Portland State University

PDXScholar

Dissertations and Theses

Dissertations and Theses

8-4-1997

The Adjunct Model of Content-based Instruction: A Comparative Study in Higher Education in Oregon

Georgann Sue Percival
Portland State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open_access_etds

Part of the [Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Percival, Georgann Sue, "The Adjunct Model of Content-based Instruction: A Comparative Study in Higher Education in Oregon" (1997). *Dissertations and Theses*. Paper 5305.

<https://doi.org/10.15760/etd.7178>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

THESIS APPROVAL

The abstract and thesis of Georgann Sue Percival for the Master of Arts in TESOL were presented August 4, 1997, and accepted by the thesis committee and the department.

COMMITTEE APPROVALS:

Marjorie S. Terdal, Chair

Kimberley A. Brown

Shirley A. Morrell

Earl L. Rees
Representative of the Office of
Graduate Studies

DEPARTMENT APPROVAL

Marjorie S. Terdal, Chair
Department of Applied Linguistics

ACCEPTED FOR PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY BY THE LIBRARY

by

on

Nov. 19, 1997

ABSTRACT

An abstract of the thesis of Georgann Sue Percival for the Master of Arts in TESOL presented August 4, 1997.

Title: The Adjunct Model of Content-Based Instruction: A Comparative Study in Higher Education in Oregon

Content-based instruction (CBI) in all forms is widely used in ESL programs in higher education. The adjunct model of CBI, which links ESL classes to academic content courses, is regarded as an effective way to provide a transition between ESL and academic classes. Considering the growing numbers of limited English proficiency students entering colleges and universities for degree and vocational programs, the adjunct model provides an innovative means for ESL programs to serve these students.

This comparative study investigates how adjunct model courses are planned, administered, and taught in eight colleges and universities in Oregon. Telephone surveys were used to locate all the ESL programs that had adjunct courses. In-depth taped interviews with ESL program directors and ESL adjunct teachers investigated selected issues related to adjunct courses. The interviews explored rationale for including adjunct courses

in the ESL curriculum, administrative decisions about adjunct courses, the preparation of adjunct course syllabi and teaching materials, the selection and recruitment of content courses, the criteria used to place ESL students in adjunct courses, the cooperation between ESL and content instructors, and the evaluation of adjunct courses.

Details of the interviews related to these issues were presented and discussed. The eight schools reported being satisfied with the pedagogy of the adjunct model, but none had collected data to investigate its effectiveness in preparing students for academic classes. Administrative difficulties related to increased financial costs, low enrollments, and registration concerns were reported and led to two schools discontinuing adjunct courses although both still reported satisfaction with its pedagogy. In this study the adjunct model was adapted by Oregon schools to meet the needs of ESL programs and students.

THE ADJUNCT MODEL OF CONTENT-BASED INSTRUCTION:
A COMPARATIVE STUDY IN HIGHER EDUCATION IN OREGON

by
GEORGANN SUE PERCIVAL

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS
in
TESOL

Portland State University
1997

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express appreciation to all the program directors and ESL teachers who so willingly shared their knowledge and gave so generously of their time for the interviews in this study. It has been my experience that ESL professionals are exceptionally generous and supportive of each other; the participants in this study lived up to and exceeded this image.

I am grateful to Linfield College for the time and assistance to complete this degree. In particular, I want to thank Ellen Summerfield, Director of International Programs and Sandra Lee, Coordinator of the ESL Program, for their continued encouragement and support.

Finally, my thanks go to this thesis committee Marjorie S. Terdal, Kimberley A. Brown, Shirley A. Morrell, and Earl L. Rees. I am particularly grateful to my thesis advisor, Marjorie S. Terdal, for her assistance, support, patience, and those gentle nudges that helped me to finish.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
LIST OF TABLES	v
LIST OF FIGURES	vi
I INTRODUCTION	1
Background	2
Definitions	4
Research Questions	5
Method	6
II REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	8
Origins of Content-Based Language Instruction ...	10
Theoretical Foundations of CBI	13
Models of Content-Based Instruction	18
Effectiveness of Content-Based Instruction	32
The Adjunct Model	37
III METHODOLOGY	47
General Method	47
Subjects	48
Procedures	49
IV RESULTS	55
Introduction	55
Phone Survey	56

Interview Results	60
Rationale for Adjunct Course	60
Administrative Decisions	66
Syllabus and Teaching Materials	82
Selection and Recruitment of Content Courses	92
ESL Student Placement in Adjunct Courses	102
Cooperation between Content and ESL Faculty	108
Program Evaluation	117
V SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	120
Introduction	120
General Observations and Conclusions	121
Research Questions	128
Limitations	146
The Value of This Study	149
Implications for ESL	151
Suggestions for Future Research	156
Summary	158
REFERENCES	161
APPENDICES	
A PHONE SURVEY: INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE STATE OF OREGON INCLUDED IN SURVEY	168
B CBI PHONE SURVEY FORM	171
C INTERVIEW CONSENT FORM	173
D INTERVIEW QUESTIONS	175

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1	Institution Codes Assigned for Confidentiality 54
2	Number and Percent of Oregon Higher Education Institutions Offering ESL Programs and Content- Based Instruction (CBI), Spring 1995 58
3	Number and Percent of Oregon Higher Education Institutions with ESL Offering Thematic, Sheltered, and Adjunct Model Courses, Spring 1995 59

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE		PAGE
1	Theoretical language proficiency framework of Cummins and Swain that shows the range of contextual support and degree of cognitive involvement in communicative activities.	17
2	A content-based continuum illustrating how CBI models fit between typical language classes and mainstream classes.	28

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Adjunct model courses are increasingly being used in colleges and universities to provide a transition experience for ESL students between ESL and mainstream classes and to attempt to better prepare students for academic courses. This comparative study explored aspects of planning, administering, and teaching adjunct courses in ESL programs at Oregon institutions of higher education. A phone survey identified eight colleges and universities with adjunct model courses. Taped, personal interviews with program directors and ESL teachers of adjunct courses were used to collect information on (a) rationale for adjunct courses, (b) administrative decision-making, (c) syllabus planning and development of teaching materials, (d) selection of content courses, (e) criteria for student placement in adjunct courses, and (f) evaluation of courses. Data collected identified problems and successes with adjunct courses at these schools and pointed out characteristics of adjunct model classes that need attention for the successful implementation of this instructional model.

Background

Interest in content-based second language instruction (CBI) has grown steadily over the last decade, and CBI has been widely applied with students at all levels, including higher education. Brinton, Snow, and Wesche (1989) explain its premise: "Classroom experience and second language acquisition theory both tell us that rich second language input in relevant contexts is the key, where the attention of the learner is focused mostly on the meaning rather than on the language"(p. 9).

Content-based instruction provides an effective way to prepare international students in colleges and universities for academic classes. Building grammatical and communicative competence does not guarantee success for students in mainstream classes; students must also learn what Saville-Troike (1984) calls academic competence. Therefore, English as a second language (ESL) programs must teach the skills that will build academic competence.

International students may arrive at US colleges and universities with some degree of conversational fluency but lack the academic English skills needed to cope with mainstream courses. They often come from very different educational systems, and they lack experience with student-centered instruction, an understanding of the expectations for student participation in the classroom, and exposure to American classroom culture. In addition, these students need to develop learning strategies and study skills that will help them compensate for lower English proficiency.

ESL programs can and do employ different approaches and methods to help students develop language and academic competence. In traditional ESL skills classes that emphasize language learning, the focus of attention is on language form. The addition of CBI in ESL is valuable because it places the center of attention on content; students use the target language to deal with the subject matter. Academic competency skills can be and are included in both traditional and content-based ESL courses.

Still, the transition from isolated ESL classes to mainstream classes can be abrupt and difficult for students. The adjunct model of CBI offers a means for ESL students to experience a mainstream college or university class while still getting support from the ESL program. The students participate in the academic content course with native English speakers and at the same time take a linked ESL class that integrates language skills, study skills, learning strategies, and information about American classroom culture. The purpose is to build a bridge between ESL and mainstream classes and smooth the transition between the two, with the ultimate goal of preparing students to be successful in future college and university courses. Of all the forms of content-based instruction, the adjunct model is best structured to accomplish these goals.

As college and university ESL programs are increasingly using the adjunct model, it is necessary to understand how the model can be adapted and how it can best be implemented. A number of different issues related to planning, administering, and teaching adjunct model ESL courses can have an impact on the effectiveness of these courses.

Definitions

The following terms are frequently used in the discussion of content-based instruction, and are found in the text of this thesis. Many of the terms will be defined in greater depth in Chapter II.

Adjunct Model of CBI - second language students enroll in linked language and content courses; language learning activities are derived from and coordinate with the content course.

CALP (Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency) - the term Cummins used to encompass the type of language proficiency needed for success in academic studies.

CBI (Content-based Instruction) - an approach to language instruction that integrates language and content; the primary focus is placed on content rather than on language form.

Communicative Approach - a language teaching approach where the primary goal is communicative competence.

EAP (English for Academic Purposes) - a component of ESP; teaching English to students with specific academic goals.

ESP (English for Specific Purposes) - teaching English to a particular group of students with specific goals and needs.

ESL (English as a Second Language) - programs for teaching English to persons with a different first language delivered in an English-speaking country.

LAC (Language Across the Curriculum) - a movement that promotes the teaching of language in all subject classes.

LEP (Limited English Proficiency) - refers to individuals with levels of English proficiency less than what is necessary to fully participate in classes taught only in English.

Sheltered Model of CBI - academic courses are delivered in sections reserved for second language students; the separation allows adjustments in content teaching for LEP students.

Thematic Model of CBI (Theme-based Content Instruction) - ESL classes that are structured around one or more themes or topics.

TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language) - a standardized test of English proficiency required of international students for admission by many colleges and universities in the United States. TOEFL admission levels vary widely; a score of 500-550 is commonly required (660 is a perfect score).

VESL (Vocational English as a Second Language) - a component of ESP; teaching English to students with specific employment goals.

Research Questions

This study was designed to explore various aspects of planning, administering, and teaching adjunct courses in ESL programs at Oregon institutions of higher education. The seven research questions below identify the primary issues to be explored in this study using personal

interviews. Each represents an area of questioning that involves a number of related issues. Therefore, specific interview questions were prepared for each area to address the issues in more detail; the specific interview questions are included in Appendix D.

1. What was the rationale for including adjunct courses in the ESL curriculum?
2. How were administrative decisions concerning adjunct courses handled?
3. How were ESL adjunct class syllabi planned and teaching materials developed?
4. How were content courses selected and recruited?
5. What criteria were used to place ESL students in adjunct courses?
6. How was cooperation between ESL and content instructors facilitated?
7. How were adjunct courses evaluated?

Method

This research project was a comparative study of how the adjunct model of content-based second language instruction was planned, administered, and taught at post-secondary institutions in the state of Oregon. A phone survey of all institutions offering four-year degrees was conducted to determine which ESL programs used the adjunct model of

CBI and to obtain names and phone numbers of directors of these programs.

Eight colleges and universities were found in Oregon with adjunct model classes; the ESL directors were contacted by phone to explain the research project and to schedule personal interviews. One to one and one-half hour in-depth interviews were conducted with ESL administrators and teachers available and willing to participate between February and June 1995. The interviews were conducted using interview question forms developed from the seven research questions. Each interview was audio taped.

Typed notes were prepared after each interview by listening to the audiotapes. The results of the interviews were organized following the seven research questions and were presented in the form of summaries and paraphrases taken from the typed notes and quotations from the audiotapes. Results were coded to maintain confidentiality.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Different approaches and methodologies for teaching language are regularly being created and adapted by researchers and language teachers. Celce-Murcia (1991) outlines and describes nine classic yet diverse approaches to language teaching just in the 20th century. She then introduces newer approaches to language instruction that teach all language skills within an integrated framework where language must be used to communicate and learn; one of these is content-based instruction (CBI). These approaches she labels as "the cutting edge and future directions in the profession" (p. 313) and states they offer a broader, integrated approach for language teaching.

This concept of a teaching approach that is broader and more integrated appears to have wide appeal currently. Prator (1991) observes that recently many professionals have begun to express the opinion that past methodologies were too narrow in scope and what is needed is a flexible approach to teaching with a sound theoretical base that meets learner and societal needs and that will remain open to new ideas and research from various disciplines. Content-based language instruction is such an approach.

Is content-based instruction an approach to language teaching or a more narrow methodology? Snow maintains that CBI is an approach or philosophy about curriculum with a theoretical foundation (Snow & Buchanan, 1995). CBI provides a way to look at curriculum; it is a mind-set of how to approach teaching that is compatible with many different communicative teaching techniques being used today. There are no specific methodologies for content-based instruction, according to Snow; it is compatible with a variety of different teaching methods (Snow & Buchanan, 1995).

Stoller (1994) reports more and more experimentation with different forms of CBI and predicts this will continue. She points out that CBI can be used for any level of student. The flexibility and diversity of the CBI approach to language teaching is evident in the professional literature on CBI. A review of this literature shows many varied forms of CBI are being tried in schools at the elementary and secondary levels, in colleges and universities, and in adult education programs.

This literature review begins with an overview of the origins of content-based language instruction, including the language across the curriculum movement, bilingual immersion programs in Canada, and the English for special purposes movement. Next theoretical foundations for CBI are examined; theories presented are the communicative approach, Krashen's comprehensible input theory, and Cummins' cognitive academic language proficiency theory. Then models of CBI for K-12 and for the college and university level are described, followed by an evaluation of

the effectiveness of CBI. Finally, the adjunct model of CBI is examined in greater detail, including strengths and limitations of the model and an evaluation of its effectiveness.

Origins of Content-Based Language Instruction

The concept of learning a language through the study of content is not a new idea. In fact, Kelly (cited in Brinton, Snow & Wesche, 1989, p. 4) found reference to this educational philosophy in the writings of St. Augustine in 389 AD:

Once things are known knowledge of words follows . . . we cannot hope to learn words we do not know unless we have grasped their meaning. This is not achieved by listening to the words, but by getting to know the things signified. (p. 36)

This quotation illustrates deep historical roots for the concept of content-based language learning. Explicit approaches to content-based foreign language and second language instruction have evolved over the last 25 years out of the teaching-language-across-the-curriculum movement in first language education, foreign language immersion programs, and the English for Specific Purposes movement.

Teaching Language Across the Curriculum Movement

The teaching language across the curriculum movement in first language instruction may have provided the momentum for later content-

based second language teaching. Crandall (1987) reports that the 1975 Bullock Report from Great Britain, which proposed that instruction in first language be integrated into the curriculum of all content areas, was one of the first recommendations to combine language and content instruction. Since that time, the concept of teaching writing and reading across the curriculum has been supported by numerous writing and reading specialists and has had a significant influence on the curriculum of schools in England and North America. This movement in first language education provides a means to teach academic language skills needed in content learning (Brinton, Snow, & Wesche, 1989).

Canadian Bilingual Immersion Programs

One of the earliest and most successful efforts to integrate language and content teaching can be found in the French immersion programs begun in Canada in 1969. In the 1970's and 80's, a number of different immersion models were established in Canada, including total and partial French immersion programs introduced both early and late in the curriculum; a few programs also teach other target languages. These bilingual programs, which were planned for English language majority students, offer 50 to 100 percent of instruction in the target language and teach the same content curriculum as for students studying in English only. The target language is used as the medium of instruction, and classes integrate language learning with content instruction. Explicit instruction in the target language is not included in early grades but is gradually added

at grade three. Follow-up studies have shown the French bilingual foreign language instruction, especially the early, total immersion programs, is successful in developing advanced proficiency in French, does not compromise the development of English proficiency, and leads to mastery in content learning (Swain & Lapkin, 1981).

English for Specific Purposes (ESP) Movement

The teaching languages across the curriculum movement and the Canadian bilingual immersion programs have both influenced and shaped current approaches to content-based second language instruction. Another direct historical root of CBI is the English for Specific Purposes (ESP) movement.

The basic philosophy of ESP is to connect the design and content of language instruction directly to the intended uses for the target language by the learners. ESP advocates extensive and careful needs analysis and use of authentic language materials; the integration of language and content forms the core of an ESP curriculum. One main branch of ESP is English for Academic Purposes (EAP), and Robinson (1991) explains the main concern of EAP is "with 'studying in context', that is, with identifying the social as well as academic requirements of a particular situation and equipping students to cope" (p. 106). Content-based instruction has emerged as a means to fulfill the basic objectives of EAP.

Theoretical Foundations of CBI

In addition to the teaching language across the curriculum movement in first language instruction, the bilingual immersion programs, and the ESP/EAP movement, research in second language acquisition presents additional rationale for the content-based approach to language instruction. In particular, the communicative approach, especially Krashen's comprehensible input hypothesis (1982), and Cummins' and Swain's theoretical language proficiency framework (1986), provide a theoretical foundation for content-based instruction.

The Communicative Approach: The Comprehensible Input Theory

The communicative approach to language teaching, which has had a significant impact on second language teaching methodologies in recent decades, forms the primary theoretical foundation for ESP and, thus, content-based language teaching. In the viewpoint of the communicative approach, communicative competence is achieved through the subconscious acquisition of the target language, which happens when individuals engage in real communication activities. More traditional language teaching approaches focus primarily on language form, do not engage students in real discourse situations, and utilize isolated language teaching activities that offer little motivation to students. In contrast, in a communicative classroom, students are given the opportunity to use the target language to accomplish tasks they have a personal interest in. The

motivation to communicate and progress in the target language comes from needing to use that language to meet their immediate goals; "language then will be learned," according to Snow, Met, and Genesee (1989), "because it provides access to content . . ." (p. 202).

Content-based language teaching stems directly from this theoretical foundation. Regardless of which model of content-based language teaching is used, the primary focus of the class and the students is on the subject matter. Classroom activities are designed so that students must use and manipulate the target language in order to learn the content. This situation provides many opportunities for students to receive input and produce output of contextualized, extended discourse on relevant topics (Brinton, Snow, & Wesche, 1989).

Of all the proponents of the communicative language approach, Stephen Krashen's theories have been the most widely known in the United States and have had a significant influence on North American second language teaching methodologies. According to Krashen's (1982) input hypothesis, language acquisition takes place when the learner is focusing on meaning and not on linguistic form. This process of language acquisition requires comprehensible input, that is, language that is one step more advanced in structure than the individual currently understands. In addition to being comprehensible, Krashen suggests three other characteristics of language input that will promote acquisition. First, he recommends avoiding a grammatically-structured syllabus because it tends to produce boring and unnatural language. Secondly, acquisition requires a

large quantity of comprehensible input although the precise amount needed is not yet defined. Finally, he suggests optimal input is that which is interesting or useful to the learners so that their attention is focused on the content of the message and not on linguistic form (Krashen, 1982). Content-based language teaching provides a means to provide intensive comprehensible input and meets all the above criteria.

