn and use language" (Nunnan, 1999, p. 171) and literacy. I focused on recurring patterns of collaborative teaching and learning strategies peers used to help each other learn Spanish or English oral and/or written language. I also compared and contrasted strategies that the same children used across the two WW contexts and identified strategies that were context-specific.

Findings and Discussion

Spontaneous peer collaborations emerged naturally and frequently within and across the parallel WW contexts. These peer teaching/learning interactions provided opportunities for ongoing negotiation of meaning through hybrid literacy practices, i.e., the blending of Spanish and English, home and school registers, and formal and informal knowledge, that facilitated the development of bilingualism, biliteracy, and cross-cultural understanding for both groups of students. Even in the Spanish WW environment, where Spanish is promoted and privileged, the use of English mixed with Spanish (i.e., Spanglish[2]) appeared to dominate, or at least blend into, many episodes of peer collaboration. From a linguistic perspective, Spanglish is rule-governed like any variety of language (MacSwan, 2000), and Spanglish users are capable of articulating complex ideas, constructing meaning, and expressing their cross-cultural experiences. The findings support Gutiérrez, Baquedano-López, & Tejada's (1999) assertion that "hybrid literacy practices are not simply . . . the alternation between two language codes," but rather "a systematic, strategic, affiliative, and sense-making process" (p. 88).

Mediating Dual Language, Literacy, and Cross-Cultural Learning through Peer Collaboration

Across the two WW contexts, peer collaboration related to the negotiation of meaning around *language/culture*, *literacy/writing*, and *WW procedures*. Emergent bilinguals used a variety of strategies to co-construct meaning, including soliciting assistance, providing strategic advice, scaffolding with cues, giving directives, posing instructional questions, requesting/providing clarification, and strategic codeswitching.

Negotiating meaning around dual language and cross-cultural development. Collaboration around language development occurred across both WWs and involved negotiation of meaning related to vocabulary/word choice, translation, and grammatical structure. As children planned, drafted, and revised stories in progress, they enlisted the help of their peers in negotiating how to best represent their intended meaning and in learning new vocabulary in the target language. Some of these interactions were in one language; others

[2]I define the term Spanglish as a hybrid language and literacy form, characterized by the interaction and blending of Spanish and English, which is common in bilingual contexts and communities. Spanglish represents a positive way of identifying the normal borrowing and code-switching events of stable bilingual communities that reflect the bicultural experiences of Latino bilinguals living in the U.S. (Morales, 2002; Zentella, 1997).

Downloaded By: [University of Miami Library] At: 16:19 15 December 2008

involved the strategic use of both languages. Bilingual interactions were much more common in the Spanish WW than in the English WW. Although monolingual and bilingual interactions seemed to serve similar purposes of clarifying, mediating, or providing language for children's stories, bilingual collaborations highlight how students drew on their developing bilingualism, biculturalism, and sociolinguistic competence to negotiate meaning (Gort, 2006) and mediate their learning in interaction with others (Manyak, 2001, 2002). The following excerpt depicts a common bilingual exchange in the Spanish WW in which Lucy offered Katherine a language-based directive. Although Katherine originally rejected Lucy's suggestion, she was able to incorporate it successfully with an additional scaffold from Lucy.

Katherine: (rereading story in progress) Compramos soda y *popcorn* [We bought soda and popcorn].
Katherine: (to herself, but loud enough for Lucy to hear) ¿Cómo se escribe *popcorn*? [How do you write popcorn?].
Lucy: Escríbelo en español, palomitas de maiz [Write it in Spanish, "palomitas de maiz"].
Katherine: A si, palomitas [Oh yes, popcorn].
Katherine: Palomitas . . . ¡No, en inglés! *I don't know how to write* palomitas! [No, in English!. . .].
Lucy: (helping Katherine to "sound out" the word) paaaaa . . . loooo . . . miiii . . . taaaas.
Katherine: (writes "palomitas") ¡de maiz! [of corn]
Katherine: (rereading) Palomitas . . . ¡Ya! *There! Done!* [popcorn . . . There!...]

This exchange highlights the ways in which bilingual children develop an enhanced awareness that positively influences their understanding of language structure and flexibility in manipulating languages (Bauer, 2000). Lucy and Katherine demonstrated metalinguistic awareness in different ways: Lucy's proposal to use the Spanish term for "popcorn" in a Spanish-medium story suggests that she distinguishes between her two languages and uses them in systematic ways; Katherine's original rejection of Lucy's suggestion, presumably due to a foreseeable encoding challenge, suggests an awareness of the different language structures of English and Spanish and the strategic use of two languages. In this process of translation, linguistic/literacy scaffolding, and negotiation, each child becomes more aware of her own bilinguality. This suggests that such cross-linguistic interactions represent bidirectional learning opportunities for all participants.

Bilingual interactions around language development also occurred between proficient speakers and emergent language learners. One common pairing involved Jeremy, an English-dominant child with emerging Spanish skills, and Barbara, an English-dominant child who was proficient in Spanish. When Barbara and Jeremy collaborated in the Spanish WW, the initial language of the interaction was always English; it was Jeremy who usually solicited assistance from Barbara around general translation or Spanish grammatical structure. The following example, typical of Barbara and Jeremy's ongoing collaboration, illustrates how Barbara's input, directives, modified speech, and instructional questioning served to scaffold Jeremy's L2 learning. Barbara herself gained practice in the complex exercise of translation. In this and similar interactions, children with stronger language abilities mediated the language learning of their less proficient peers, and vice versa.

Jeremy: (to Barbara) I keep forgetting how to say 'telephone'. . . *¿teléfono?*
Barbara: Aha.
Jeremy: Barbara, how do you say, 'We went to the magic show?' . . . *¿Fuimos a. . . ?*
Barbara: (dictating) Nosotros nos fuimos a [We went to].
Jeremy: Wait, wait, wait. You're saying it too fast.
Barbara: (dictating slowly) No . . . so . . . tros [we]
Jeremy: (writes "Nosotros"; then rereads) Nosotros [we]
Barbara: (dictating) fuimos [went]
Jeremy: (writes "fuimos"; then rereads) Fuimos . . . ¡ya! [went . . . done!]
Barbara: ¿ya? Done?
Barbara: (rereading what Jeremy had written) Nosotros fuimos
Barbara: (continues dictating) aaaaaaa . . . laaaaaaa [to the]
Jeremy: (writes "a la").
Jeremy: How do you say, 'magic show?'
Barbara: Hmmm . . . I don't know.. . .
Barbara: Nosotros fuimos a la . . . ummmm . . . ¿la show de magia? [we went to . . . ummmm . . . the magic show?].
Jeremy: (writes "show de majia" [sic]).
Barbara: Are you done yet?
Jeremy: Nope. How do you say, 'then we saw the show?'
Barbara: Después . . . después . . . [then . . . then]
Jeremy: (writes "despúes").
Barbara: (dictating slowly) después vimos . . . viiiii . . . mooooooos [then we saw].
Jeremy: (writes "vimos").
Barbara: the magic show . . . you know how to do that!
Jeremy: ¿el show?
Barbara: (confirming Jeremy's answer with enthusiasm) ¡el show!

This exchange continued for another few minutes, as Jeremy requested additional translation assistance from Barbara, who brokered the new code and provided comprehensible input in the co-construction of Jeremy's (and her own) Spanish language development:

Jeremy: (rereading) Despues de eso . . .
Jeremy: Barbara, how do you say, 'we got pizza'? ¿Nosotros. . . ? [We. . . ?]
Barbara: Cojiemos [sic] . . . pizza [we got pizza].
Jeremy: (encoding) cojiemos [sic] pizza [we got pizza].

Downloaded By: [University of Miami Library] At: 16:19 15 December 2008

In this lengthy and complex exchange, we see how Barbara provided a firm structure of support through which Jeremy took up as much or as little as he could manage. Barbara demonstrated that she is a competent and supportive dual language user and facilitator, providing comprehensible target language at Jeremy's current language learning level. Through Barbara's word-for-word modeling and repetition, Jeremy was able to advance his Spanish language (and literacy) skills in ways that would not be possible on his own. We also see how complex are the skills of translation and interpretation, especially when language is presented in decontextualized units (i.e., individual word vs. sentence or phrase level). Through the process of translation and interpretation, Barbara herself advances her bilingual skills. In these ways, bilingual collaborative exchanges between Barbara and Jeremy led each participant to a level of dual language understanding and biliteracy development that cannot be accessed in individual activity or monolingual collaborative interaction (Chen & Gregory, 2004; Fassler, 1998).

Other bilingual interactions in the Spanish WW involved discussions of hybrid terms that were common Spanglish colloquialisms in the children's Dominican-American community. In the following interaction, Katherine, Lucy, & Steven discussed the nature and use of the term "qucau" [sic].