Cummins's Theory of Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency

Preparation of second language students for academic success in mainstream classes is not addressed by the communicative approach, but Cummins's model of language proficiency provides insight into this issue and gives additional theoretical support for content-based language instruction. In this model Cummins differentiates between conversational language skills and academic language skills. He coined the term BICS (basic interpersonal communicative skills) to describe language skills needed for everyday conversation where a significant number of contextual and paralinguistic cues exist to provide meaning to the non-native speaker of English. Thus, BICS skills are designated as "context-embedded and cognitively undemanding" (Cummins, 1984, p . 139). On the other hand, academic language skills, called CALP (cognitive academic language proficiency), are described as "context-reduced and cognitively-demanding" (p. 139) because academic environments lack common contextual cues and require individuals to rely primarily on linguistic cues to derive meaning.

Cummins (1989) explains that students may seem to be very fluent in English (have a high level of BICS proficiency) and yet may have great difficulty succeeding in an academic setting because they have not developed CALP skills. In addition, Cummins states that the time needed to develop proficiency in BICS and CALP differs; he believes it takes considerably longer to develop CALP proficiency.

In response to criticisms of excessive simplicity in this model of language proficiency, Cummins and Swain (1986) revised the theoretical language proficiency model from the BICS/CALP dichotomy into a continuum framework to create a broader theoretical model that incorporates a developmental perspective to the acquisition of language proficiency and academic achievement (see Figure 1).

The similarity of this theoretical model to the original BICS/CALP model is that everyday conversational communication tasks are highly context-embedded. In early stages of language learning these tasks are cognitively-demanding (B quadrant) but with practice move up the continuum to quadrant A. Cummins and Swain (1986) suggest it takes about two years to master context-embedded communication tasks. Academic language skills (highly context-reduced linguistic tasks) are also initially cognitively-demanding (quadrant D) and also can move up the continuum to become more and more cognitively-undemanding (quadrant C) with time. However, the authors estimate that five to seven years are needed by most L2 students to master the context-reduced

linguistic tasks involved in academic English to achieve a proficiency level equivalent to native speakers.

Figure 1. Theoretical language proficiency framework of Cummins and Swain that shows the range of contextual support and degree of cognitive involvement in communicative activities.

Note. From Bilingualism in Education: Aspects of Theory, Research and Practice (p. 153) by J. Cummins and M. Swain, 1986, London: Longman.

Cummins and Swain (1986) emphasize that a primary goal of education is to help students develop the ability to deal successfully with cognitively demanding context-reduced tasks. Clearly then, second language instruction planned for students who need to function in an

English-speaking educational system must emphasize these tasks in order to prepare students for academic success. Content-based language teaching provides a logical means to introduce and develop these linguistic skills. Instruction in the content area is accompanied by language instruction that focuses on the academic linguistic knowledge and skills required to master that content.

The theoretical concepts of Krashen and Cummins are fully compatible. As Krashen recommends the use of comprehensible input that relates to the knowledge and experiences of the learners, Cummins develops these ideas in more depth. In the theoretical language proficiency model (Cummins & Swain, 1986), it is the highly context-reduced input that will be the least comprehensible to L2 learners; thus, making input as context-embedded as possible will aid comprehension. Therefore, to develop academic language proficiency, L2 instruction must not only overtly teach these language skills but find ways to communicate them that relate to the knowledge and experiences of the learners, in other words, provide context-embedded cues to the learners (Cummins & Swain, 1986).

Models of Content-Based Instruction

The core or basis of all content-based language teaching is the integration of content or subject matter curriculum with second or foreign language curriculum. The underlying rationale, according to Brinton, Snow, and Wesche (1989), is that "a second language is learned most

effectively when used as the medium to convey informational content of interest and relevance to the learner" (vii, 1989). In spite of this common philosophical base, the implementation of content-based language teaching has generated a diverse range of formats. Lewis, et al. (1995) explains that the format of content-based programs must necessarily differ because of different student needs, administrative goals, faculty, and program resources.

The need for an approach to second language instruction that teaches academic English skills and facilitates the integration of students into mainstream school curriculum is clearly evident in North America. Canada, with two official languages, has become a leader in bilingual education and, in addition, must educate students that speak several other minority languages. The number of students in public schools in the United States that are nonnative speakers of English is steadily growing. These population realities have fostered the development and application of content-based instruction at the elementary and secondary levels of education. The introduction of content-based second and foreign language instruction occurred initially at the K-12 level, and, thus, the bulk of information about CBI in the literature is written for these audiences. Application of CBI for college and university students is more limited but is steadily increasing.

In order to review the varied forms of content-based instruction, it helps to categorize the different models. One way to categorize the varied instructional models is by level of target audience. The majority of CBI

instructional models in the literature have been designed for K-12 audiences; only a few are intended specifically for college and university level students. Williams (1995) takes a different approach to classification and labels models of CBI as descriptive frameworks, those that primarily describe the basic structure of the instructional model, or implementational frameworks, those that provide specific and practical information on how to implement the model in the classroom. The CBI models included in this review will be grouped by intended audience, K-12 or college/university, and the framework of each model (descriptive or implementational) will be noted.

Models of CBI for the K-12 Level

One of the most fully developed implementational frameworks of content-based instruction is the Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA), a theme-based language instruction model intended for upper elementary and secondary students. Chamot and O'Malley (1987) explain that this program was designed for LEP (limited English proficiency) students in ESL or bilingual programs to prepare them to enter mainstream academic classes. This transitional program, which integrates language and content instruction, includes three components, a content-based curriculum, development of academic language skills, and instruction in learning strategies. In order to develop students' academic language skills, the instruction is built around authentic content topics selected from science, mathematics, and social studies at the student's

current grade levels. Class activities are structured to include a wide variety of context-reduced and academically demanding tasks that are expected of students in mainstream classes. Finally, students are introduced to a variety of metacognitive, cognitive, and social-affective learning strategies to assist them in becoming more effective learners (Chamot & O'Malley, 1987).

The CALLA program was developed, according to Chamot and O'Malley (1985), because many LEP students who were successful in specialized language classes and were evaluated as proficient in oral English, did not perform satisfactorily when placed in mainstream classes with their peers. It was concluded that although these students had developed proficient social communicative skills, they had not developed the necessary academic language skills. Chamot (1985) emphasizes that content-based language programs are not submersion programs or intended as a substitute for mainstream classes but are transitional programs that prepare students to enter mainstream classes. The distinguishing characteristic of CALLA content-based classes is the language development component that emphasizes academic language skills. ERIC documents contain sample lessons in science, mathematics, and social studies to demonstrate how to integrate objectives in content, academic language skills, and learning strategies (Chamot & O'Malley, 1987), and a comprehensive handbook on the CALLA model is now available (Chamot & O'Malley, 1994).

Another primary and secondary level model of content-based instruction, called Foresee, was developed at the University of Manitoba by Kidd and Marquardson (1993, 1994) as an extension of CALLA. Like CALLA, Foresee integrates content, language, and learning strategies, but Foresee includes an extended theoretical model to guide teachers in developing lesson objectives. In addition, Foresee has an interactive application model for designing lessons and incorporates five instructional techniques to help instructors integrate language, content, and learning strategies. Diana Turner, ESL instructor, reports that the Foresee model "provides more explicit language instruction than CALLA, especially in terms of academic language, and while acknowledging CALLA's important contributions, gives a very specific process for developing lesson and unit plans" (personal communication, June 8, 1995). Two teachers' guides are available (one for the elementary level and one for the secondary level) to explain the theoretical background and application of the model and give sample unit plans.

Both CALLA and Foresee place emphasis on the teaching of academic language skills, the language that teachers and students use in educational activities. Chamot and O'Malley (1994) identify specific language functions important in elementary grades and categorize the lower-order and higher-order thinking skills needed to perform these language functions. The CALLA Handbook (Chamot and O'Malley, 1994) provides a classroom observation form and a textbook analysis form that ESL teachers can use to identify and select academic language to teach.

The authors also give specific guidelines on how to integrate academic language and content teaching. Kidd and Marquardson (1993, 1994) organize academic language into three components: linguistic knowledge (vocabulary, structures, and discourse features), functions (concepts, forms, and names), and skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing). They also explain how to integrate these language components in content lessons in elementary and secondary classrooms. These aspects of academic language have always been components of ESL instruction; however, CALLA and Foresee both guide instructors to select and integrate academic language teaching in a content-based curriculum.

Mohan in his book Language and Content (1986) introduces a "knowledge framework" approach to integrating language and content in K-12 instruction. This systematic framework can be applied across the curriculum to teach topics or themes and to adapt materials for second language instruction. This implementational framework divides knowledge into specific, practical knowledge taught through experiential learning and theoretical knowledge taught by expository learning. Examples illustrate the knowledge framework and how it facilitates language learning; sequencing principles for language and content learning are suggested.

Cantoni-Harvey (1987) offers practical suggestions and content-based exercises, primarily in social sciences, mathematics, and science, for elementary and secondary content teachers of minority students. Her

implementational framework is intended to enhance the LEP student's level of English language proficiency as well as teach content.

Crandall has written a great deal on the integration of language and subject matter instruction for K-12. Her edited book, ESL Through Content-Area Instruction (1987), offers a rationale for CBI as well as detailed, practical assistance from experienced teachers for developing curricula and activities for mathematics, science, and social science. Further suggestions for integrating second language instruction and mathematics at the elementary level is available from Allen (1990). For more assistance with introducing CBI in middle school and high school, Short (1991) provides helpful guidelines, strategies and techniques that emphasize using multiple media, developing critical thinking skills and study skills, and creating student-centered instruction. Allen and Short are only two of a number of ERIC documents available to help teachers integrate language and content in K-12 classrooms.

Enright and McCloskey (1988) apply a whole language approach to developing thematic units to integrate language skills instruction and content information. A variety of whole language strategies are used that emphasize linking experiential learning to oral and written language development. Examples are given of how to apply this approach at the elementary level.

A conceptual framework for second or foreign language teachers to work collaboratively with content teachers for integrating language and content into elementary level classes comes from Snow, Met, and Genesee

(1989). Based on the content-area curriculum, the language curriculum, and an assessment of learner needs, teachers identify content-obligatory language objectives and content-compatible language objectives. Brief descriptions of how this model could be applied for low English proficiency students in two types of second language programs and for English majority students in two foreign language programs are included. Although this model calls for collaboration of teachers at the elementary level and the illustrations are all for elementary classes, the concept of content-obligatory language and content-compatible language is applicable and useful for designing content-based instruction for any audience.

One implementational model available as a textbook, English for Science, (Zimmerman, 1989) offers a resource for a thematic ESL course at the secondary, community college, or adult education level. It integrates language skills, general science concepts (around the theme of the scientific method), and rhetorical functions used in the study of science. The purpose of the text is to prepare intermediate and advanced second language students with the academic language skills needed to participate in basic science courses. The book includes many sample exercises; an instructor's manual is also available.

Models of CBI for the College and University Level

The most extensive information available on CBI at the college and university level is available in the book Content-Based Second Language Instruction by Brinton, Snow and Wesche (1989). In this book the authors

describe and differentiate three basic variations on content-based instruction that they label theme-based, sheltered, and adjunct models. All these instructional models are similar in that they keep the focus of instruction on the subject matter rather than on the structure and form of language. In addition, they all rely on an integrated approach for teaching language. Each model, however, varies in how the class is organized, taught, and evaluated and may be appropriate to meet different student needs and levels of language proficiency.

The theme-based model of content-based instruction utilizes one or more topics or themes, and integrated language activities are developed around the chosen topic(s). This is an ESL course that consists entirely of second language students and is taught by an ESL instructor. The teachers generally create their own teaching materials although theme-based ESL materials are becoming more widely available. Theme-based instruction is appropriate for all levels of language proficiency and for a variety of settings and population groups. The main emphasis for evaluation is on language skills and functions rather than mastery of content. Brinton, Snow and Wesche (1989) suggest there are two important elements for success of the theme-based model. First, it is essential to select themes or topics that capture the interests of the students and choose materials at an appropriate level so activities can be designed to meet the language needs of the particular learners. Secondly, the teacher needs to find the appropriate balance between teaching content and language skills. (Brinton, Snow & Wesche, 1989).

The sheltered model of content-based language instruction has been used primarily at the secondary and post-secondary levels of education. This model is adapted from secondary immersion programs where the second language students study the same curriculum as the native speakers but in separate classrooms. Thus, the subject matter content is the same, but the pace and language can be adapted to the learners' needs, and additional integrated language learning activities can be introduced. The class is seen as a content class, and instruction is typically provided by content instructors. Mastery of the content material is the primary focus of course evaluations (Brinton, Snow & Wesche, 1989).

The adjunct model of instruction (also called bridge class by other authors) is used primarily in secondary and post-secondary settings. This model consists of two linked courses, a content class and an ESL class. Students register for a regular academic content class and at the same time enroll in an ESL English language support class linked to that content course. Integrated language activities designed to develop academic language skills are developed for the ESL support class from the lectures, texts, and other materials of the content course. The adjunct model is used to teach academic language skills and to help equip second language students with the skills they need to enter regular high school or college/university classes where they must compete with native English speakers (Brinton, Snow & Wesche, 1989).

Although Brinton, Snow, and Wesche (1989) present the theme-based, sheltered, and adjunct models as separate forms of instructional

models, they emphasize they are best viewed as existing on a continuum (See Figure 2). The differences in the three instructional models include the extent of integration of content and language instruction, the authenticity of the classroom activities and the materials used, and the need to modify language for the students in content instruction. The theme-based model is closest to the usual language classroom format and the adjunct model provides an environment closest to the mainstream type of class. Each model can serve an important function of transition for LEP students between ESL and the mainstream classrooms.

Figure 2. A content-based continuum illustrating how CBI models fit between typical language classes and mainstream classes.

Note. From Content-Based Second Language Instruction (p. 23) by D. M. Brinton, M. A. Snow, and M. B. Wesche, 1989, Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

All the different formats for content-based language teaching explained earlier provide opportunities to include optimal comprehensible input and make classes more relevant to students. Skill-based ESL classes typically include contextualized exercises for the purpose of introducing topics that will make lessons more interesting to learners; however, the

degree of interest or relevance may still be at a low level for many students. Content-based language teaching provides a format that may more effectively offer interesting, relevant, and abundant input that focuses on content (meaning) rather than linguistic form. Thematic content courses offer one or more themes (topics) as the central focus of the curriculum. The topics may or may not be relevant to students. Sheltered content courses may be perceived as more relevant to students if they are receiving content credit for the course. The adjunct type course may provide the most optimal input for more advanced second language students for which these courses are appropriate, since the students are enrolled in a regular college or university course along with native speakers and receive content credit. Activities in the language support course are completely relevant as they revolve around current content course material, offer study skills needed to complete assignments, and have the goal of teaching the context-reduced, cognitively demanding linguistic skills needed for college/university level coursework.

Adamson (1993) provides a fourth CBI model for the university level that he calls the precourse. He developed this descriptive model to combine elements of the theme-based and adjunct model for intermediate level ESL students who are not yet ready to spend a whole semester in a credit class with native English speakers yet still need to experience authentic academic tasks in an authentic classroom setting. In the precourse, the ESL students are enrolled in a thematic ESL class; one unit of this thematic class has the students participate for three weeks in a non-ESL

course. The ESL students attend the non-ESL class and participate fully in all its activities. In addition, they meet regularly with the ESL instructor for support with study skills and content review.

The precourse model shows the flexibility of CBI and illustrates that there are no clear borders between the different models. It is possible to adapt and blend characteristics of different instructional models to fit the unique needs of students and institutions. Other creative innovations and adaptations of CBI will be illustrated as adjunct programs in Oregon institutions of higher education are described.

Williams' (1995) analysis of CBI models classifies all the college and university frameworks as descriptive in that they do not include specific, practical guidelines for teachers to implement the frameworks in the classroom. Although it is true these models do not provide a formula for developing objectives and planning curriculum as is found in many of the K-12 models, the Brinton, Snow, and Wesche book (1989) does include a practical chapter on how to select and adapt materials for CBI that includes numerous examples. Other useful resources in developing adjunct model classes can be found in the LEAP (Learning English-for-Academic-Purposes) training manuals at California State University, Los Angeles (Snow, Year One, n.d., Year Three, 1994). The manuals include course syllabi, objectives, and examples of language exercises developed from the content material of each course. Another useful source of CBI teaching ideas for the college and university level is contributed by Adamson in Chapter 7 of Academic Competence (1993), which presents a variety of

classroom activities to help students learn content and develop academic learning strategies. These sources are the only published teaching materials specifically for college and university level adjunct courses that I have found.

The application of CBI in foreign language instruction at the college/university level is described by Krueger and Ryan (1993). This book provides theoretical foundations for discipline-based foreign language instruction and eight case studies from different colleges and universities that have developed varied and innovative models to implement foreign language across the curriculum.

One implementational CBI model for planning thematic units or courses is the Six-T's model developed by Stoller and Grabe (Stoller, 1994). This framework includes six components that need to be explicitly identified and planned by the teacher "to make principled reasoned curricular decisions" (Stoller, 1994): themes (the central idea that unites a curricular unit), texts (all the varied resources used to provide information about the content), topics (subunits or different aspects of the topic), threads (the links between different theme units), tasks (the activities used to teach content, language learning skills, and learning strategies), transitions (ways to provide coherence between tasks, topics, and themes). Steps to implement the model and examples are provided to help illustrate its application. Although this model was created to develop thematic ESL classes in an English for academic purposes curriculum at Northern

Arizona University, the model would be equally applicable for students at any level.

Effectiveness of Content-Based Instruction

The most complete information on the educational effectiveness of content-based instruction comes from the French bilingual immersion programs in Canada. These programs have been carefully followed to evaluate student's progress in first and second language proficiency as well as in subject matter learning in comparison to Francophone and English students studying only in their first language. In general, Swain and Lapkin (1981) report that these bilingual immersion programs have been successful in developing advanced levels of proficiency in the French language; the early, total immersion students are able to achieve near-native levels of listening and reading comprehension but demonstrate less proficiency in French speaking and writing skills. Late and partial immersion students generally demonstrate lower levels of proficiency in French than students who participate in early and total programs. In addition, although proficiency in English language skills for early immersion students is lower in early grades, after grade three, English language proficiency becomes equivalent to that of students in English only programs. Finally, mastery of mathematics, science, and social studies content by the immersion students is equal to students studying only in English.

Immersion programs have been most successful in North America as a means of foreign language teaching. Second language immersion education for language minority students in the United States has not shown this same level of success. Brinton, Snow and Wesche (1989) attribute this difference in success to the fact that language majority students have continual out-of-classroom opportunities to develop their English (first language) skills as well as formal in-school instruction in English. On the other hand, language minority students lack opportunities to practice and develop proficiency in their first language and are usually not provided any formal instruction in this language. Support for this view comes from Collier (1989), who argues that second language acquisition research shows that continued cognitive development in L1 must continue through age twelve to maximize proficiency in L2.