> Katherine: (orally rehearsing the next story detail she planned to write) Era muy caliente y fuimos a la piscina . . . era muy caliente y hicimos un cucao [sic]. [It was very hot and we went to the pool . . . it was very hot and we had a *cucao*]
> Katherine: (repeating to herself, but loud enough for Steven to hear) cucao . . . cucao [sic] [cookout].
> Steven: ¿Qué és un cucao? [What is a *cucao*?]
> Lucy: Un cucao [sic], que hay mucha comida [a *cucao*, that there is a lot of food].
> Steven: *Oh, cookout!*
> Katherine: Hicimos un cucao [sic] en la playa una vez y *that was so fun*! [We had a cookout at the beach one time and that was so fun!]
> Katherine: (to Lucy) ¿Cucao empieza con la 'qu' (q) o con 'ce' (c)? [Does *cucao* begin with a 'q' or with a 'c'?]
> Lucy: ¡Intentalo! [Attempt it!] (referring to a collaborative spelling sheet that is used as a resource in the WW).
> [Katherine took the spelling sheet and attempted to spell the word. She spelled it "qucau," then handed it to Lucy to attempt to spell the word.]
> Lucy: ¡Yo no se escribir 'cucao'! [I don't know how to write '*cucao*'!]
> Lucy: (orally manipulating word as she writes it on spelling sheet) cuqueo . . . cucao . . . curcarro (laughing) [Lucy spells it "cukao"]
> Steven: *cookout . . . cookout!*
> Katherine: (correcting Steven's English pronunciation) ¡cucao!
> Lucy: (supporting/affirming Katherine's Spanish pronunciation) ¡cucao!
> Katherine: *cookout* . . . ¡eso es ingles! [Cookout . . . that is English!]
> Katherine: ¡En español es 'cucao'! [In Spanish it's *cucao*!]

This and related metalinguistic negotiations reveal the children's developing understanding of such terms as representing either "Spanish" or "English," and demonstrate how bilingual/bicultural children co-construct knowledge that legitimizes out-of-school communities, experiences, and identities as resources for classroom language, literacy, and cross-cultural learning. Katherine, Lucy, and Steven did not see certain language and literacy functions as legitimate or illegitimate, standard or non-standard. Instead, they applied, constructed, and re-constructed their dual language, literacy, and cultural knowledge in ways that served their functions and needs. Through a hybridized discourse (Pérez, 2004a), the children in these classrooms blended Spanish and English language and literacy practices and used their home and school registers for communication, meaning-making, and learning in the writing workshop. In this process of linguistic and cultural brokering (Morales & Hanson, 2005), students broadened their cross-cultural and sociolinguistic understandings.

Negotiating meaning around bilingual writing development. Peer scaffolding around bilingual literacy/writing development involved collaborative support with spelling, punctuation/capitalization, the use of literary devices/stylistic writing features, and the content of students' writing. Across WWs, a common strategy involved including a bilingual clarification (i.e., translation) for the target word, as illustrated by Brian in the following excerpt:

> Brian: How do you spell 'run?'
> Barbara: What do you want me to write?
> Brian: Run . . . run . . . like run . . . *correr* [to run].

Other biliteracy/writing-oriented collaborations were related to the use of stylistic features in writing. Often writers got ideas for developing their own stories by simply listening to a peer reread his/her story in progress. For example, Katherine "borrowed" from Lucy two stylistic features for signaling emphasis: the repetitive use of an adjective and the use of exclamation marks.

> Lucy: (rereading story in progress) El ratón tenía cepillo tan tan tan grande.. . . [The mouse had a very very very big toothbrush. . .].
> Katherine: (rereading her own story in progress) Era muy caliente . . . [It was very hot].
> Lucy: (to Katherine) Yo escribí 'tan tan tan' [I wrote 'very very very'].
> Katherine: (to herself) Tan tan caliente [Very very hot].

Downloaded By: [University of Miami Library] At: 16:19 15 December 2008

You give me idea! [sic] Thank you!
Katherine: Okay! ¡Tan tan tan caliente! [Very very very hot!].
(writes: "Tan tan tan caliente," then rereads) Tan tan tan caliente.
Lucy: (adds single exclamation mark at end of sentence: "El ratón tenía cepillo tan tan tan grande!" [sic]).
[Katherine watched Lucy add single exclamation mark].
Katherine: ¡Voy a poner signo de animo! [I'm going to put an exclamation mark!] (correctly inserts double exclamation marks around "¡caliente!"). (rereading, with enthusiasm) ¡Caliente!