Collier (1989) analyzes research on how long it takes to achieve academic proficiency in a second language and concludes that bilingual education is the most effective means to accomplish this goal. Bilingual education not only develops proficiency in the second language but also builds student's academic knowledge and develops their academic skills. Collier reports that second language acquisition research shows these two latter factors are the critical ones for academic success; a person's grammatical proficiency in a language is not a significant factor in overall academic success. Collier asserts that "consistent, uninterrupted cognitive academic development in all subjects throughout student's schooling is

more important than the number of hours of L2 instruction for successful academic achievement in a second language" (p. 527).

Traditional ESL programs place students with little second language proficiency in intensive L2 classes, and although adolescents can in two to three years achieve high proficiency level in the L2, these students still show poor overall academic achievement and frequently drop out of high school. Collier attributes this to the two to three year interruption in their academic work while they are learning the second language, a gap that never closes, leaving the students two to three years behind the native-speaking students (Collier, 1989).

Does all content teaching promote effective second language learning? Swain argues that it does not. Swain (1988) observed content-based classes in Canadian immersion programs and found several factors in the typical content teaching methods that she believes do not promote effective second language learning. First, the second language students were not provided opportunities in the classroom to produce sustained output in the target language; in the classes students responded to the teacher's questions using mostly minimal responses that consisted of words and short phrases. In addition, the emphasis in the classrooms was solely on having students comprehend meaning and did not require the students to consider the relationship between language form and content. Also, the teacher talk in the classrooms provided input to students that Swain labeled as "functionally restricted"(p. 75); in other words, it did not include a full functional range of linguistic items. Swain stresses the need to

integrate language and content teaching; teachers need to utilize teaching methodologies and to develop classroom activities that will create real contexts that require a full range of language use, and require students to produce extended discourse in the target language.

Krashen's input hypothesis stresses the importance of comprehensible input for language acquisition; Swain and Lapkin (1989) contend that a second component, comprehensible output, is also an essential factor needed for language acquisition. Krashen himself (1982) noted that it is possible to comprehend meaning without understanding the syntax of the input. An understanding and analysis of syntax is acquired primarily from producing the language, according to Swain and Lapkin (1989). Thus, they recommend that second language students need extensive practice producing extended discourse that is "conveyed accurately, coherently, and appropriately" (p. 156).

The importance of integration of content and language teaching is reinforced by Snow, Met, and Genesee (1989) who discuss the need for second and/or foreign language teachers in the public schools to work cooperatively with content teachers to promote more effective language learning by students. Language and content curricula in public schools are mostly developed and taught separately without thought of how each could enhance the other. In addition, the needs of second and foreign language learners are not evaluated for the purpose of curriculum planning. If developing language proficiency is an important goal in a

school system, getting language and content teachers to collaborate is an effective solution, according to Snow, Met, and Genesee.

Adamson (1993) studied how 34 intermediate level, high school level, and college ESL students performed in mainstream classes when they left ESL programs. He was specifically concerned with how the students completed the academic tasks in their content classes. The case studies revealed that all students had difficulties with their academic work. All students utilized various academic strategies to cope, not all of which were effective strategies. In fact, many students adopted strategies to complete assignments without understanding them. Therefore, Adamson believes that ESL students need explicit instruction in academic skills; they need to be taught to make effective use of their limited resources to complete assigned academic tasks. His research concluded that "the best way for ESL teachers to prepare their students to succeed in a content course was to teach them effective academic skills and appropriate background knowledge of the content material. The approach to ESL instruction that seemed most compatible with this goal was the language through content approach" (p. x).

As a result of the findings of this case study research, Adamson has developed five principles to help prepare ESL students for mainstream content classes. He recommends that:

1. Academic strategies should be explicitly taught on an individualized basis.
2. Students can best learn strategies in a language through [a] content course that uses authentic text.

- a. The content material should be studied in depth.
- b. The course should provide contact with native speakers.
3. Teaching should be interactive in ways that are compatible with students' learning styles and prior scripts for school
4. Teaching should be experiential.
5. The content subject should be one that students will need to know when they are mainstreamed. (p. 114)

Adamson concludes that although various models of CBI can help prepare students for academic competence, the adjunct model is the one that best fulfills the above principles.

The Adjunct Model

As this thesis project focuses specifically on the adjunct model of content-based instruction, the remainder of this literature review will look at this instructional model in greater depth. First, the strengths and limitations of this model as put forth in the literature will be presented. The final section will address evaluations done on the educational effectiveness of the adjunct model.

Strengths and Limitations of the Adjunct Model of CBI

The strength most frequently mentioned in the literature is an increased motivation level of the students in adjunct classes. Chamot (1985) suggests this occurs because students are focused on studying content they are interested in rather than just studying language in isolation. Crandall (1987) agrees that the focus on content not only enriches the

classroom but makes the ESL classroom more interesting for the students, and this provides motivation. Snow and Brinton (1984) suggest some motivation in their UCLA Freshman Summer Program may come from the fact that the students are receiving academic credit for the content course and need the English support to do well in the content course. Thus, the language course becomes relevant to the students, and higher motivation is the result.

Valentine and Repath-Martos (1992) suggest motivation is more complex and present four components of motivation: interest, relevance, expectancy, and satisfaction. These authors studied student motivation in two simulated adjunct classes at UCLA and compared student perceptions of their academic language needs to activities in the simulated adjunct classes to determine if students found the course curriculum relevant and motivating. They found that students need to perceive that the classroom tasks they are asked to perform are relevant to their needs. Where student perceived needs matched the curriculum of the course, students expressed satisfaction. However, these authors found that many students held traditional expectations for a language classroom, in particular, instruction in grammar and vocabulary. Even though instruction in grammar and vocabulary was indirectly taught in the simulated adjunct course, they were not offered as separate components, and students expressed some dissatisfaction as a result. These authors concluded that it is important for instructors to explicitly explain the rationale for classroom activities and

find ways to include more grammar and vocabulary work in these courses to maintain high motivation levels (Valentine & Repath-Martos, 1992).

Perception of relevance was a positive motivating factor to the students in these simulated adjunct courses, but other factors were also a very important part of motivation according to this study. The level of interest in the content topic, which was determined primarily by the individual student's background experiences and personal interests, was a key component to motivation. A topic of little interest to the student was found to be a significant factor in lowering motivation levels. Relevance and interest do not always coincide as many students reported that activities such as note-taking and outlining were useful but not interesting to them. Another factor that increased student motivation was the use of group work activities that promoted student interaction with other class members. Finally, Valentine and Repath-Martos (1992) found that instructors play an important role in maintaining motivation when they have knowledge of and interest in the topics and when they believe in the validity of content-based instruction.

Snow and Brinton (1984) believe another strength of their UCLA Freshman Summer Program was the greater heterogeneity of the ESL students in these classes. Kessler (1992) argues that the presence of ethnic and linguistic heterogeneity in group activities will foster sensitivity and understanding between culture groups and, in addition, will serve to promote language learning.

Another important strength of both the sheltered and adjunct models is that they can effectively teach academic discourse. Clark (1987) emphasizes that these instructional models, unlike traditional ESL classes, provide a mechanism for students to develop cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP), the acquisition of which requires a long term effort by the educational system. Snow and Brinton add that adjunct courses introduce students to authentic academic content and help students cope with university-level texts. In addition, they state that "in our opinion, adjunct instruction is the only model of language teaching that provides a rich enough context for resolving both pieces of the language acquisition puzzle--comprehensible input and comprehensible output" (p. 37).

What about benefits to the instructors of adjunct courses? Snow and Brinton mention several benefits for ESL instructors that emerged from the evaluation of their Freshman Summer Program at UCLA. Instructors commented that although the teaching, especially the materials development, was exhausting, it was also challenging and rewarding. The teachers liked to be directly involved in preparing their students for entering university classes, they shared more directly their student's successes and failures, and they appreciated working within "a carefully structured and well-thought out pedagogical framework . . ." that was organized around real academic content and encompassed a broad range of objectives (Snow & Brinton, 1984, p. 19).

Any instructional model will have limitations or potential problems as well as strengths. One possible limitation of the adjunct model course is

that it is not appropriate for all students, particularly those with low levels of English proficiency because students must deal with authentic university-level language in the textbooks and in lectures (Snow & Brinton, 1988b). Tickle (1992) indicates that students should be at the high-intermediate to low-advanced level to benefit from an adjunct model class. Duffy (1992) recommends that students need a background in the basic skills of listening to lectures, note-taking, answering questions, and writing essays before entering an adjunct course. She adds that a TOEFL score alone is not a sufficient measure of readiness for an adjunct course and suggests a variety of information should be considered in determining student readiness.

To be successful, the adjunct model requires coordination between the content and ESL faculty. This coordination, according to Snow and Brinton(1988b), needs to start well before the course begins in order to plan the syllabi and projects, and the communication needs to continue regularly throughout the course. This necessitates having highly committed faculty because of the exceptionally large amount of time and energy needed to develop integrated language activities based on the content class and to make the effort to coordinate the two courses (Snow & Brinton, 1988b). In addition to communication and coordination, an adjunct program needs an administration that understands and supports the instructional objectives and special needs of adjunct classes. Without attention to these potential problems areas, the adjunct model may not function smoothly and may have difficulty achieving its objectives.

Another limitation mentioned by Willetts (1986) is the lack of textbooks available for content-based instruction. Clark (1987) also proclaims a need for more teaching materials for content-based programs because the development of integrated language materials is very time consuming, and it is inefficient for instructors to continue to develop all their own materials. He suggests as a solution for sheltered classes at the secondary level, that a series of sheltered English textbooks should be developed by publishers that do not dilute content and that gradually incorporate higher levels of English proficiency to prepare students to enter mainstream classes.

Evaluation of the Adjunct Model

Content-based language instruction offers a rational approach to developing the academic language proficiency of students and is grounded in current theories of second language acquisition. Proponents of the adjunct model and other instructional models of content-based language instruction are enthusiastic supporters of content-based language teaching and offer a number of benefits and strengths to back this approach. The primary deficiency in the content-based approach to language instruction is research to support the effectiveness of these models. Willetts (1986) writes that ". . . there is virtually no systematic, longitudinal evidence with regard to the pedagogical efficacy of content-based courses" (p. 33). Currently, research findings on the adjunct model are still very limited but not completely nonexistent.

UCLA's Freshman Summer Program (FSP) incorporated formal evaluation into its program and reported some results on the efficacy of the adjunct model. The UCLA FSP is a 6 week intensive program planned to provide a transitional academic experience for new freshman students who are judged to be high-risk, primarily US ethnic minority students and immigrant students who completed high school in the United States. Students take one of four content classes, psychology, history, political science, or anthropology, along with an English class linked to the content course; all the immigrant students were placed in the psychology course. The program was evaluated over a period of three years by administering course evaluation forms and self-assessment surveys at the end of each summer term, giving simulated final exams to measure how students were able to integrate language and content, and conducting a series of structured interviews of former FSP students enrolled at UCLA (Snow & Brinton, 1988a).

The end-of-term course evaluations considered all components of the course and asked the students to rate the over-all effectiveness of the FSP program. In all three years of student evaluations, a consistently high over-all rating was given for the FSP program by all students. Students' responses indicated that they felt that their greatest improvements occurred in writing skills, especially in organization of ideas and in revision work. The least improvement, according to the self-assessments, was in study skills development. All students expressed a significant increase in confidence in 11 out of 15 academic skills; however, the results

for the ESL students when viewed separately, showed less increase in confidence in the academic skills over the course of the summer session than did the group as a whole.

In the retrospective program evaluation, former FSP students reported they valued all the activities in the FSP program; in particular, they felt the program helped them adjust to UCLA, increased their self-confidence, and helped them utilize the UCLA facilities. These students ranked taking lecture notes, prewriting strategies, proofreading for errors, and preparing reading guides and notes as the most helpful academic skills learned. In the interviews conducted early in their first term at UCLA, the former FSP students expressed confidence in their note-taking, reading, and time management abilities; however, later in the term, the same students were much less confident and indicated difficulties with these skills in their current classes. Almost all students stated that the FSP program helped prepare them to deal with writing assignments although most were aware they still needed to continue to improve their writing skills. The results of the simulated final exam showed that the ESL students in FSP performed at a level equivalent to a non-FSP comparison group on both the objective and essay parts of the exam (Snow & Brinton, 1988a).

Macalester College offered an adjunct course in geography and used student scores on the geography exams to evaluate ESL student performance. Course test scores of native English speakers in the class (NS) were compared to those of the non-native speakers enrolled in the

language support bridge class (NNS-bridge) and the non-native speakers in the geography course who were not concurrently enrolled in the support class (NNS-no bridge). At the beginning of the course, scores on exams were highest for the NS and lowest for the NS-bridge, who were the students with the lowest levels of English proficiency. However, this latter group, during the course of the semester, were able to achieve higher exam scores than the NNS-no bridge, who initially had higher levels of language proficiency, and their final scores were close to NS exam scores. This suggests the English language support class helped the non-native speaker students compensate for lower language proficiency by developing skills in classroom culture and preparing them for methodology of that discipline. Also, geography professors commented that international student dropout and failure rate in their course was significantly reduced by the addition of the adjunct course (Guyer & Peterson, 1988).

Duffy (1995) also reports that intermediate level ESL students at St. Michael's College taking adjunct courses like international politics, philosophy, economics, and genetics, are able to compete academically as measured by grades achieved in content courses. However, the program wanted a measure of the progress of the language learning of these students and undertook a study to focus on academic writing skills. The written production of 16 ESL students enrolled in a writing intensive international politics class (linked to an EAP class) was analyzed over the course of a semester. First drafts of 14 essays were evaluated by ESL teachers for linguistic factors (syntactic complexity and surface errors) and

discourse features (topic development, organization, connections, sentence structure, vocabulary, and mechanics) and by the content teacher for concept development. Although much variation was observed between students, a preliminary conclusion by Duffy is that the ESL learners in the adjunct course showed marked improvement in their academic writing skills. In particular, the students showed over the course of the semester, a decrease in the number of surface errors, an increase in length of essays (in number of words per essay and number of words per sentence), an increase in syntactic complexity, an improvement in over-all concept development, and a significant increase in control of academic discourse. Further analysis of writing in other adjunct courses is planned to follow-up this preliminary study (Duffy, 1995).

ESL programs at colleges and universities wishing to initiate adjunct model courses need resources that provide practical information on how to plan, administer, and teach these courses; however, the professional literature on CBI offers a very limited amount of this type of information. The theoretical foundations of the adjunct model are well covered in the professional literature. The practical information that is available typically describes the experiences of isolated programs; comparative studies that show how different ESL programs have adapted the model have not been published. This comparative study of the planning, administration, and teaching of adjunct model courses in institutions of higher education in the state of Oregon can serve as a resource of practical information for the design and implementation of adjunct model CBI courses.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

General Method

This project was a comparative study of the adjunct model of content based instruction (CBI) in institutions of higher education in the state of Oregon. A telephone survey was used to identify which higher education institutions use or have used the adjunct model of instruction in their English as a second language (ESL) programs. After the initial survey, in-depth interviews of ESL program directors and teachers of adjunct model classes were used to explore in detail how the adjunct model was structured, administered, and taught at these schools. Specific issues investigated included: rationale for using adjunct courses in second language instruction; difficulties in establishing adjunct courses within institutions of higher education; policies for load credit or compensation for teachers of the adjunct courses; course objectives and syllabi design for the ESL support class; selection of content classes for adjunct CBI classes; ESL student placement in adjunct courses; perceptions of the need for collaboration between ESL and content faculty and the means to achieve collaboration; and process of evaluation of adjunct CBI classes.

Subjects

This study proposed to identify all institutions of higher education in the state of Oregon that currently include or have in the past included an adjunct model of CBI in its English as a second language program. It was decided to contact all state universities and private colleges and universities that offered either a bachelors or masters degree; state community colleges were also included. Other institutions that offered only certificates, diplomas, or other non-degree programs were not included in the survey. The complete list of higher education institutions contacted in the study can be found in Appendix A.

Each school was contacted by phone to determine if it had an English as a second language program; when the answer was affirmative, the name and phone number of the program director was solicited. The program director was then called to learn if the program used the adjunct model of CBI and to request the program director and/or adjunct class instructor to participate in an interview. Interviews were conducted in person at four private liberal arts institutions, one community college, and three state universities in the state of Oregon. The decision on who to include in the interviews was based on who was available, interested, and willing to participate. In some cases, the program director also served as the adjunct teacher, so only one interview was conducted. In some cases the program director was not directly involved with the adjunct courses, and only one or more of the teachers were interviewed. In other cases, both the program director and teacher of the adjunct class were interviewed.

Procedures

Phone Survey

A telephone survey was used to contact each of the institutions of higher education in the state of Oregon. The names of the institutions and general phone numbers were obtained from the reference book, Accredited Institutions of Postsecondary Education (Wade, 1992). The initial contact by phone was to identify institutions that had ESL programs and to obtain names and phone numbers of program directors. The second phase of the survey was to call the program directors. The phone surveys began in January 1995 and continued through summer 1995.

A brief, one-page phone survey form was created to record the results of the surveys with the ESL program directors. (See Appendix B, CBI Phone Survey.) Although many different adaptations of content-based instruction exist, at the college and university level nearly all content-based instruction can be categorized as theme-based models, sheltered models, and adjunct models as described by Brinton, Snow, and Wesche (1989). Therefore, ESL program directors were asked if any of these CBI models were used in their programs. For consistency, notes were prepared with the characteristics of each model following Brinton, Snow, and Wesche's (1989) description. If the program directors were not familiar with these instructional models, each was described, and the directors were asked if they had classes that fit that description. The survey was not intended to be quantitative; it was

simply to determine which of the three CBI models were currently used in ESL programs at the different institutions.

As the focus of this study was the adjunct model of instruction, additional questions in the survey asked how long the adjunct model had been used, if it had ever been used in the past, or if there were plans to offer these classes in the future. The phone survey also provided an opportunity to ask if the program directors were willing to participate in an interview about their adjunct classes and to get referrals to the teachers of the adjunct classes. The results of the phone survey were compiled to determine what percent of higher education institutions in Oregon use content-based instruction, theme-based CBI, sheltered CBI, and adjunct CBI.

Interviews

In-depth personal interviews with ESL program directors and/or ESL adjunct course instructors were used to obtain information about how adjunct model classes are structured, administered, and taught at the various schools. The issues selected to be explored in the interviews originated from reading about content-based instruction in professional literature, talking with colleagues about their experiences with the adjunct model, listening to presentations on the adjunct model at professional meetings, and personal experience teaching an adjunct model class.

Interview questions were organized into seven categories:

1. Rationale for adjunct courses
2. Administrative decisions

3. Syllabus and teaching materials
4. Selection and recruitment of content courses
5. ESL student placement
6. Cooperation between content and ESL faculty
7. Program evaluation

At the beginning of each interview the required consent forms for human subjects research were presented with an explanation of the purpose of the consent form and its main points. (See Appendix C, Interview Consent Form.) Each person was given two copies of the consent form to sign, one for them to keep and one to return. Signed copies of all consent forms were placed in secure files.

Printed question sheets were prepared for the interviews for note-taking and to make sure the issues in each area would be addressed. The plan was to ask the same questions in the same order at each interview, and as much as possible this plan was followed. However, several factors influenced the course of the interviews, including the structure of the ESL programs, the diversity of the students, and the intended objectives of the adjunct courses. As programs were encountered with different objectives and students, certain specific questions were omitted when irrelevant and the interview was adapted to the specific program; however, all seven question areas were always included in the interviews.

In addition, time constraints made it impossible to cover each of the original questions within each question area in depth. Interviewees were told ahead of time that the interview would take one to one and a half

hours. Although everyone was gracious and generous with his or her time, it was considered important to stay within this time limit. Also, as the interviews progressed, issues initially identified as important (e.g., was a textbook used in the adjunct course) became of lesser importance, and other issues emerged as more significant and were given more interview time. No ESL program with an adjunct class declined to participate in the interviews. A total of 13 separate interviews were conducted in this study between January and June 1995. Fifteen different ESL program directors and ESL teachers participated in the interviews. A total of about 18 hours of interviews were recorded for this project.

Data Collection

Copies of the interview questions with space for notes were used to guide the interview process and to record main points. (See Appendix D, Interview Questions, for a complete list of questions used for the interviews.) In addition, each interview was recorded on audio tape.

The consent form included a statement that the interview would be audio taped. It was carefully explained that the audio tapes would only be used for the purpose of writing this thesis and would not be given to any other person. They would be kept in secure files for the duration of this project and then destroyed. Everyone was agreeable to these conditions.

The interviews were audio taped on cassette tapes using a portable tape recorder. The audio taping was essential for accuracy of information and to obtain quotes to use in writing results. As soon as possible after each

interview, the tapes were listened to and complete notes of the interview were typed. Therefore, for each interview in this study there are the original interview notes, the typed notes prepared after the interview, and the original audio tapes.

Class Observations

The original proposal for this thesis included the intention to visit ESL support classes linked to the content courses to provide more information on syllabus design of the ESL support classes. After visiting two class sessions at one institution, it became clear that although this was very useful personally, attending isolated classes was not going to provide more information about class design than could be obtained from written syllabi and interviews. Schedule conflicts and time limitations also made it impossible to continue the class observations; therefore, this project was limited to the information obtained in the interviews.

Confidentiality

In order to maintain confidentiality, the names of the programs investigated and the persons interviewed are not included in this thesis. Each institution was arbitrarily assigned a letter of identification by randomly selecting a letter of the alphabet to represent the institution. Therefore, for instance, if A was selected to represent an institution, the program director will be referred to as program director A, and the teacher of the adjunct course at that institution will be referred to as teacher A. If more than one teacher was interviewed at an institution, then the teachers would

be teacher A1 and teacher A2. Interviews were completed at the eight institutions of higher education in the state of Oregon that currently use or have in the past used the adjunct model of instruction; the code letters chosen for these institutions are H, L, M, O, R T, U, and Y (See Table 1).

Quotations used in reporting results were taken directly from the taped interviews with the directors and teachers. For purposes of confidentiality, these quotations were not documented with the American Psychological Association format used elsewhere in this manuscript. Also, third person pronouns were used randomly in reporting results and do not necessarily reflect the actual gender of the program directors or teachers interviewed.

Table 1

Institution Codes Assigned for Confidentiality

<u>Code</u>	<u>Type of Institution</u>
H	Private College
L	State University
M	Private University
O	State University
R	Community College
T	Private College
U	Private College
Y	State University

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Introduction

This study was designed to compare how the adjunct model of content-based instruction was being used in ESL programs at institutions of higher education in the state of Oregon. A phone survey of 46 schools identified nine that currently used or had used in the recent past an adjunct model course in their second language instruction programs. Since one of these schools was the private college where I teach, it was not necessary to conduct any interviews there; therefore, eight schools were identified as sites for interviews. In-depth personal interviews with ESL program directors and teachers of adjunct courses were conducted at these eight institutions and collected information on how each planned, administered and taught these courses. Data were collected from the taped interviews using the seven original research questions on the topics listed below; each research question area included several specific questions (see Appendix D for the complete set of interview questions):

1. Rationale for adjunct course
2. Administrative decisions

3. Syllabus and teaching materials
4. Selection and recruitment of content course
5. ESL student placement in adjunct courses
6. Cooperation between content and ESL faculty
7. Program evaluation

This chapter reports and summarizes data obtained from the preliminary phone survey. The results of interviews follow organized according to the seven research question areas and the specific interview questions written for each area. In reporting results, not all of the specific interview questions (found in Appendix D) were included in this chapter. Several questions proved redundant and information collected on these issues was combined and included under the broader question.

Phone Survey

Data from the phone survey were recorded on a spreadsheet and totals and percentages calculated. Out of the 46 institutions of higher education contacted, 15 had no ESL program (see Table 2). These data show differences in the availability of English as a second language programs at the various types of institutions. Ninety-four percent of Oregon community colleges had ESL programs (only one community college did not), and 75 percent of state colleges and universities offered ESL instruction (only two state schools did not have an ESL program). However, there were ESL programs at only 45 percent of the private

institutions. It was primarily the very small schools and specialty schools, such as seminaries, Bible colleges, fashion and art schools that did not offer ESL. Community colleges are the primary means for delivering adult, non-credit ESL instruction in Oregon, so this explains the very high percentages of ESL instruction found at these institutions. State and private higher education institutions provide ESL instruction primarily for international students and permanent residents who are pursuing college degrees.

Content-based ESL instruction was available at 68 percent of the Oregon colleges and universities contacted that had ESL programs. CBI in some form was offered fairly equally by these community colleges (67 percent), state universities (67 percent), and private schools (70 percent). Table 3 shows which models of CBI (thematic, sheltered, and adjunct) were offered at the different types of higher education institutions. Fourteen of the schools offering CBI had classes representing only one model of CBI, six schools offered two different CBI models, and one school offered all three models of CBI in its program.

Table 3 shows that of the three CBI models, the thematic model was by far the most widely used. Some form of thematic class was utilized by 65 percent of the higher education institutions that had ESL programs. Community colleges reported that thematic classes were widely used in their adult education ESL programs, and 69 percent of the community colleges offered thematic model courses. Similar use of thematic classes

were reported by the state universities (67 percent) and the private schools (60 percent).

Table 2

Number and Percent of Oregon Higher Education Institutions Offering ESL Programs and Content-Based Instruction (CBI), Spring 1995

<u>Institutions</u>		<u>No ESL Program</u>		<u>Has ESL Program</u>		<u>Schools with ESL that Offer CBI (any form)</u>	
<u>Type</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Comm. College	16	1	6%	15	94%	10	67%
State Coll./ Univ.	8	2	25%	6	75%	4	67%
Private Coll./ Univ.	22	12	55%	10	45%	7	70%
All Institutions	46	15	33%	31	67%	21	68%

The sheltered model of CBI was the one least found at Oregon institutions of higher education. Only one private school reported using sheltered classes. Twenty-six percent of higher education institutions in Oregon with ESL programs used the adjunct model of CBI when this survey was taken. Most adjunct classes were found at the private and state colleges and universities; 50 percent of private institutions and 33 percent

of state institutions offered adjunct model classes in their ESL curriculum. In contrast, only one community college had an adjunct class although several directors and teachers expressed interest in starting this type of course for their students who plan to enter college and university degree programs.

Table 3

Number and Percent of Oregon Higher Education Institutions with ESL Offering Thematic, Sheltered, and Adjunct Model Courses, Spring 1995

<u>Institutions with ESL</u>		<u>CBI Models</u>					
		<u>Thematic</u>		<u>Sheltered</u>		<u>Adjunct</u>	
<u>Type</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Comm. College	15	10	67%	0	0%	1	7%
State Coll./ Univ.	6	4	67%	0	0%	2	33%
Private Coll./ Univ.	10	6	60%	1	10%	5	50%
All Institutions	31	20	65%	1	3%	8	26%

Note. Percentages do not total 100% because some schools with ESL did not offer any CBI model while others offered more than one model of CBI.

As was explained previously, most ESL students in community college programs are in non-credit adult education programs. The adjunct model has been primarily used as preparation for 4-year college and university degree students. However, the one community college using the adjunct model reported that it used it successfully with a non-degree auto mechanics program and is considering using it in their health care support/health services management program.

Interview Results

Rationale for Adjunct Course

Question 1: For what reasons did the ESL program add an adjunct course to the curriculum?

When explaining rationale for having an adjunct course in the ESL curriculum, the most frequent reply was to better prepare students to be successful in college and university classes. Several described the adjunct course as a bridge between ESL and non-ESL classes. Teacher O stated that the goal of their course was “to make a smoother transition between ESL and academic courses.” School Y, in particular, mentioned wanting to give students a realistic, first-hand exposure to the college classroom experience. Director Y2 said an adjunct course serves “to give students a chance to see what a course was like in a way that would be ‘real’ and, at the same time, not potentially destructive to their GPA’s.” (The ESL students at school Y

were not enrolled as degree students at that institution when they were taking the adjunct course.)

These courses were, of course, also viewed as a means to continue to increase the English proficiency of students and to prepare them to be successful students in colleges and universities in this country. Director L stated, adjunct courses built students' "sociolinguistic awareness of how college classrooms function in the US."

In four instances it was reported that the impetus for using the adjunct model came, at least in part, from outside the ESL program at the school. At school T, humanities professors had expressed concern about how poorly international students were doing in their classes. The adjunct courses at school T were initiated in response to these faculty concerns in order to prepare students more effectively for academic classes.

As institution L worked to internationalize its curriculum, it did a study of the needs of international students on campus. It became clear from a faculty survey that many students admitted to the school at 500+ TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language) levels were not fully ready for academic studies, and the school made a commitment to provide language support for these international students. A new academic ESL program was developed, and an adjunct class evolved within this program as one means of meeting the needs of these students.

Concern about ESL students not being adequately prepared for university level work was also an issue at institution H. ESL teacher H stated that she felt students exiting their ESL program were not fully ready

for academic classes. Although their students had high enough English proficiency according to required TOEFL scores, they were not able to compete as successful students in academic courses and still had both language and non-language problems. When professors in other departments at that school also expressed the concerns that international students never talked in class and did poorly on exams and came to the ESL program to ask how to deal with these students, the ESL program responded with an adjunct course to address these students' needs.

Another example of the impetus for adjunct courses coming from outside the ESL program was reported by institution L. A needs analysis study completed by an academic department at school L identified that international students were not successful in their graduate classes. The ESL program built a relationship with this department and developed an adjunct course for these students for an existing pre-professional summer session designed to prepare students to enter this degree program.

As reported earlier, school R developed a vocational auto mechanics class that was planned as a sheltered course for non-native speakers. However, due to an error, native speakers were also allowed to register for the course. The auto mechanics department approached the ESL program about how to deal with this problem, and an adjunct model ESL support class was attached to the course for the non-native speakers.

Reasons to develop adjunct model CBI courses also came from within the ESL programs interviewed. School O had experimented with linking activities in several ESL skills classes to a content class to make the

ESL classes more relevant to students. This was tried for several years with different advanced listening, reading, and vocabulary classes with limited success because only some of the ESL students were taking the content class for credit; the students that were not enrolled in the content course for credit were less motivated to participate. Also, as the ESL teachers did not attend the content course, it was difficult for them to be aware of what was occurring in that class and, thus, to prepare students for the content course. The move to an adjunct model course gave a “wider scope,” said teacher O, and integrated all language skills in one ESL support class.

School U reported the adjunct course model provided motivation for their most advanced ESL students. Director U said their students were anxious to move out of ESL classes, and morale was poor for these students before starting the adjunct model. Now, students receive graduation credit for the ESL adjunct courses and the content class fulfills a graduation requirement for these students. Participating in a “regular” content course and receiving course credit helped motivate students and helped them feel they were making progress out of ESL. The ESL faculty at School U used student progress in the adjunct classes as the primary means to evaluate when students were ready to leave the ESL program.

Others agreed with the perception that providing credit-bearing content classes was a motivating factor for their students. Teacher Y said their students often asked to take credit classes before the ESL program felt they were ready. The adjunct model allowed students to take a content class while giving them the support they needed for success in that class.

Another rationale for adjunct courses mentioned was to make the ESL program more visible and respected on campus. The adjunct model provided the opportunity for the ESL program to form closer ties to other departments at the institution, reported teacher Y. Director L2 stated their ESL program gained credibility by linking with an academic discipline. Teacher Y also mentioned that adjunct courses made ESL instructors more aware of what college or university classes were really like, and, thus, the ESL instructors were better able to prepare students for academic classes.

One school reported the adjunct model was selected to help meet the unique needs of their students. At institution M, one -year exchange students with a low level of English proficiency must take content classes that fulfill the graduation requirements of their home university. Sheltered and adjunct classes have evolved to allow these students to take content courses in English.

Question 2: How long have adjunct courses been offered?

Responses to inquiries about how long adjunct model courses have been used in ESL programs in Oregon showed that their use was relatively recent. The longest use of the adjunct model was at school U where adjunct classes have been offered each semester for five and one-half years. Only one other institution (L) has used the adjunct class for five years, but this program only offers the class once during the summer in a pre-professional graduate program. The next longest use of the adjunct was school T that had taught an adjunct course each quarter for four years.

Four other schools interviewed (R, H, M, and Y) had used the adjunct model for a period of two to three and one-half years. School R offered the adjunct course in a vocational program for two years and stated they hoped to apply this course model to other vocational programs in the near future.

Question 4: Do you intend to keep this course in the curriculum?

Most schools reported that they were satisfied with the adjunct model and planned for the course to remain in their curriculum but would continue modifying the course to fit the needs of their students and programs. The program director at school U stated that the adjunct course was an integral part of the advanced level of their ESL curriculum, and the ESL faculty were satisfied that the adjunct model met the needs of their students. In fact, seven of the schools interviewed (U, L, T, R, H, M, and Y) indicated they were happy with the adjunct model and planned to continue offering adjunct courses. The newest adjunct class reported was in the planning stage at the time of the interview and was scheduled to be offered for the first time in fall 1995 in the academic ESL program at school L.

Only two programs have discontinued the use of an adjunct course; school O offered an adjunct class three different terms over a period of two school years, two years ago. It was discontinued primarily for financial reasons; the adjunct course was more costly because the ESL teacher was given additional compensation to attend the content course. One teacher in the ESL program at school R experimented with an academic adjunct

course one term in the 1994-95 school year but planned to substitute a thematic CBI course the next year. The instructor liked the adjunct model but difficulty getting adequate student enrollment in this optional course was the primary reason to not offer the class again, and also the instructor decided to experiment with other CBI models. Both these two ESL programs stated the desire to try an adjunct class again in the future when it would be feasible for them.

In the preliminary phone survey with ESL program directors, several schools that had not tried the adjunct model expressed interest in it for the future. One school was in an early phase of investigating the adjunct model for its program. Others merely said they believed this type of class would be helpful for their students going on to academic degree programs and that they would like to try the model but had not yet. Lack of administrative support or financial concerns were the most frequent reasons given for not moving ahead.

Administrative Decisions

A unique feature of the adjunct model is that because it links an ESL support class to a content class and the activities in the ESL class are directly related to the lecture, texts, and other assignments in the content class, the ESL instructor must know what is happening in the content class at all times. One common solution is for the ESL instructor to attend the content class, but this is an extra commitment of time for that teacher. Adjunct instructors also spend time designing original teaching materials

based on the content class lectures, texts, and assignments. Thus, one important administrative issue is how to calculate teaching loads and compensate adjunct instructors, and how to justify the extra expense involved with adjunct courses. These and other administrative issues were included in these interviews.

Question 1 - When you began using the adjunct model, did you find it necessary for your program to “sell” the concept to administrators at your institution? What kinds of barriers or problems did you encounter initially in instituting this type of course?

The eight schools where I interviewed were very different in size and administrative structure of the institutions and the ESL programs. Therefore, it was not surprising that the experience of developing and implementing adjunct classes followed different pathways. Most directors and teachers could not come up with many difficulties or barriers in selling the concept of the adjunct model and remarked on the positive administrative support they received at their schools.

In response to whether there were difficulties selling the adjunct class to their school administration, director T said, “none at all.” The administration at school T was concerned about student retention and how the international students made the transition to academic classes and “generously supported” the development of the adjunct classes. The ESL support classes (linked to freshman composition courses) were assigned an English department prefix, and they counted as elective credits in communication for the students. In addition, the English department financially supported the teaching of these courses. The fact that the ESL

adjunct instructor regularly taught in both the ESL and English departments facilitated this arrangement.

School H was one of the institutions where a number of professors were concerned with the poor performance of international students in their academic classes. Teacher H reported very good working relationships between the faculty at school H; professors would frequently consult with the ESL faculty about how to work with international students. Therefore, when the adjunct class was proposed as a way to prepare ESL students more effectively for academic classes, the support from faculty was already in place. Their adjunct course proposal readily passed the traditional channels for new course approvals.

Working to gain support of faculty and administration was echoed by director L2. Finding “a friendly ear,” she said, was crucial in the beginning. She added:

If you have to convince someone that this [the adjunct class] is necessary, then it puts you in a very vulnerable position, and it requires a tremendous amount of energy. Whereas, if you can identify areas where faculty and/or the administration have already identified as problem areas and step into those, then the only convincing you need to do is that the [ESL program] has resources available to meet these needs. . .

The experience of developing an adjunct class was very different at school U. The administration at this school was trying to establish a program to support international students in a new sister school relationship. This led the school president, dean of faculty, and ESL program to work together to develop a second language program with adjunct classes on a trial basis outside the usual channels of curriculum

change. Satisfaction with the experimental program eventually led to its formal acceptance in the school curriculum.

Teachers at school R reported that the administration at their institution actively encouraged interdisciplinary work and integrated instruction, and grant money was available to support innovative integrated programs. This atmosphere fostered the building of good relationships between departments and created a receptive climate for experimenting with the adjunct model by the ESL program.

In the early years of their program, some ESL teachers at school M voluntarily held ESL support classes for sheltered content courses because the students needed extra help to learn the content material. These informal classes did not become an official part of the ESL program until after a major administrative reorganization. The new administration continued the sheltered content classes but recognized that the students, who had a fairly low level of English proficiency (400-470 TOEFL range), needed appropriate support for these classes to be successful. A modification of the adjunct model, where an ESL support class is linked to a sheltered class, was adopted. Recently, regular adjunct classes were added to the curriculum to challenge the more advanced students.

Informal experimentation with linking ESL to content classes also was the forerunner of a formal adjunct class at school O. The desire to make classes relevant to advanced students and to prepare students for academic classes, as well as a new program director who supported the

concept of the adjunct model, led to the development of a formal adjunct class.

School Y was one institution that reported some difficulties in the development and implementation of an adjunct class. The ESL faculty were united in wanting to include an adjunct class to serve the students going on to degree programs; however, complications arose because of the organizational structure at this institution. The ESL program was located in a separate institute, and its students were not admitted to the school to take academic classes. Initially, the administration was concerned that the presence of ESL students (with TOEFL scores lower than the level required for admission) in academic classes would "be a drag on the class," teacher Y reported. However, the course proposal was given provisional approval for the first year, and the ESL program was required to write progress reports for each adjunct class and turn in student grades. The results of the adjunct classes during this provisional year led to making the adjunct course a part of the regular ESL curriculum.