By listening to Lucy's read-aloud and subsequent comment about her story-in-progress, and watching her write, Katherine made a connection to her own work and found a way to incorporate these features into her story. In this way, Lucy's writing process and draft (including the read-aloud and discussion) became a scaffold for Katherine's biliteracy development.

Other ways in which writers supported and extended each others' bi/literacy development related to the content of developing stories. Emergent bilinguals offered suggestions such as adding details or deleting unrelated information, matching pictures to text, and providing ideas for story topics when peers weren't able to access any on their own. In these interactions, students used their home and school knowledge for communication and meaning making to create stories that represented their bilingual and bicultural experiences.

Negotiating meaning around WW procedures. Emergent bilingual writers also negotiated meaning around WW procedures, including orienting peers about what to do next or where to find necessary materials, and directing peers to classroom tools and resources that facilitated writing in the workshop. For example, writers often reminded each other to use the classroom word walls or dictionaries to get help with spelling of commonly used words, to begin planning a new story if a peer wasn't available to edit, or to begin each WW by rereading their story in progress.

Roles Played by Spanish-dominant and English-dominant Peers in Mediating Dual Language and Literacy Learning

Emergent bilinguals of different language backgrounds and varying language proficiencies collaborated in the parallel WWs in various pair/triad configurations. These included integrated language pairs (e.g., Spanish-dominant/English dominant, English-dominant bilingual/English-dominant) and same language pairs. Children took on multiple roles within and across WW sessions and contexts where they served as language and culture expert/facilitator, literacy expert/facilitator, and WW expert/facilitator at different times and to different degrees.

In the role of dual language and culture expert, Spanish-speakers provided translation assistance for their native English-speaking peers in the Spanish WW. In this capacity, children acted as language brokers and carried out "intercultural transactions," an important role frequently ignored in classrooms (Vasquez, Pease-Alvarez, & Shannon, 1994). In the English WW, given the more equivalent levels of English proficiency among students, peers worked collaboratively to accurately represent a writer's intended meaning in the target language. Although English predominated in this context, Spanish was used for purposes of clarification and confirmation. The term "dual language/culture facilitator" was more accurate here, as both groups of students supported each other in joint production of story-related language for their developing narratives. In both contexts, more proficient peers accommodated the needs of less proficient ones by using the native/dominant language of the novices, adjusting their target language to support the novices' comprehension and communicative ability by scaffolding, translating, clarifying, and providing non-verbal cues and phrases to support their emergent language, literacy, and cross-cultural development (Baker, 2006; Pérez, 2004b).

Across both WW contexts, the roles of bi/literacy expert/facilitator and WW expert/facilitator also were commonly adopted by Spanish-dominant and English-dominant children as they provided oral and written language scaffolds to extend their peers' literacy development, as well as procedural support to facilitate the writing process. Children functioned as agents in each other's language and cross-cultural learning (Chen & Gregory, 2004) in this process of reciprocal support. These findings suggest that, in integrated academic/language contexts such as TWI, the roles of dual language/culture, bi/literacy, and WW expert or facilitator are dynamic and negotiable with emergent bilingual children of varying abilities (Chen & Gregory, 2004; Fassler, 1998). These multiple roles may be assumed by all children at some time given opportunities for collaboration in the co-construction of bilingual, biliteracy, and sociocultural development.

Taken together, the spontaneous peer interactions involving Spanish- and English-dominant emergent bilinguals presented here illustrate the benefits of peer collaboration on bilingual language and literacy development (Angelova, Gunawardena, & Volk, 2006; Chen & Gregory, 2004), and sociocultural integration. By using their developing dual language and cultural knowledge with peers who come from different backgrounds, children became more bilingual, biliterate, and bicultural. Through cross-linguistic and cross-cultural interactions, Spanish-dominant and English-dominant students constructed and mediated alternative discourses

Downloaded By: [University of Miami Library] At: 16:19 15 December 2008

that enabled them to develop cultural and linguistic capital. In this way, the benefits of peer collaboration extended beyond language learning by providing spaces in which cross-cultural understanding could emerge.

Young bilingual writers worked cooperatively in different roles to facilitate mutual understanding in the process of co-constructing Spanish and English texts. Bilingual collaborations were common across same language and integrated language pairings, as Spanish-dominant and English-dominant peers engaged in hybrid oral language and literacy practices that drew on their developing dual language and literacy knowledge, prior knowledge and experiences, formal and informal ways of communicating and meaning making, and developing bilingual/bicultural identities to express themselves orally and in writing. These collaborations included metalinguistic negotiations of hybrid linguistic terms that were common in the local community but not necessarily represented in the formal discourse of school (Nieto, 2006; Zentella, 1997).