The separation of the ESL students from the institution created other enrollment issues for this program. Registration for ESL classes was handled at a separate time, and tuition was calculated on a different scale. Therefore, reserving places in the content class for the ESL students was problematic and a time consuming task handled by the ESL adjunct instructor. Moreover, ESL students taking the adjunct course had to pay additional tuition. In response to this, the ESL administration reduced its tuition for these students, but the total cost was still more expensive.

For these reasons and because the adjunct course was only an elective course in the ESL curriculum, one of the most serious problems with the adjunct course at this institution has been low enrollments. This was a continuing problem, and the adjunct teacher and program director reported ongoing efforts to better market the course and recruit students. Philosophically and educationally the ESL program was satisfied with the adjunct model and believed it should be continued in their curriculum, but administrative issues remained a concern. For others wanting to smoothly organize adjunct classes, Director Y stated, "I would advise them to know the hierarchy better than we did. Know what trail you should follow and what order the steps should go in."

Complicated administrative problems led to unresolved barriers at school O. One administrative concern with the class was consistently low enrollments (eight students or less). This happened, according to director O, because the class was an elective. The ESL support class carried no graduation credit for the students, and the students felt they could not take the time to complete an "extra" course.

The greatest problem, that ultimately led to discontinuance of the course at school O, was financial difficulties. The ESL program funded released time for the ESL instructor to attend the content class and prepare for the adjunct course, but the course enrollments were low and registration fees did not bring money back into the ESL program since some students took the class after they left the ESL program. Director O said "It was very clear that this was not a cost-effective move, and we were not able

to continue it. So the curricular basis for creating the course was and still is a very sound one. The financial basis for funding for the course was extremely shaky.”

Director O added that in terms of curricular design, it can be difficult to be innovative within a basic intensive English program. One complication for this ESL program was that the optional adjunct class ended up competing for students with other classes at the advanced level in their program. This director said she believed the adjunct class was “the way to go,” but they had not yet found a mechanism to introduce a full-time adjunct class that allowed them to work within the politics and economics of their institution.

Question 2 - How many class hours per week are allotted to the ESL support class in proportion to the weekly hours in the content courses?

Most of the schools devoted the same number or close to the same number of class hours for the ESL support classes as for the content classes. However, two programs were significantly different; one program had considerably more ESL hours and one less than in the content course.

The majority of adjunct classes were quite similar in the amount of time devoted to content and ESL instruction. School M has one-half to one hour per week less in ESL instruction than in content instruction, and the two ESL instructors interviewed agreed they wished the time in the ESL classroom could be increased.

Teacher H started an adjunct course with two hours of ESL instruction for a three-hour content class. At first, the support class was

substituting for a listening/speaking class in the curriculum, and the course content dealt primarily with these skills. As the support class evolved into a much broader adjunct program, the hours were increased to four hours per week. Teacher H chose four hours to accommodate the types of activities she did with each chapter in the content textbook and thought this worked well with this content course. She suggested the hours needed for a support class could depend on the particular content course, how it was taught, and how fast the class moved.

Only one other school had one more hour weekly in the ESL class than the content class. Instructor O said the 3:4 ratio with four hours in the ESL class was ideal although she expressed the concern that she did not do enough with reading, note-taking, or other aspects of the course. The amount of ESL class time was not reported in these interviews to be a major issue by the other adjunct teachers who had a number of weekly teaching hours in the ESL support class equal to the content class. No major concerns were expressed although there was general agreement that more time would always be desirable.

Two schools (U and R) were unique in the structure of their adjunct class and adapted the hours for the ESL support course to fit the particular needs of their students. At school U, the whole advanced level of the ESL program was structured around the adjunct course. Students attended a content class three hours per week and two ESL classes (note-taking and reading) that were directly related to that content class for six hours a week. In addition, these same students spent eight additional hours in ESL classes

each week (writing and speech) where part of the time in each course was devoted to activities related to the content course. This adaptation of the adjunct course model was created because the students at school U had lower levels of English proficiency than is recommended for adjunct courses. The school evolved this structure over several years to help their students be successful in the content courses, and the faculty was very satisfied with it.

At the opposite extreme were the adjunct courses linked to vocational auto mechanics classes at school R. One term they offered a four-hour content class linked to a two-hour ESL support class. The second term a different content class met ten hours per week; the support class met for two hours. For the third term the ratio of content to ESL class hours was eleven to three. The amount of time in the ESL classes was quite small in proportion to the content classes; however, comparison was difficult because the nature of the classes was entirely different. The auto mechanics classes included laboratory activities and were job training programs in contrast to the academic lecture and discussion classes at the other schools.

Question 3 - Do the ESL instructors regularly attend the content classes? If not, how do they coordinate activities between the adjunct and content classes?

There was general agreement by everyone interviewed that ESL adjunct class instructors needed to plan class activities related directly to the content class and, therefore, must be continually aware of what was

happening in the content class; however, the eight schools interviewed in this study found different means to accomplish this end. Most concurred that it was essential for the ESL instructors to attend the complete content class at least one term or semester, whether that was before teaching the adjunct course or the first time the class was offered. Some directors and teachers believed very strongly that it was important to attend the content course regularly every term; however, others indicated it was not necessary to go regularly or at all the second or third time through with the same content course. Several variables mentioned in these interviews that influenced this decision were the ESL teacher's background in the content area, the content course itself, the level of the students and what was required of them, and the compensation policy of the ESL program for the adjunct course.

The importance of regular attendance at the content class, at least the first time through, was the general consensus of both teachers and directors. The explanation of teacher H who attended the content class regularly from the beginning was typical; he reported that they have used the same professor and content course each semester. "I am at a point now," he stated, "where I am not in the [content] class everyday . . . I have such thorough notes and understand her teaching methods so well . . . that daily attendance is no longer essential." He went on to explain that he met regularly with the content professor in her office once a week to ask if there would be any schedule changes or new exercises for that week. Meetings with the content professors on some kind of regular basis, informally after

class or more formally arranged, were frequently mentioned as another important means for the ESL instructors to keep up with the content class.

At school T, the ESL support teachers have always attended the content classes and were fully compensated for this time. This was essential for the teachers because they frequently changed content courses. Now the ESL program has selected one particular content course to use exclusively with the adjunct model class with the intention of providing extra compensation for the ESL adjunct instructor only the first term the course was taught. This director and others stated that after an adjunct course was established, if the content course stayed essentially the same, the time commitment for the ESL teacher would decrease, and it would no longer be essential to be in the content class daily.

At school Y, the ESL teacher received one course released time to attend the content course the first semester she taught the adjunct course but now received no further compensation. However, this teacher still said that it was necessary to attend the content class and see the students in the classroom setting. She added that although the course was basically the same each semester, it was important for "getting the examples that he [the content course teacher] uses . . . He tries very hard not to use culturally-bound examples, but he does . . . and so just knowing which examples he has used I can explain them better if I have been there." She now tried to attend the class at least once a week. The director at this school also stated that he believed it was important for the adjunct instructor to attend the content course and added, "if [the students] see their ESL teacher there, it

motivates them . . .” However, attendance at the content course was not mandatory for the instructor because of the extra time it required. The program funded the extra hours for the first term, and also hired a student note-taker to help the instructor collect complete class notes.

Teachers in an intensive summer adjunct program at school L reported they always attended the two-hour content classes Monday through Thursday and preferred to schedule the one and one-half hour ESL support class immediately after each content class. Director L1 of the program stressed it was really important for the instructor to know what was happening in the content lectures so she could exploit this and be able to answer student questions. This director described herself as an advocate for the teachers to explain and rationalize the time necessary for these courses. The teachers were fully compensated for their time in the content courses.

A further benefit of having the ESL instructor attend the content class, reported director L1, was that it was a good opportunity for content training for the ESL teacher. Director L2 mentioned one issue with adjunct instruction was how much the adjunct instructor needed to know about the content; does this person need to be a specialist in the content area? Director L1 said it was desirable for the ESL teacher “to develop a specialization in that content area to have . . . credibility with the students, to be able to facilitate discussions, and to be able to ask the right questions . . .” If an adjunct instructor had no knowledge in the content area, teaching a linked

course would be very difficult, she added. The content class in this program was a graduate level course.

Lack of content knowledge was also a concern to ESL instructors in undergraduate classes and provided a compelling reason to regularly attend the content class. One teacher at school R taught an adjunct class linked to accounting. She stated, "I had no academic business background, so I attended virtually every accounting class. I took accounting the same as the students did." She related she had discomfort with the content and arranged for the accounting teacher to attend the ESL support class as the content expert. This mutually agreed upon arrangement and the open and informal relationship between the two instructors made the adjunct class function smoothly. This ESL instructor was fully compensated for attending the content class.

At the same school, another teacher taught linked classes in a vocational auto mechanics program without any compensation to attend the classes even the first time. This instructor attended about half of the content class sessions. The primary difficulty was that three nights a week were required to attend the content classes and the ESL class, and this instructor had family responsibilities. She recommended that the next teacher be paid to attend at least one class each week. Consultations with the content instructors and a mechanic friend helped her deal with course content.

The only other ESL adjunct instructor in these interviews who did not attend all the content classes for at least one term, was a teacher that

had himself served as the content instructor for the English composition content course in the past and was, therefore, very familiar with the course content. He mentioned he did attend some of the content classes when he first taught the adjunct class. At the time of these interviews, he said he got syllabi from the instructors and frequently met with them to talk about the students and assignments.

Question 4 - Do you think teaching an adjunct course is more time consuming than other ESL courses?

There was general agreement among all but one person interviewed that teaching adjunct classes was more time consuming than skills-based ESL classes. However, the responses varied from two strongly worded statements, to others less vigorously phrased. The two most emphatic “yes” answers came from teachers at two different schools that did not provide any released time or other compensation to adjunct teachers.

Several individuals added that the first time teaching an adjunct class was particularly time consuming. Not only is the content discipline new, but also attending the content classes, keeping up with the content reading, consulting with the content faculty, and developing class materials all create added pressures for the instructor. After teaching the same course once or twice, it was mentioned that these pressures decreased considerably. Director L1 suggested another pressure was that teachers were “dealing with advanced level students that expect something that works.”

The one “no” response came from teacher O who said preparation time varies with different ESL skill classes and thought that teaching ESL writing was the most time consuming. She rated teaching an adjunct class with teaching an advanced level reading class. This instructor was given released time the semester prior to teaching the adjunct class to attend content lectures to collect notes and complete readings.

Question 5 - Are ESL teachers compensated in time or money for their attendance at the content class?

Three different policies were found on the load compensation issue at the eight schools interviewed. One policy was to compensate ESL instructors for their attendance at the content course by regularly including the hours partially (two hours load credit was given for attending a three or four hour content course) or totally (three hours teaching load was assigned for attending a three hour content course) in the instructor’s teaching load. The instructors at these institutions (L, M, T, and the academic adjunct course at R) regularly attended all of the content courses. School T was in the process of changing their compensation policy to the next model to save money.

The second policy reported was to give full teaching load compensation for either the first semester the adjunct course was taught or for the semester before for preparation for the course. Instructors at these schools (O and Y) reported that they did not attend the content course daily but tried to attend occasionally and believed it was necessary to do so. The final policy was to offer no teaching load compensation to instructors of the

adjunct courses. The ESL teachers at these institutions (H, U, and the vocational class at R) also reported they all thought they needed to attend the content course although the reported attendance varied.

Question 6 - Has load credit or compensation for adjunct courses been an issue or concern at your institution?

Teaching load and compensation are significant administrative matters to be resolved when a program begins adjunct classes. Director L2 commented on compensation: " it is a big issue . . . it's a big concern in terms of the adjunct because those courses do take time and are just more expensive because of the double load for the teachers . . ." This director added that the ideal situation was to have the ESL instructor attend the content course regularly, but the difficulty was the expense involved.

One of the unique adaptations of the adjunct model encountered in these interviews was at school U where the top level of their ESL program consisted of one content course linked directly to two ESL classes and partially linked to two additional classes. None of the ESL instructors received extra compensation for teaching the adjunct classes. The note-taking instructor regularly attended the content class. The reading instructor did not attend but spent extra time to prepare textbook study questions. The director emphasized that good communication between all the instructors was essential for their model to function smoothly. They all worked to maintain communication, but occasionally the coordination would break down. Offering no extra compensation to ESL instructors had worked for this program in the past, but now the director was concerned

about changes in their program that would necessitate using more part-time instructors. She felt she could not assign adjunct classes to part-time instructors because of the extra time commitment and added that this issue was not likely to be resolved in the future.

Syllabus and Teaching Materials

Question 1 - Do individual ESL instructors plan syllabi, or does the ESL program try to standardize the curriculum of all adjunct courses?

The question of who plans course syllabi was included to determine if there was any attempt to coordinate or standardize adjunct course objectives or content at schools that offer more than one adjunct model class. Of the eight schools interviewed, four offered only one adjunct course (O, H, Y, and L), so coordination between courses was not possible. At these schools the syllabi were designed entirely by the individual adjunct instructors. A fifth school (R), offered two adjunct courses; however, one was linked with an academic class for students pursuing college degrees and the second was with a vocational, job-training program. Thus, coordination was not appropriate, and individual adjunct instructors designed their own syllabi.

The three other schools interviewed also offered more than one academic adjunct course per term making coordination of objectives a possibility, but the circumstances at each were quite different. At school T, one of the adjunct courses was always with a freshman composition class; thus, the emphasis in the support course was almost entirely on writing.

The second adjunct course was linked to a lecture class, and the ESL support class had multiple objectives. Since the classes were so different in objectives and design, each support course was planned individually by the instructors.

School U was also unique because it offered one content class with four linked ESL support courses each semester: reading, listening/note-taking, writing, and speech. The ESL instructors worked together to prepare and coordinate objectives for these courses, but teachers individually prepared their own course syllabi. Instructors also consulted during the term to coordinate the classes.

School M was the only one that offered several adjunct courses in their program each term. Each individual instructor was responsible for planning his or her own syllabus, but the program provided guidelines for the design of the ESL support classes. The program developed a general framework for adjunct classes to include the following activities: speech communication, readings from the content course, journal and/or essay writing, lecture preview and review. Handouts with model syllabi and formal group meetings with all ESL and content instructors before the term began were used to discuss the framework. However, the instructors had the freedom to develop their own syllabi around the general guidelines.

Question 2 - What are the primary objectives of the adjunct course?

When asked during the interviews for the objectives of their adjunct courses, some of the respondents replied with broad, global course

objectives; others gave more specific instructional objectives. Taken together, they provide a comprehensive picture of what adjunct courses try to achieve.

The director at school M contributed general objectives for their adjunct courses, most of which were a blend of sheltered and adjunct courses designed for a homogeneous group of exchange students with levels of English proficiency lower than is generally considered appropriate for the adjunct model. Using sheltered content classes allowed the students at this proficiency level to be successful in the content classes they were required to take by their home university.

Director M identified two primary objectives for their adjunct classes. First, these classes serve as “a forum for the students to continue to improve their English language skills.” This class format allowed the students to increase their fluency in both written and oral skills and to do this within the context of a subject area. A second important objective for these classes was to help students acquire authentic, contextualized academic skills that would prepare them for academic classes they would take later. Director M also emphasized that this model “creates a teaching and learning environment that meets the students where they are but at the same time is very demanding and places high expectations on the students.”

Another objective contributed by teacher R1 was to give students the opportunity to acquire the communication skills they need to be successful in the particular academic discipline of their content course. A more global

objective for adjunct classes came from teacher O. She said her primary objective for the adjunct class was to “introduce the students to the requirements of academic courses and to help them be realistic in their expectations of what they would face.” Unfortunately, she added, often the students’ objective was to get tutoring in the content course; they wanted a passing grade in the class. Helping students be successful in the content class was an adjunct course objective mentioned by director T.

Many of the replies to the inquiry about course objectives elicited more specific instructional objectives. The syllabus for the adjunct course at school H provided the following comprehensive list of course goals:

- to increase accuracy in taking notes and summarizing lecture materials
- to help students learn how to synthesize readings and lectures
- to teach students how to think, read and listen critically in a second language
- to help make the transition from ESL classes to degree classes work more smoothly by exposing students to a degree class in a controlled manner
- to give students the ability to see the mastery level of English that is required of them in a degree program second language
- to teach students how to use peer study groups in order to discuss and clarify class notes and prepare for exams
- to teach students pre-lecture study and preparation techniques
- to teach students techniques for utilizing and participating in classroom discussions

Other instructional objectives mentioned in the interviews included:

building a knowledge of basic concepts and language associated with the content area, library skills, identifying resources on campus, increasing reading speed, increasing vocabulary, test taking strategies, and other specific study skills.

Question 4 - To what extent are specific study skills integrated into the adjunct course?

This follow-up question to course objectives was designed to identify particular study skills integrated into adjunct courses. All teachers interviewed incorporated a number of different study skills into their adjunct classes. Everyone mentioned lecture listening, note-taking, and different strategies for reading comprehension, such as SQ3R (survey, question, read, recite, and review), previewing, finding main ideas, summarizing, paraphrasing, or increasing reading speed. Also, nearly everyone included test-taking strategies in their list. Other study skills reported were time management, class participation skills, and forming peer study groups.

Question 5 - Is a textbook used in the adjunct course?

This question was included to learn if textbooks other than the content text were used with ESL support classes. Everyone reported they use the content textbook with the support class, but only two teachers responded that they use another text. The teacher of the ESL support class linked to freshman composition had her students buy an ESL editing text to use with writing assignments from the composition class. School U, which had four ESL support classes linked to the one content class, used textbooks in three of the ESL classes. The reading class had a vocabulary text, and the two courses only partially linked to the content class (writing and speech) both had textbooks. No one else had students purchase a

textbook for the support class; however, the teachers reported using a variety of different resources for class materials.

Question 6 -What is the primary source of teaching materials used by the ESL instructors in the adjunct classes?

The primary source of teaching materials mentioned by all teachers interviewed was self-designed activities based on the content class textbook, lectures, and other content class materials. Lecture notes taken by the teacher or hired note-taker, videotapes of lectures, and exercises and materials similar to those presented in the content class served as important sources of teaching materials for the support course. Several teachers mentioned they use other ESL textbooks like vocabulary or study skills texts as sources of inspiration for exercises; also mentioned were other videos, and activities teachers had used teaching other ESL classes.

The practice of adapting materials was widespread; nearly all the teachers said they adapted exercises from other sources to fit the subject matter of the content class. Director T said the difficulty was that all exercises had to be so specific for the particular content course and what was applicable for one course could not transfer directly to another. This director remarked that their adjunct teachers spent a great deal of time developing activities because they needed to be geared directly to the text and activities in the content course. This type of comment was repeated by other directors and teachers.

Two teachers reported using supplementary materials that were available from the publisher of the content textbook. Teacher H said their

content text was excellent, and a number of supplementary resources like a student study guide, a test bank, and a companion textbook for critical thinking skills were available. The test bank was a source for multiple choice and essay questions she used to practice test-taking strategies. The student study guide contained a variety of different exercises she adapted for activities in the support class, and the companion text provided materials to develop critical thinking and application skills. This teacher said these books were her primary source of teaching materials and had made teaching this class easier.

Teacher R also reported using materials from a supplementary teacher's guide available with their content text. She said this resource book contained crossword puzzles, overheads, matching exercises, and a variety of other types of activities. The primary concern was adapting them to her students, she reported, but they were useful for both in-class and homework exercises.

Question 7 - How are class activities planned on a day-to-day basis to accomplish the course objectives and to coordinate with the content course?

The original plan for this study included attending sessions of ESL adjunct courses to observe how the courses were structured to achieve course objectives. When it became clear that it was not possible to visit some classes and there was insufficient time to do both interviews and observations, the class observations were dropped. Therefore, this question was given minimal time in most interviews.

All teachers reported using the content course syllabi as the basis for planning the adjunct course, and daily classes were planned to coordinate with activities in the content course. All adjunct course syllabi collected or reviewed in the interviews were general syllabi containing course objectives and goals, grading information, and explanations of major projects and assignments; none had a weekly or day-to-day format as is typical in content courses.

Question 8 - To what extent does the adjunct course become tutoring for the content course? Has this ever been a concern?

The teachers and directors interviewed at these eight schools gave very different responses to this question. Several instructors did express concern about this issue; however, others thought it was not an important concern and found it difficult to differentiate between content and language learning.

One instructor who stated that this was an issue in her adjunct course was teacher O. She stated her student's primary objective was to pass the content course; they wanted to be tutored on the content material in the ESL support course. When asked how she kept a balance between content and language objectives she replied: "I didn't feel I did as good a job with that as I would like to." She said the students pulled her in the direction of reviewing content.

Teacher R1 also reported this was an issue their ESL teachers continue to debate, and she said she would periodically ask herself if what she was doing was supplemental instruction. She found her students

resisted assignments made for the support class because they wanted to spend their time only on content course assignments. It was necessary to remind the students that the support class was a separate class they were getting credit for. To deal with this concern, teacher R1 said "I would make what we did in class really relevant . . ." to what was happening in the content class. Another solution to directly satisfy the students' desire for tutoring on the content material was to regularly arrange some time in the support class (particularly before exams) for the content professor to be present to review content. She reported this worked very successfully for her class.

Teacher Y explained that while her over-all objectives for the ESL support course have not been altered from when she began teaching the course, the focus of the class activities has changed. She said, "When I started out I was much more focused on actual skills, and as it's gone along, I am more focused on the content." Student comments in class evaluations said they wanted more time spent on content, so now she said she did not teach the skills so overtly but incorporated them into content activities.

Other teachers and directors interviewed simply said the issue of becoming a content tutor was not of great concern to them although some did think about it occasionally. Director L1 did agree that it is an issue to some extent and that teachers must plan to incorporate language and study skills into the class. However, she added, "I have a really hard time separating content from those skills."

This last response was a common idea reported by several others with similar philosophies; teacher M1 elaborated on this concern about the balance between tutoring content and language skills:

I don't worry about that. I think if the student is interested and you are using language, you're teaching language. And the joy of working with the content of the content class and with the content instructor is that . . . the emphasis is where it is naturally when people learn language. It's on learning; it's on using the language -- writing, or speaking, or asking questions, or answering questions.

She continued to say she did not know how “to slice apart” the teaching of language and the teaching of content. Teacher M2 agreed and said the focus on content often holds the interest of students in a manner that does not happen in ESL language classes. She often observed students “struggling to read things they wouldn’t ordinarily read because of their interest in [the topic].”

Question 9 - Is separate tutoring for the content course available for the ESL students? Is it required? Who does the tutoring?

There were differences found between the schools interviewed as to the use of separate content tutoring for students in adjunct classes. Teacher O said there was no specific provision for any additional content tutoring for the ESL students outside the ESL support class. Three schools (H, L, T) mentioned that although there was no special tutoring for the adjunct class students, either the ESL program or the school had tutoring centers available to the students if they wanted extra assistance. Teacher R said a school tutoring center was available, and the content professor scheduled tutoring sessions for all students enrolled in his course.

In two instances, the content class made tutoring sessions available to all students in that class. The two programs where the ESL students had lower levels of English proficiency hired peer tutors to be content tutors for the adjunct students. School M hired student peer counselors who held two study sessions per week for the students; attendance at the study sessions was optional. At school U, the study sessions with American student tutors were optional in the beginning, but at the time of the interview, the tutoring was required for the students. Finally, three teachers (H, L, and Y) reported forming study groups within the adjunct courses so the students would learn to help each other study for the content class.

Selection and Recruitment of Content Courses

The selection of an appropriate content course to use with the adjunct class is a critical issue for success of this instructional model. The content course is the credit-bearing course in the college or university curriculum that is linked to the ESL support course. The ESL students enroll in both courses concurrently, and the coursework in the ESL support class is based on and derived from what occurs in that content course. The interviews inquired about several issues related to selection of content course of these issues but primarily explored the criteria used by the various programs in their process of selecting the content course or courses and how the course selection was finally decided.

Question 1 - What criteria does the program use when selecting a content course?

The process of selecting a content class is not necessarily the same at every institution because goals for the adjunct courses and the types of ESL students differ. This was definitely the case for the eight schools included in these interviews. Although, several selection criteria common to all institutions emerged from the interviews, other significant differences also influenced the selection process. For instance, although at most schools the ESL program selected the content courses, the courses were selected for the ESL program by other academic departments in three programs.

School M had a unique structure where nearly 100 percent of its ESL student population was composed of exchange students from one foreign university. These exchange students needed to complete content courses that fulfilled graduation requirements in subject areas dictated by this foreign university, and school M agreed to offer courses in these disciplines. Therefore, the specific content courses offered by the ESL program were courses from the curriculum of school M that fit into the required subject areas. Most of the content courses at school M were taught as sheltered classes with a linked English support course. This adaptation of the adjunct model made these courses more appropriate for students with lower levels of English proficiency. Three years ago, non-sheltered content courses (or typical adjunct model course) were added to the curriculum to challenge the more advanced students.

Two other programs developed adjunct courses for content classes selected primarily by other academic departments. In each case, the ESL students were a homogeneous group preparing for or taking classes in those academic departments and had specific curricular needs. At school L, an adjunct course was developed for graduate students preparing to enter an MBA program. Therefore, the business department was asked to decide which course would best prepare these students for success in this program. The selection process was completed in consultation with the ESL program director who gave input on the type of course structure and content that would function best in the adjunct model.

Another unique program exists at school R where adjunct courses are linked to vocational automotive classes. The automotive department had selected automotive classes for a job training program. The ESL program was asked if they could add ESL classes to help the non-native speaker students; the adjunct model was selected for these classes. Although several schools, consulted with school administrators and academic departments in the process of selecting content courses, most ESL programs made the final selection themselves.

A number of criteria for selection of content courses were mentioned in the interviews. Most of these can be categorized into three general areas: the nature of the content course, including the subject matter covered and the structure and organization of the course; the attitude and interest of the content course professor; and whether or not the course meets general graduation requirements for students at that

school. Some aspect of these factors was mentioned by nearly every ESL program, even the ones that had the courses partially or totally selected for them. These three general factors stood out as salient criteria for content course selection at the institutions in this study.

The first general criteria, the nature of the content course, encompasses a number of different factors. A point frequently mentioned in the interviews was the desire for a “well-rounded” course. Specifically, most directors and teachers were concerned with finding a course that included a variety of classroom activities that required students to use diverse learning strategies. Classes that combined lecture, group discussions, readings, group projects, objective and essay exams, as well as writing would present the most opportunities for ESL instructors to teach a wide range of study skills that not only help students be successful in that content class but also prepare them for future academic classes. Teacher H said he also considered the language skill level of the ESL students compared to the complexity of the content course. Although, the perfect content class may not exist, the majority of directors and teachers interviewed in this study said they evaluated for variety in teaching styles, testing methods, and types of required assignments when selecting a content course for the adjunct model.

Emphasis on variety may not always be desirable if the ESL program decides to focus on one language skill as did school L. At the time of the interview, School L was in the process of planning an adjunct model course to substitute for their advanced reading course. Therefore, they

were searching specifically for a reading intensive content course with appropriate reading content.

Other directors and teachers also mentioned reading materials, specifically the textbook, as a factor considered in content course selection. Teacher H examined the difficulty and organization of the textbook. He said their freshman level content course was thought to be one of the more difficult freshman classes on campus, but the outstanding organization of the textbook was one reason this class was selected. In addition, the textbook publisher had several supplemental texts available for students and instructors which greatly enriched and facilitated the teaching of this adjunct course. Director Y specified that she wanted a content course with a textbook that was "well organized, clear, and fairly easy to comprehend." Teacher Y mentioned she also reviewed outside readings required in the course and added that the textbook used with their content course had an international focus, which she thought was a plus for teaching international students.

Other factors related to the nature of the content course were more practical in nature. School Y wanted the same course to be offered each term of the school year. School U used a different content course each term, but wanted the same class to be offered the same term each year. The hours the content course was offered needed to be convenient for the ESL instructors and students and not conflict with other required ESL classes. Scheduling difficulties were mentioned by several schools. Willingness of the professor to reserve places for the ESL students was a scheduling

complication at one school. Another person mentioned that the content course had to have high enough enrollment so the ESL students would not constitute too large a proportion of the class. In addition, the course needed to be an introductory level course and have the appropriate hours of credit. These practical considerations were not always the most important selection criteria, but were necessary to consider when making final decisions.

The second common selection criteria that emerged from these interviews was the attitude and interest of the content course professor. As with the first general criteria, nearly everyone interviewed mentioned the importance of selecting not only the right course but finding the right professor. Several different points were reported during the interviews on this issue.

Finding a professor that was interested in participating in an adjunct class was a major factor. One way this interest level was determined was through recommendations from others. Director U said they initially got referrals from their dean of faculty who recommended several people he thought would work well with the ESL program and enjoy this new type of teaching experience. Others relied on personal relationships already established with professors at their institution. Teacher R1 said she knew the content professor well before they ever decided to do the adjunct class. She emphasized that "one of biggest factors to me is who the team-players are." She knew they could work together, and the content professor regularly visited the adjunct course to answer the students' content

questions. Without compatible team members, she said she would not have been so willing to teach this class in a discipline that was new to her. At school L, one ESL staff member had a spouse in another academic department who provided a network for building contacts within that department which led to the development of an adjunct course.

A willingness of the content professor to cooperate with ESL teachers was a characteristic frequently mentioned. The availability of the content professor for consultations on teaching was one aspect that teacher H considered. In two interviews, the ESL teachers noted that willingness to share materials was a desired quality of the content instructor; some professors shared overheads, lecture outlines, sample exam questions or past exams, or allowed videotaping of lectures. Director U remarked that you needed an instructor that was flexible and not intimidated by having colleagues attend the content class.

Interest and cooperativeness of the content instructor can be difficult to assess before teaching an adjunct course, but if lacking can necessitate having to change content courses. At school O, a new adjunct course was planned, and the ESL instructor attended the content class for a whole term to prepare for the course. However at the last minute, the content course instructor decided he was not willing to participate, and the course had to be canceled. School T had offered adjunct courses with several different content classes, and the director said part of the reason not to continue certain courses "was based on the content instructor who maybe was not

easy to follow and not as cooperative, or didn't provide materials. You need a content instructor who is very cooperative."

Teaching styles of the content professors were mentioned by two individuals in the interviews. Teacher H said she looked for a content teacher that "makes full use of teaching methods and materials." When their ESL program was in the process of selecting a content course, teacher H visited several different classes to help find the best professor. Director L2 also specified that they wanted a professor "willing to take a look at his or her teaching methods."

School M had to link with certain content classes required for their exchange students, so the ESL teachers said they were not able to select professors for their teaching styles or any other factor and sometimes "that means that you are working with people who might not be your ideal choice for being in this program." However, they added that if the professors continued teaching the adjunct classes they often saw significant changes take place in their teaching styles. Even those who were unbending at first changed over time and came to better understand the students' needs. Teacher M2 added that they were really strong on pedagogy "and almost everybody [content professors at school M] has added a lot to what they do because of working with us. . . ."

The experience of the content professors with international issues and their interest in working with international students was another criteria reported in several interviews. Teachers H and Y both mentioned being concerned with the intercultural understanding of these professors

and their willingness to help ESL students. Teacher Y said, “they chose a professor who was very open to international students -- very much willing to help them outside of class.” Director Y1 added that they were looking for someone “who was open without compromising high educational standards.” Director U wanted professors “who value having the diversity in the class” and thought they were fortunate to work with two professors who made an effort to find ways the international students “can contribute and enrich the experience for the other students.”

The third general criteria considered important by the four-year schools was that the content course fulfill general graduation credit for the students. Director U explained that their ESL students had widely varying academic interests, and it was not possible to find one class that was of great interest to all. Therefore, they thought it was important to select courses that were part of their general education requirements and would transfer to other institutions. Director U added, “that’s a great motivator because even if a student hates history, they know they have to have it anyway” The director at school T reported that the content class for the ESL adjunct course was originally changed each term for variety; however, each term some of the ESL students would not be interested in the course selected. As a result, they had decided in the future to stay with one content course that every student who graduates from that institution was required to take. Three other four-year schools also specified that the content course they selected had to fulfill general graduation requirements.

The ESL program at school O selected a world geography content class to use with the adjunct class. Teacher O thought one reason for low enrollments in the optional adjunct course was that the ESL students were not very interested in taking a geography class. Also, the geography course did not fulfill any graduation requirements at that school.

The one community college interviewed said most of their ESL students were interested in the field of business. Therefore, they decided to target this particular student group for their first adjunct course. With the help of the business department, a required accounting course was selected because ESL students have traditionally done poorly in this class in the past.

Question 3 - What specific content courses has the program used with the adjunct course?

In the four-year institutions, a number of different content courses had been used with adjunct classes. These courses included: American studies, environmental science, geography, geology, history, international political economy, political science, introduction to business, business management, economics, introductory psychology, developmental psychology, social psychology, introductory sociology, and statistics. One private school used a required religion course in their adjunct model.

Least frequently selected were English courses. School M did offer a comparative American literature course, but this was one of their sheltered content classes. School T offered an adjunct course linked to their required English composition courses. These ESL adjunct courses were not

required, but the director said they were taken by most of the ESL students. This same school also offered other optional adjunct courses with other subject matter content.

Question 7 - Did you survey ESL students for their preference for particular content course?

None of the schools used a direct survey of student preferences in their selection process. However, director L2 said they did an indirect survey. They obtained records about the courses international students took immediately after leaving the ESL program to see which ones were most popular. This helped them initially target classes to investigate in their planning stage.

ESL Student Placement in Adjunct Courses

The adjunct model of CBI is generally viewed as most appropriate for students with an upper immediate or advanced level of English proficiency. As Crandall (1992) explains, the “adjunct program is typically limited to those students whose language skills are sufficiently advanced to enable them to participate in content instruction with English speaking students” (p. 116). Also, since adjunct courses are most frequently employed to help prepare ESL students for entrance into college and university degree programs, they have typically been part of the upper level of ESL programs. Thus, adjunct courses serve as “bridges” between ESL classes and other courses in the college or university curriculum.

Interview questions were included on issues related to student placement to determine if policies in these Oregon schools followed the basic adjunct model reported in the literature. Some of the programs interviewed did follow the typical adjunct model with one content class linked to one ESL support course to prepare ESL students for undergraduate classes; however, a number of different variations in adjunct classes were also reported.

Question 1 - Are adjunct courses required or optional in your ESL program?

The schools interviewed reported different policies on this issue. At some schools the adjunct course was an elective class; at others it was a requirement for all ESL students. Schools T, O, Y, and R all offered elective adjunct courses for their ESL students. School O had a set required curriculum for their upper level. The adjunct course was offered as an elective for students that were more advanced in one skill area and had previously completed an advanced level course or for students who had already completed the ESL program but still needed more language support. Unfortunately, there were only a limited number of students in the first category and few students who completed the ESL program wanted to take the time for another ESL class, reported director O. This led to small enrollments in the class which was one factor in deciding to discontinue the adjunct course.

School R experimented only once offering an elective adjunct course linked to an accounting class for their ESL students planning to major in

business. Teacher R explained that one reason to not continue this course was that students only wanted to take required ESL courses. Even though the adjunct course was a credit bearing class for the students, unlike other ESL classes, they did not want to take an extra ESL class. School Y had a wide selection of elective courses in levels four and five of a five-level program; the adjunct course was one of the choices. However, recruitment of students was difficult because the ESL students had to pay an extra fee to take the content course.

At school T, adjunct courses were offered each term with all sections of freshmen composition, and the ESL support course carried English department prefixes and received graduation credit. Also offered each term was an adjunct course linked to a content course in another academic discipline. ESL students received graduation credit for the content course but not the ESL support course. All adjunct courses were optional for ESL students, but according to director T, most students wanted to take them. The content courses had the reputation for difficulty at this school, and the director reported that the ESL students had learned that they would benefit by taking the adjunct courses. Enrollments in these courses had been steady.

The adjunct course was required for all students in the upper level of the ESL program at school H. In addition, international students who had never been to school in the US previously were also required to take the adjunct course upon entering school H even if their TOEFL score exempted them from other ESL requirements. The adjunct courses were

required at school U because the whole upper level of the ESL program was structured around these courses. Finally, the graduate adjunct course at school L was required by the Business Department for selected students admitted to the MBA program.

Question 2 - Are the adjunct courses in the most advanced level of your program?

At most schools interviewed the adjunct courses were classified as advanced level ESL classes; however, several programs adapted the adjunct model for students at different levels or for purposes other than for entering undergraduate degree classes. As previously reported, school L adapted the model for graduate students entering an MBA program, whereas school R used the model with Hispanic students in a vocational program in auto mechanics.

Schools M and U used adjunct classes for undergraduate ESL students pursuing degrees; however, they adapted the model to accommodate students with lower levels of English proficiency. This was accomplished at school M by using primarily sheltered content classes linked to ESL support classes although non-sheltered content classes also existed for the more advanced students. These courses were taken in the second and third terms of a three term exchange program. In the top level of the program at school U, one content course was linked with four separate ESL support courses in listening and note-taking skills, reading, writing, and speaking to provide more support for their students.

The undergraduate adjunct class that was being planned

at school L was to be an alternative for an upper level reading course. The present ESL reading course would continue to be offered, but one section would be linked to a content course as an option for students. This ESL adjunct course would primarily emphasize reading skills and, therefore, not be as broad in scope as the typical ESL adjunct class.

Both the ESL programs at schools T and H had begun the process of curriculum revision to place adjunct courses in a post-ESL status. In the future, students would complete all the current ESL levels and then enter a transition semester with adjunct courses. School H wanted to assign a non-ESL prefix to the English support class and have this class receive graduation credit; the present ESL adjunct class carried an ESL prefix and did not carry graduation credit. The new course would continue to be required of international students as described previously in this section. The adjunct courses would remain optional at school T.