Adopting a Vygotskian lens, these findings build upon and extend the conclusions of other socioculturally based investigations (Gutiérrez et al., 1999; Moll & Diaz, 1987) in support of a "bilingual/bicultural zone of proximal development," through which the acquisition of new knowledge depends on young bilinguals' opportunity to draw upon their two languages and cultures through hybrid language and literacy practices to mediate their learning in interaction with others. This occurred in spite of a conscious effort by program staff to separate the two languages for instruction.

Conclusion and Implications

The findings presented here have important implications for designing and implementing effective language, literacy, and cross-cultural learning environments for bilingual children from minority- and majority-language backgrounds. They emphasize the crucial role that emergent bilinguals' broad linguistic and cultural repertoires play in enabling children to gain access to genuine participatory roles in classroom activities. Through the use of hybrid language and literacy practices, children's bilingualism and biculturalism (and thus, children themselves) became valuable intellectual, social, and cultural resources within the parallel academic communities of WW. The research demonstrates how developing bilinguals drew on all the codes at their disposal—including community and school discourses, linguistic and cultural knowledge, and literacy tools and experiences—to communicate and make sense of their classroom experiences, despite the TWpI program's policy of language separation. In practice, teachers in these classrooms created spaces for hybridized discourse in the social context of the TWpI classrooms. Children's flexible use of language was evident in their written texts and oral interactions. By creating opportunities for mixed-language student interactions where cultures of linguistic collaborations evolved (Pérez, 2004a) within the rich interactive space of the WW, teachers recognized and supported bilingual children's needs for their home and community discourses to be recognized and valued. Thus, even in "monolingual" classroom contexts, teachers can support bilingual children's linguistic and cross-cultural development and validate their community knowledge and experiences, formal and informal ways of communicating and meaning-making, and bilingual/bicultural identities by encouraging bilingual children to communicate using their full linguistic and cultural repertoires.

The research also demonstrates how bilingual/bicultural peers can serve as guides in academic, cross-cultural, and linguistic activities in the classroom, especially if such interaction is encouraged in the classroom social structure. When teachers encourage and support peer collaboration, children may develop as skilled facilitators of classroom learning and other academically useful forms of interaction (Chen & Gregory, 2004). Cross-linguistic and cross-cultural interactions, as shown here, have the potential of giving children experience in coordinated parallel activity (e.g., crafting, revising stories in progress), guidance/scaffolding (e.g., offering suggestions for story content, writing conventions, WW procedures), and collaboration (e.g., working together to negotiate sociolinguistically and socioculturally relevant linguistic terms to include in a story).

The findings further highlight the importance of learning environments that foster the development of bilingualism/biliteracy and support emergent bilinguals' ability to navigate multicultural realms of knowledge, interaction, and understanding in the process of learning. In these TWpI classrooms, the exchange of ideas in two languages promoted bilingual/bicultural children's cognitive, linguistic, and cross-cultural development. Across other classroom contexts, wherein children learn from and with peers from different linguistic and cultural groups, bilingualism, biliteracy, and biculturalism can and should be positioned as legitimate symbols of academic achievement.

References

Alanis, I. (2000). A Texas two-way bilingual program: Its effects on linguistic and academic achievement. *Bilingual Research Journal, 24*(3), 225–248.

Angelova, M., Gunawardena, D., & Volk, D. (2006). Peer teaching and learning: Co-constructing language in a dual language first grade. *Language and Education, 20*(3), 173–190.

Baker, C. (2006). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (4th ed.). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Downloaded By: [University of Miami Library] At: 16:19 15 December 2008

Bauer, E. B. (2000). Code-switching during shared and independent reading: Lessons learned from a preschooler. *Research in the Teaching of English, 35*(1), 101–130.

Bloome, D., & Theodorou, E. (1987). Analyzing teacher-student and student-student discourse. In J. Green, J. Harker, & C. Wallat (Eds.), *Multiple analysis of classroom discourse processes* (pp. 217–249). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publications.

Calkins, L. (1986). *The art of teaching writing.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Chen, Y., & Gregory, E. (2004). "How do I read these words?" Bilingual exchange teaching between Cantonese-speaking peers. In E. Gregory, S. Long, & D. Volk (Eds.), *Many pathways to literacy: Young children learning with siblings, grandparents, peers, and communities* (pp. 117–128). London: Routledge Falmer.