Question 3 - What criteria are used to place ESL students in these courses? Do you have a set level of English proficiency?

Most schools did not report having a set level of English proficiency for admission to the adjunct course. Students qualified by completing the previous level of ESL courses successfully. Where the adjunct courses were optional, the ESL program typically recruited for the course through their student advising process and also relied on ESL teachers to identify students that needed the course.

Two schools did have TOEFL requirements for their adjunct courses. At one of these schools (Y), the requirement came from outside the ESL

program. The university had a strict policy that a student had to have a 500 TOEFL score to take non-ESL classes. Therefore, students officially needed to achieve this TOEFL score to be eligible for this elective course. However, the institution agreed to accept five students a term for this adjunct course with scores below but close to 500; this facilitated the recruitment of students for the course. At school T, the director reported that in its new revised curriculum, one criteria for ESL students to exit the top level of the program and enter the new post-ESL transition semester with adjunct courses would be a TOEFL score of 500.

Question 4 - Are students allowed or encouraged to repeat an adjunct course?

School T did not require students to repeat an adjunct class if they failed, but they could opt to take the course again. Teacher O reported that once a student did repeat the course; in another semester, a student failed but could not repeat it because it was not offered the following semester. The director at school U said that occasionally a student had repeated the top level of their program with the adjunct course, and that was the reason they linked with a different content course in the fall and spring. The director added that students who most needed to repeat generally did not want to, and the ESL instructors had to persuade them why it was necessary. Finally, teacher H reported that their students must repeat the adjunct class if they failed because the course was required to exit the ESL program; she stated this had occurred only once. Information on this issue was not obtained from the other schools.

Cooperation between Content and ESL Faculty

In adjunct courses, the classwork in the ESL component is related to the lectures, readings, exercises, and assignments of the content courses. This is why most ESL instructors attend all or many of the content classes whether or not they receive released time. As teacher O said, “the most important thing for the [adjunct] class to be effective is for the person who is teaching the [adjunct] course to know what is going on in the content course.” Attending the content course is one way to stay informed, but some contact between the two instructors is also necessary. Interview questions on the cooperation between ESL and content instructors were intended to determine what efforts were employed to build and maintain the relationship between these faculty members before and during the adjunct course.

Question #1 - How much consultation do you feel is necessary between content and ESL faculty? Before the course begins? During the course? Question 2 - What process does your program use to facilitate cooperation and contact between content and ESL faculty? (Results for these two questions were combined.)

There was no consensus on the amount of consultation that was needed for adjunct courses. In the interviews, the ESL teachers discussed several factors that could influence the amount of contact necessary or possible: the commitment of the content faculty and department to the course, the openness of the content faculty to working with another faculty member, the means by which the content professors were selected, the previous relationship between the two instructors, the size and

organizational structure of the institution, the background of the ESL instructor in the content discipline, the length of time the adjunct course had been linked to a particular content class, and the regularity of attendance of the ESL instructors at the content courses.

The degree of formality of the relationships between ESL and content faculty varied at the different schools interviewed; however, most relationships reported were informal. Only one school (M) reported having an established process to build and maintain these relationships. Each ESL instructor described how he or she made contact with the content instructors before and during the adjunct courses.

In every case, the first contact came from the ESL adjunct course instructor or the program director. Director Y1 explained that it was part of the ESL instructor's duty to make contact and work with the content professor. To begin this contact, Instructor Y reported that he went to the content professor's office before teaching the adjunct course to meet the professor and discuss the course. Instructor O reported the same initial contact; this first meeting was when she explained the goals and objectives of the adjunct course and thought this helped develop cooperation between them.

At school U where four ESL courses were linked with one content course, the director reported that she always met with the professor of the content course for the upcoming semester at the end of the previous semester to discuss number and types of assignments, readings, papers, etc. The ESL instructors then used this information to plan and coordinate

their syllabi. No regular meetings were scheduled during the adjunct course, but at least one ESL instructor attended the content courses daily.

Instructor H had been teaching the same adjunct course each term for two years with the same content professor. She stated that the amount of contact needed depended on "what point you are in developing the course." At the beginning, she mentioned she would have liked to have had more contact than she had; however, now that the course was established, less was necessary. This instructor emphasized the informality of their relationship which was facilitated by being at a small school where all faculty knew each other. She said she always met with the content professor once before each term; "I just simply go up [to her office] and sit down and have a cup of coffee and see . . . what's new for the next term." Also, she reported that she stopped by the professor's office about once a week to check if there were any changes planned for that week.

No regular meetings were scheduled between ESL and content instructors at school T according to the director; however, they communicated if there were any problems or concerns. The ESL instructor attended the content class and, thus, saw the other instructor regularly.

The background of the ESL instructor in the content course discipline also could influence the amount of contact needed. Director L reported that their ESL instructor taught academic skills in their academic learning center, had an undergraduate degree in business, and was currently working on an MBA. In addition, he sat in on the graduate economics class chosen by the business department for the adjunct

program a term in advance and regularly attended the content class during the adjunct course. Although there was little collaboration or outside meeting between the two, the course had worked well for their program.

At another institution (R) where the ESL and content instructors had established a relationship before the content course, the ESL teacher reported that they already knew they could work well together. They met before the course and regularly during the term; they talked together a couple of times a week about the course. Teacher R1 said she had no background in accounting and expressed initial concern about teaching this adjunct course; the accounting course had been selected by the business department as the best course for ESL students pursuing a business degree. However, the frequent meetings during the term and a well established relationship between the two instructors made the course successful.

In contrast, teacher R2, who also had little background in the subject matter of the adjunct course (auto mechanics), reported little consultation with the automotive instructor the first term she taught the adjunct course although she did attend the content class regularly. However, she realized more contact was necessary, and the following term when they had a grant to support the course, a more formalized process of regularly weekly meetings was held. That “was better for the students and there was more coordination between the classes” that second term, she reported.

Cooperation between ESL and content faculty is one level of a relationship between adjunct instructors, and the development of a cooperative relationship was reported by all ESL teachers interviewed.

However, a higher level of relationship between faculty would be collaboration, which was reported less frequently. Director O stated:

What works the best is when there is professional equality of status so that there is an assumption on the part of the content teacher that he or she has something to learn from the ESL teacher -- and frequently it's been related to pedagogy . . . If you have a situation where a content faculty member is assuming that there is the equivalent of a teaching assistant in with them, they are dealing with professional colleagues in unequal status

This can create problems. According to the individuals interviewed in this study, developing true collaboration depended on the individual faculty members and required time to develop.

Only at school R did the ESL instructor report collaboration developing the first term of the adjunct course; however, as previously explained, these two faculty had a well established relationship before the adjunct course began. Teacher R was unfamiliar with the content course subject matter (accounting) and made an arrangement with the accounting instructor to attend the adjunct course periodically. Outside of class they would sit down together regularly and discuss issues related to the course; teacher R reported that the accounting professor would often initiate these meetings. She described their relationship as collaborative.

Teacher Y also reported developing a relationship over time that has gone beyond mere cooperation. They communicated regularly by e-mail and phone about the course; in addition, the content professor was very concerned about reaching the international students and had initiated discussions about teaching techniques.

The director and teachers at school M were the only others interviewed to report developing collaboration between faculty members. One unique feature of the adjunct courses at school M was that most were sheltered content courses for students with lower levels of English proficiency; thus, both the content and ESL support courses had exactly the same students. Teachers M1 and M2 agreed that this situation made it possible for more collaboration to develop. The content professor generally planned the syllabi and selected topics for the courses. However, the teachers interviewed said sometimes the ESL and content teachers would discuss how to divide the content instruction between the two courses, and a content instructor may move an exercise into the ESL part of the course and attend the ESL course when that exercise was done. They also reported working with some content instructors to develop joint projects. Teacher M1 stated that there were a few content professors who saw the ESL class as an extension of their class and that the two were very much related. She also mentioned that she tried to share materials that she used so the professor knew what was happening in the ESL class.

This level of collaboration did not exist for all the adjunct courses at school M; the ESL teachers reported that the degree of collaboration between faculty members at school M varied greatly. In one course she taught, teacher M2 said real collaborative behavior began to develop in about the third year; it can take years to work out a good team process. Teacher M1 added, "I have worked with several different professors. Some of them are eager to do a very high level of collaboration . . . There are

those . . . that value your opinion and your knowledge of what is helpful for the students . . . and like to work closely together.” The two classes can then become very connected and very related. Teacher M1 continued: “Sometimes the collaboration can be really exhilarating; it can be groundbreaking . . . Other times you work with somebody and . . .” collaboration never develops. Some professors were very professor-centered, not student-centered; they were not open to a collaborative mode. Many had no idea about how the process worked and could be defensive or condescending at first. Although some were unbending in the beginning, many have changed over time.

Teacher M1 mentioned that the subject matter in the content class is a big factor affecting collaboration:

The first time I taught international political economics . . . I didn’t feel I had much I could say. I was just going to the class; I was trying to understand . . . what the content was all about The less you know about the content, I think that your role is different. It’s maybe not as much of a collaboration until you gain some confidence, and you’ve been through it once, and you get an idea of the whole picture because otherwise . . . you don’t see how everything is connected yet.

These teachers were asked for advice on how to build collaborative relationships. They replied that it was rare to have much collaboration the first time working with a content professor. “It just takes time,” they said more than once; “you can’t force it.” They also emphasized it depended on the content professor. They had observed that more of the younger faculty were sensitive to the students and to the collaborative process and to building the relationship. Some did not have the time to spend on these

classes, but teacher M2 added that “other people come in really open and just dying to learn and so they’re willing to spend a lot of time . . .” They also recommended opening the lines of communication with the content professor early in the term. If a person does not know how to collaborate or want to collaborate, regularly pick out issues to discuss about the course or students. They observed that the level of collaboration would slowly build.

Both teachers described recent successful collaborative experiences where they worked jointly with the content teachers to plan and teach classes. “The unity and collaboration makes a really good atmosphere for learning . . . more than with one teacher; its a richer atmosphere. So when it works, it’s very very nice,” stated teacher M2.

Question 3 - Does the ESL program have a formal “training” program or is the relationship left to individual instructors to develop on their own?

Formal training or orientation for the ESL and content instructors was encountered in only two schools (M and T). Director T, who taught in both the ESL and English departments developed an adjunct course with the required freshman composition courses. The ESL students could enroll in any of several composition sections; the ESL support course relied more on individual conferences on writing assignments than on group activities. Thus, the task of the ESL instructor was to keep aware of the activities in several different content courses each term. To accomplish this the ESL teacher held a meeting before each term with the writing

instructors and attended English department meetings to provide opportunities to talk about the adjunct course and the students. She also attended different writing classes periodically and frequently saw the writing instructors informally.

School M, the only school that offered several adjunct courses each term with the same format and objectives, was the only other ESL program to report formal training for instructors before the adjunct courses began. The ESL instructors reported that they were given a deadline to contact the content professor they were assigned to work with the next term. Later, an in-service training session was scheduled for the ESL and content instructors to discuss the ground rules; talk about past successes and frustrations, and give advice. In addition, in the beginning of the program, content faculty worked with the ESL program to develop general guidelines for organizing and teaching the adjunct courses. At first, these joint meetings were held once each semester for everyone involved, but after the program was established and there were more permanent and experienced faculty, the meetings were held primarily for the benefit of new faculty.

Both the director and teachers at school M emphasized that these group meetings helped to facilitate collaboration. The director said that we tried "to get away very quickly from the notion that the English class is a support class . . . We established with [the content faculty] that this is a collaboration; it is 50/50." The majority of the collaboration took place

between the individual faculty team members, she added. They met regularly throughout the course; it was an on-going process.

Program Evaluation

Question 1-Have you developed any process to evaluate adjunct courses?

Several questions related to the process of evaluation of adjunct courses were prepared for the interviews. However, since none of the programs interviewed had completed any formal evaluations, only a general summary of comments is included here.

Of the eight schools interviewed, none had established a process for formal evaluation or collected data that could be published to support the effectiveness of the adjunct model. Director L2 who was planning a new adjunct class for fall 1995 said they wish to build evaluation into the design of this new program but had not yet made decisions on how to accomplish this. None had conducted formal evaluations to assess either student or instructor attitudes about adjunct courses.

Even though there were no formal evaluations of the adjunct courses at these schools, all regularly did some kind of informal evaluation of their classes. Each reported administering the end-of-term or semester course evaluation forms used at their institution. All of these evaluations were written; however, one teacher at school R used an oral evaluation process called small group instruction diagnosis (SGID). A person other than the course instructor held small group discussions with the students

in the class to ascertain what they liked and did not like about the class and what they would like to see changed. These students reported in general that they believed the class was helpful to them. The instructor of the vocational adjunct courses at school R used a written process of SGID where the students wrote the evaluations in Spanish and had the results translated.

Several schools also reported adding questions to standard course evaluations to try and determine what aspects of the course were most and least useful to students in order to restructure the courses. Teacher H said their course received good course evaluations. This teacher also relied on her own impressions of student progress: "By the time the students finish, I have seen so much progress . . . and they feel more confident about entering a real class and being able to do it."

No school had done any formal follow-up study of students' academic progress after leaving the adjunct class. However, several of the directors or teachers said they informally tried to follow the students in their academic work after they completed the course. One teacher at a small school reported that he frequently saw former ESL students around campus and inquired how they were doing in classes. Another small school said they sent forms to all professors of ESL students their first semester out of ESL to track their progress. At this same school, ESL students took a 1 hour writing tutorial with ESL instructors their first semester out of ESL to get help with writing assignments in their academic classes. Both these efforts helped the ESL program track their former

students. The one ESL director that conducts adjunct courses for a graduate program explained that she informally contacts the administrator of that graduate program to inquire about the grades of adjunct students after their first semester as full-time students. None of the other schools reported any efforts to follow the progress of ESL students when they left the ESL program.

Question 5 - Do you believe grading standards for the ESL students were the same as for the other students in the content class?

Little information was obtained about grading standards applied to ESL students in content courses. Two individuals expressed concerns or interest in the issues, none had concrete information to share, and this was the last question in a long interview.

One director said standards of grading was an issue they had not explored. She did not know if their students got rated lower because of their English skills. Another director said they had concerns about grading standards; in one content class the grading was more subjectively based than in the second. This director said their content professors tried to differentiate between content and language errors on essay exams. This was repeated by one other adjunct teacher. Several agreed that grading standards were a sensitive issue and one that was difficult to evaluate.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

Content-based instruction (CBI) in all forms is widely used in ESL programs in higher education. The adjunct model of CBI, which links ESL classes to academic content courses, is regarded as an effective way to provide a transition between ESL and academic classes. Considering the growing numbers of limited English proficiency students entering colleges and universities for degree and vocational programs, the adjunct model provides an innovative means for ESL programs to serve these students.

This comparative study investigated how adjunct model courses were planned, administered, and taught in eight colleges and universities in Oregon. Telephone surveys were used to locate all the ESL programs that had adjunct courses. In-depth taped interviews with ESL program directors and ESL adjunct teachers investigated selected issues related to adjunct courses. This chapter (a) provides a summary of results presented in Chapter IV, (b) discusses salient points of the data obtained from the interviews, (c) presents conclusions based on the results, (d) considers limitations and values of this study, (e) provides implications for ESL, and (f) makes recommendations for further research.

Seven research questions were selected to explore in the interviews and were used to formulate specific interview questions. The seven research questions are repeated below:

1. What was the rationale for including adjunct courses in the ESL curriculum?
2. How were administrative decisions concerning adjunct courses handled?
3. How were ESL adjunct class syllabi planned and teaching materials developed?
4. How were content courses selected and recruited?
5. What criteria were used to place ESL students in adjunct courses?
6. How was cooperation between ESL and content instructors facilitated?
7. How were adjunct courses evaluated?

General Observations and Conclusions

Phone Survey

The phone survey found that content-based instruction was widely used in ESL programs at institutions of higher education in Oregon. Of the 31 schools in Oregon that had ESL programs at the time of these interviews, 21 (68 percent) incorporated some form of content-based instruction in their curriculum. Thematic classes were used most widely and sheltered classes the least. Adjunct model courses were found at eight

schools, including one community college, two state universities, and five private schools.

Although the adjunct model was not the most widely used form of CBI in Oregon colleges and universities, this study showed adjunct courses had been added to ESL curriculums over the last five years in these eight schools. If the phone survey was any indication, there was considerable interest in the adjunct model in programs that prepare students for college and university degrees.

Adjunct Model at Community Colleges

Only one community college in Oregon used the adjunct model when these interviews were conducted. School R had two courses, one in an academic program and one in a vocational job-training program. Gee (1992), who taught at a community college in California with an adjunct course, writes that content-based instruction was ideal for community colleges. Shore (1993) also reports finding successful use of adjunct courses in academic programs at community colleges in New Jersey.

The only instance of using an adjunct course in a vocational program encountered in this study was with the auto mechanics program at community college R. Wong (1992) reports that City College at San Francisco teaches vocational English as a second language (VESL) bridge classes that are occupation-specific courses. They were started because many students that met entry requirements for vocational courses were unable to succeed in the classes. No details are provided about the

structure of the bridge classes. In addition, Henze and Katz (1997) encourage ESL professionals to think about how content-based ESL instruction could be integrated with workplace literacy programs.

The continuing increase in immigrants and refugees to the United States and the increasing numbers of these adults that need job training suggest that content-based second language instruction and vocational education could be a logical and productive partnership. Collaborative efforts could offer the potential to expand ESL instruction at community colleges. In Oregon, this partnership has not been widely explored. Teacher R2 was enthusiastic about the successful adjunct courses with the automotive program that had been initiated by that vocational department. She reported that the ESL program was developing plans to work with the health services management department.

Part of the grant teacher R2 obtained to develop the automotive adjunct course was targeted for ESL instructors to go into various businesses with health service workers to observe the skills and language needed to perform jobs. At the time the interview with teacher R1 was conducted, there were plans to develop a bilingual (English and Spanish) medical terminology class for both Spanish and English speakers, and later to develop other linked courses.

Adaptability of Adjunct Model

One observation about the adjunct model of second language instruction that has come from this study is its adaptability. Adjunct

courses have been most frequently used in higher education academic programs as illustrated by the community college and the private and state colleges and universities in this study, but Wegrzeka-Kowalewski (1997) reports on a successful adaptation of this model in Thomas Jefferson High School in Los Angeles. School R and City College at San Francisco represent an application of the model for vocational education programs.

In addition, adjunct courses have been adapted for students of different language proficiency levels. Although adjunct courses are traditionally used for more advanced students, school M reported how a sheltered-adjunct variation can allow intermediate level students access to content classes. School U also adapted the model by linking a content courses to four ESL courses to provide more language support for their students.