Chesterfield, R. A., & Chesterfield, K. B. (1985). "Hojas with the h": Spontaneous peer teaching in bilingual classrooms. *Bilingual Review, 12*(3), 198–208.

Christian, D., Montone, C., Lindholm, K., & Carranza, I. (1997). *Profiles in two-way immersion education.* McHenry, IL: Delta Systems and Center for Applied Linguistics.

Fassler, R. (1998). Room for talk: Peer support for getting into English in an ESL kindergarten. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 13*(3), 379–409.

Gort, M. (2006). Strategic codeswitching, interliteracy, and other phenomena of emergent bilingual writing: Lessons from first grade dual language classrooms. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy, 6*(3), 323–354.

Graves, D. H. (1983). *Writing: Teachers and children at work.* Exeter, NH: Heinemann.

Gregory, E. (1998). Siblings as mediators of literacy in linguistic minority communities. *Language and Education, 12*(1), 33–54.

Gutiérrez, K., Baquedano-López, P., & Tejada, C. (1999). Rethinking diversity: Hybridity and hybrid language practices in the third space. *Mind, Culture, and Activity, 6*(4), 286–303.

Howard, E. R., Christian, D., & Genesee, F. (2004). *The development of bilingualism and biliteracy from grade 3 to 5: A summary of findings from the CAL/CREDE study of two-way immersion education.* University of California, Santa Cruz: Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence.

Howard, E. R., Sugarman, J., & Christian, D. (2003). *Trends in two-way immersion education: A review of the research.* John Hopkins University, Baltimore: CRESPAR.

Kenner, C. (2004). Community school pupils reinterpret their knowledge of Chinese and Arabic for primary school peers. In E. Gregory, S. Long, & D. Volk (Eds.), *Many pathways to literacy: Young children learning with siblings, grandparents, peers, and communities* (pp. 104–116). London: Routledge Falmer.

Lessow-Hurley, J. (2000). *The foundations of dual language instruction* (3rd ed.). New York: Longman.

Lindholm, K. J. (1990). Bilingual immersion education: Criteria for program development. In H. Fairchild & C. Valadez (Eds.), *Bilingual education: Issues and strategies* (pp. 91–105). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Lindholm-Leary, K. (2001). *Dual language education.* Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

MacSwan, J. (2000). The threshold hypothesis, semilingualism, and other contributions to a deficit view of linguistic minorities. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 22*(1), 3–45.

Manyak, P. C. (2001). Participation, hybridity, and carnival: A situated analysis of a dynamic literacy practice in a primary-grade English immersion class. *Journal of Literacy Research, 33*(3), 423–465.

Manyak, P. C. (2002). "Welcome to Salón 110": The consequences of hybrid literacy practices in a primary-grade English immersion class. *Bilingual Research Journal, 26*(2), 213–234.

Moll, L., & Diaz, S. (1987). Change as the goal of educational research. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 18*, 300–311.

Morales, A., & Hanson, W. E. (2005). Language brokering: An integrative review of the literature. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 27*(4), 471–503.

Morales, E. (2002). *Living in Spanglish: The search for Latino identity in America*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Nieto, S. (2006). Language, literacy, and culture: Intersections and implications. In H. Luria, D. M. Seymor, & T. Smoke (Eds.), *Language and linguistics in context: Readings and applications for teachers* (pp. 315–332). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Nunnan, D. (1999). *Second language teaching and learning.* Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle.

Olmedo, I. (2005). The bilingual echo: Children as language mediators in a dual-language school. In M. Farr (Ed.), *Latino language and literacy in ethnolinguistic Chicago* (pp. 135–155). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Pérez, B. (2004a). *Becoming biliterate: A study of two-way bilingual immersion education.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Pérez, B. (2004b). Language, literacy, and biliteracy. In B. Pérez (Ed.), *Sociocultural contexts of language and literacy* (2nd ed., pp. 25–56). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Potowski, K. (2007). *Language and identity in a dual immersion school.* Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Rogoff, B. (1990). *Apprenticeship in thinking: Cognitive development in social context.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Vasquez, O., Pease-Alvarez, L., & Shannon, S. (1994). *Pushing boundaries: Language and culture in a Mexicano community.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Zentella, A. C. (1997). *Growing up bilingual.* Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Downloaded By: [University of Miami Library] At: 16:19 15 December 2008