Shore (1993) also stresses the adaptability of the adjunct model of CBI and encourages other programs to use the model to "bridge the gap between ESL and the academic mainstream" (p. 33). She discovered both traditional adjunct courses and several adaptations of the model in her 1993 study of New Jersey schools. She reports that Union County College uses a sheltered-adjunct model. In addition, Caldwell College, which has many sheltered CBI courses in its program, has created a supplemental instruction program with features like the adjunct model; Shore calls this a tutorial-adjunct model. For two sheltered classes each semester, tutors are hired to attend the content classes and work with the students up to three hours a week. Tutors assist the students with study skills, learning

strategies, note-taking, and exam preparation skills, as well as content learning (Shore, 1993).

Satisfaction with the Adjunct Model

Satisfaction with the adjunct model by the schools in this study was high. All programs that had adjunct courses at the time of the interviews reported the intention to continue them. Teachers and directors both agreed that adjunct courses did help prepare students to enter academic classes; teacher R2 was enthusiastic about the value of the model for vocational programs. The problems and dissatisfactions encountered with the adjunct model were administrative and not pedagogical. School O had previously discontinued use the adjunct course after several semesters because of the increased costs, low enrollments, and limited flexibility of the ESL curriculum, but teacher O said "I think everybody here agrees that [the adjunct course] is a good idea, and I am really committed to the idea of it."

School Y was the other school in this study that had experienced administrative problems; they reported low enrollments in the elective adjunct course and difficulty working within the university structure. Since the ESL program was housed in a separate institute with a separate registration process and fee structure, the ESL students had to enroll for the ESL component through the ESL program and the content course through the university registration. Moreover, the students had to have a 500 TOEFL score to qualify for the content course and pay extra tuition. This

situation discouraged students from electing the adjunct course and kept enrollments in the course too low to justify continuing it indefinitely.

Since these interviews, the ESL program at school Y has dropped the adjunct course from their curriculum; however, because they believed that adjunct courses do better prepare students to enter university courses, they designed a new course that continued many of the desired features of the adjunct course without the administrative difficulties. Dowling and Larson (1996) report that this new course, "Guided Observation," was adapted from a model used at the University of Arizona.

The ESL program at school Y still wanted students to experience first-hand observation of a university course but avoid the necessity of double registration and extra tuition. Therefore, in the "Guided Observation" course the ESL students, with guidance from the ESL instructor, select a lecture course in the university of interest to them, locate the professor, and obtain written permission to observe the class during the term. It is not an audit, so the student do not need to pay extra tuition. The students attend and observe the class daily and take lecture notes that are collected in the ESL class; since the students do not take exams or hand in homework assignments in the content courses, there is no increased workload for the content course instructor.

The syllabus for "Guided Observation" includes an orientation to the university, including application, registration, and availability of student services, as well as study skills that are typically part of adjunct courses, such as note-taking, test-taking, time management, and

communication skills. Other topics in the course include the culture of the American university classroom and issues of academic adjustment for international undergraduate and graduate students. Dowling and Larson (1996) report that since the ESL students are observing a number of different courses at the university, they bring in a broader range of content class experiences to contribute to discussions of classroom behavior, lecture listening, test-taking.

This course exposes ESL students to the American university classroom environment and gives them first-hand experience of attending a university course. It focuses on many of the same study skills included in adjunct courses and includes additional topics rarely covered because of the focus on content learning. What is different from the adjunct model is that the students do not experience the “real” responsibilities of a college or university level class. On the other hand, this alternative course could allow students with lower English proficiency to participate. Dowling and Larson (1996) report that this course meets the needs of the ESL students at school Y and administratively is more satisfactory for their program.

Reward for ESL Teachers

ESL instructors reported that a reward for teaching adjunct courses was being able to continue to learn in different disciplines. In spite of the challenges of teaching these courses, attending the content courses was stimulating, and learning new information was seen as a personal benefit. Teacher M2 reported that she could not imagine just teaching pure

language skills courses now. The adjunct courses were a main attraction of her job, and they allowed her to continue to grow.

My experiences concur with this observation. In the past year and a half, I have taught adjunct courses with western culture and geology classes. Both courses required considerable time and effort to develop teaching materials, but attending the content classes and experiencing the satisfaction of learning was a form of compensation that made the experience personally rewarding.

Research Questions

Question 1 - What was the rationale for including adjunct courses in the ESL curriculum?

At all schools interviewed, the teachers and directors reported believing that adjunct courses provided an effective way to prepare their students to enter degree classes in colleges and universities. Many used the term “bridge course” and envisioned this class as a bridge between the sheltered ESL classroom and other courses offered at the institution. Also, although other ESL classes include language and study skills designed to prepare students for academic courses, the adjunct class is uniquely structured to provide the most realistic context for students to practice the academic skills needed for college and university classes. In this study, adjunct courses were also reported to provide a means to respond to the concerns of non-ESL faculty about poor performance of ESL students in

academic courses, increase motivation of advanced ESL students, improve the visibility and image of the ESL program on campus, and offer content instruction to students with a lower level of English proficiency.

Shore (1993) conducted telephone interviews with two community colleges and one four-year public college in New Jersey that had adjunct courses. The rationale reported for adjunct courses by these New Jersey schools was similar to what was reported in Oregon in this study: to motivate students by allowing them to begin college-level courses while still in the ESL program, to develop the self-confidence of ESL students, to gain credibility for the ESL program on campus, and to prepare students for success in college classes.

Motivation of advanced ESL students was another rationale reported in this study. Director U explained that their top level students were anxious to leave ESL and move into academic courses even though the ESL faculty did not judge them ready. Including a credit-bearing course with graduation credit in their advanced level helped motivate their students.

Question 2 - How were administrative decisions concerning adjunct courses handled?

The professional literature has frequently identified administrative concerns as key points in implementing the adjunct model. Brinton, Snow, and Wesche (1989) writes that solid administrative support is essential to starting adjunct model courses; "as with all educational

programs, success depends in large part on a committed, knowledgeable teaching staff and on the sustained support, both financial and philosophical, of the central administration" (p. 71). Spanos (1989) includes administrative support as one of five most important factors needed for content-based instruction to function effectively.

Brinton (1992) offers advice on several administrative concerns from her experiences at a summer ESL adjunct program at UCLA and encourages others to publish their administrative experiences. Although, the adjunct model may present administrative challenges, Brinton (1992) says the results are worth the effort. She concludes that:

Even in the administratively difficult arena of CBI, the ends do justify the means. Satisfied students and teachers and documented program success are the ultimate administrator's reward, and it is my belief that an effectively administered content-based program, by virtue of the meaningful language exposure and practice which it provides, produces these desired end results. (p. 154)

Although the eight schools interviewed in this study were very different, all reported administrations and faculty that were supportive of the adjunct course concept. The administrative barriers identified in this study stemmed mainly from financial concerns and problems created because of the institutional structure.

In this study, the process of starting adjunct courses was reported to be easier and less formal in the private schools than in the larger institutions. It is not surprising that innovation would be simpler on a small campus with fewer bureaucratic channels. The largest number of administrative concerns or problems were reported by state institutions (O

and Y); in contrast, school R (a state-funded community college) reported exceptional support for adjunct courses and attributed this to their administration and the curricular revisions underway that promoted team-teaching and innovative programs. In the initial phone survey, several ESL directors at schools without adjunct courses expressed personal interest in the model but indicated that their program or school was not at that time open to change in this direction.

School Y was not the only report of problems with recruitment and registration for adjunct courses. Because of similar problems at UCLA, Brinton (1992) recommends to other administrators that special procedures to deal with admissions, enrollment, and scheduling of adjunct courses may be needed. Shore (1993) reports that Saint Peter's college experienced difficulty getting students registered for paired courses and, for this reason, moved to the sheltered model of CBI courses.

Another adjunct course failure at Jersey City State is attributed to last-minute planning and inadequate attention to student recruitment, according to Shore (1993). In contrast, Shore credits the successful use of adjunct courses at Passaic County Community College to their efforts to advertise and "sell" the classes to the ESL students. Shore (1993) emphasizes that to be successful, adjunct programs require careful planning and evaluation of students' needs. Brinton (1992) agrees "that recruitment efforts need to be backed up by well-planned and professional program packaging . . . [so] that students understand [the program's] purpose and intent"(p. 153). After the first year, the UCLA summer

program created a promotional video using program participants to market the program to other potential students.

School O reported funding the adjunct course was a major barrier which contributed to discontinuing the course; this was also a difficult issue at other schools. Shore (1993) reports that Essex County Community College used grant money to develop two adjunct courses in physics for international pre-engineering students. An inability to recruit sufficient students with required math prerequisites and the resulting low enrollments led to the administrative decision to discontinue the courses after the grant money was gone even though the teachers and students were very satisfied with the courses and judged them very beneficial.

Concern about funding for adjunct courses arises if ESL teachers are compensated with released time for attending the content course and for materials development. Regular attendance at the content course typically doubles class contact hours for the ESL instructor. Since all teaching materials in the ESL class must be tailor-made from the lectures, readings, exercises, and assignments of the content course, the ESL teacher has to know what is happening in the content course and must spend a great deal of time developing teaching materials. All directors and teachers in this study agreed that the ESL instructor needed to keep informed of what was going on in the content classes and that teaching these classes was more time consuming, at least the first time through. Whether or not they were compensated, many teachers in this study reported attending the content

class regularly or as much as possible because they thought it was essential for a successful ESL class.

Therefore, if the ESL instructor is fully compensated for attending the content class, this makes the adjunct course more costly for the ESL program. If no compensation is offered for teaching adjunct courses, teacher burn-out and frustration can be the result. The eight Oregon schools included in this study reported a range of compensation policies: (a) full compensation (in released time) for attending content classes each term, (b) partial compensation each term (one or two hours released time for a three hour content course), (c) full compensation for one term only (the first term the course is taught or the term before but not thereafter), and (d) no additional compensation.

Brinton (1992), administrator of the UCLA Advanced English Program, a summer session of adjunct courses for international students, obtained 150% summer pay for the ESL instructors based on the unique nature of teaching an adjunct class. Their rationale was that the ESL teachers “were working from a reactive curriculum in which they had to respond on a day-to-day basis to what was being presented in the content course [and they] would be developing most of their own teaching materials” (p. 150).

Question 3 - How were ESL adjunct class syllabi planned and teaching materials developed?

Establishing course objectives is an important step in implementing the adjunct model. According to Brinton, Snow, and Wesche (1989), one

defining characteristic of the adjunct model of CBI is that content and language instruction are highly integrated; in addition, adjunct courses typically are used to prepare students for success in college and university courses. For these reasons, it was expected that the ESL programs in this study would report multiple course objectives for their adjunct courses; this expectation was confirmed.

A variety of objectives were reported for adjunct courses. However, the primary objectives reported by nearly every ESL program interviewed were to effectively prepare ESL students for college and university classes by developing needed academic English skills, study skills, and learning strategies, as well as building knowledge of the American college and university classroom environment. Helping students successfully pass content courses was also mentioned but was not the primary objective. In contrast, this objective was more central at school M with one-year exchange students who needed to pass content courses for their home university and who were not planning to complete a degree in the United States. The adjunct courses at school R linked to vocational automotive courses also were primarily aimed to help the non-native speakers succeed in the vocational classes.

As adjunct courses have multiple objectives, a challenge for ESL instructors is to integrate these objectives and balance the teaching of language and content. Some teachers expressed concern about how to give focus to language learning when the students' main concern was content

learning and passing the content courses. Brinton, Snow, and Wesche (1989) also considered this issue:

There is the danger in designing an adjunct language class that students may come to view the language class as a tutorial for the content class. How can the language instructor counteract this perception and reinforce the need for specific language instruction? (p. 68)

Guyer and Peterson (1988) also address this dilemma in their adjunct course linked to a geography class; they point out that the ESL students "may be much more interested in using the ESL study skills hour to review geography content than to engage in skill-building activities which do not seem to offer an immediate reward" (p. 97).

It is interesting that the teachers in this study who were the least concerned with this issue were the ones who had taught adjunct model courses for the longest periods of time. Teacher Y explained that the basic objectives for the ESL adjunct class had stayed the same, but over time the focus of the class gradually shifted from integrating content into language learning and study skills lessons to integrating language and study skills into content learning. Director Y 2 added that if properly selected and planned, activities that cover content material also practice language skills, and vice versa. Teacher M emphasized that the language learning is an outgrowth of working with the content.

After teaching an adjunct course for several semesters, my own experience parallels that of teacher Y. The first semester, my main focus was planning lessons that covered the study skills and language skills objectives using the materials from the content course. Over time, I have also experienced this shift of focus; now I first select the readings,

vocabulary, assignments, and content concepts that the students most need help with and then plan how to address them in the classroom to include a variety of different language skills and to integrate study skill and learning strategy objectives. Adjunct courses seldom cover all the planned objectives. As director Y2 said, what you do in class is driven by the students and their needs, and this will vary with the particular course.

Another teaching issue is how to structure the adjunct course to best prepare ESL students for future college and university courses. Throughout the adjunct class, the ESL instructor provides language support for the students, but the goal is for the adjunct course to be a transition experience and prepare the students to function independently in future academic courses. Guyer and Peterson (1988) created a framework for planning an adjunct course syllabus that achieves this goal.

In the Macalester bridge course, the ESL class was divided into thirds. The first third of the class focused on giving ESL students a great deal of support for content learning. Students were given study guides and questions for readings as well as lecture outlines and transcripts to help them adjust to the fast pace of the geography course. During the second third of the course, students were given progressively more and more independence to create similar study aids on their own. Finally, as the semester progressed, additional exercises related to geography, such as (a) library research with oral reports, (b) group discussions, (c) peer editing of paper drafts, and (d) practice with analysis, synthesis, and evaluation of content were incorporated to encourage students to develop more sophisticated academic skills (Guyer & Peterson, 1988).

This plan addressed the student's immediate concerns with the content learning at the beginning of the term by providing them a full range of support activities that not only helped them with the geography class but also modeled good learning strategies. Later, the independent practice of these learning strategies was intended to develop study skills they could transfer to future classes. The third portion of the course exposed the students to additional learning strategies and greater independence in academic skills needed for college-level work. This approach to balancing content, language and study skills would be applicable to any content class and provides a useful framework for ESL adjunct courses (Guyer & Peterson, 1988).

Question 4 - How were content courses selected and recruited?

The eight schools interviewed in this study showed many differences in how they developed and administered adjunct courses; however, they reported very similar criteria as important for course selection. Even the programs that had content courses selected for them by other departments, reported the same criteria. Although a number of different criteria were mentioned, the most frequent were: (a) a well-rounded introductory-level course that included diverse learning activities and used a well-organized textbook, (b) a content course professor who was interested and cooperative, and (c) a course that offered graduation credit. Content courses from a variety of different disciplines had been used for the adjunct model at the schools in this study.

Many directors and teachers reported seeking advice on content course selection from more experienced ESL colleagues and professional literature. Some programs also reported learning from past mistakes with certain courses. Advice offered on this issue included: (a) building relationships with other academic departments; (b) surveying faculty on what problems they had had with international students; (c) consulting colleagues on campus for course suggestions; (d) observing content classes for variety in teaching styles; (e) evaluating textbooks carefully; (f) inquiring about the types of testing, assignments, and course requirements; and (f) getting to know professors before starting the course.

Selection of the right course and the right professor were given equal importance by most teachers and directors, and most schools considered both factors in making the decision. Even at school M, where selection of the professor was not possible, the importance of the right content course professor was repeatedly mentioned because it affected the adjunct course and the relationship between the two instructors.

It is interesting that more ESL programs have not developed adjunct courses with freshman writing classes. Writing is one language skill that needs continued practice by international students after leaving ESL, and the required writing courses can be challenging for these students. School U did require a one hour tutorial for all ESL students the first semester after they left the ESL program; they met weekly in conferences with ESL instructors to work on writing assignments in their courses. Only one school reported developing an adjunct course with freshman composition.

School T offered an adjunct course linked to all required writing courses. The course primarily used individual conferences to provide support on writing assignments to the international students who may register in any section of the writing course each term. These elective courses were popular with the international students that had finished the ESL program. The director of the ESL program at school T also held a faculty position in the English department which facilitated this arrangement. This adaptation of the adjunct course could be useful at other schools.

Question 5 - What criteria were used to place ESL students in adjunct courses?

The schools interviewed in this study had different policies for student placement in adjunct courses. At several institutions the adjunct course was a requirement for all ESL students who qualified by satisfactorily passing courses at previous levels. Other institutions used the adjunct course as an elective course in the upper levels of the ESL program or for students after they finished required ESL courses. The schools did not report that a particular TOEFL score or other requirements were needed to take adjunct courses; however, the classes were only for the advanced ESL students, except at school M.

It is typical in college and university ESL programs where adjunct courses are viewed as a bridge between ESL and academic courses in other departments, that the adjunct courses are part of the upper level of the ESL

curriculum. Therefore, an adjunct course would be one of the last ESL courses taken for the transition into a degree program. Even though most programs select introductory level content courses for the adjunct model, lower level ESL students would not have the level of English proficiency needed to be successful in content courses with native English-speakers. Brinton (1992) writes that “adjunct programs require a high level of student proficiency” (p. 153), and the typical application of the adjunct model reflects this viewpoint.

The usual strategy has been to use thematic and sheltered CBI for ESL students with lower English proficiency. However, it should be noted that two schools in this study had successfully adapted the adjunct model for LEP students. At School M this was accomplished by linking sheltered content courses to ESL classes and promoting close collaboration between the content and ESL faculty. School M had recently incorporated some traditional adjunct courses to challenge the more advanced students in their final term.

A different successful adaptation at school U, linked one content course to four ESL courses. Students attended the content course with native English-speaking students and simultaneously took four ESL classes in vocabulary/reading, listening and note-taking, writing, and speaking. This structure provided significantly more support for these students with TOEFL scores around 450.

Question 6 - How was cooperation between ESL and content instructors facilitated?

The relationship between ESL and content teachers is another issue frequently addressed in the professional literature. Gee (1992) provides practical details about the process she used to establish the relationship between herself and the content instructor in a "paired" class at Glendale Community College. She emphasizes that one of the most important factors for success in an adjunct course is that the ESL and content instructors develop a good working relationship. Teemant, Bernhardt, and Rodríguez-Muñoz (1997) provide suggestions for building collaboration with content teachers in public schools; they offer ten points that content teachers need to know about ESL students and suggest strategies to help ESL teachers establish collaborative relationships.

The relationship between ESL and content instructors was reported as important by all interviewed in this study. Most reported using informal means to establish and sustain these connections. Because these relationships were perceived as so important to the success of adjunct courses, the interest and cooperativeness of the content professor was reported to be a major factor in the selection of content courses.

Building truly collaborative relationships is more difficult in typical adjunct courses where the content course is composed of primarily non-ESL students. The content instructor teaches the content class; the ESL instructor teaches the linked ESL class. There is little opportunity to discuss how to teach content or to move content activities into the ESL

course because student members are not the same. Several ESL teachers interviewed did report that the content instructor occasionally visited the ESL class to help review content material.

School M was unique because its use of sheltered content courses made collaboration possible, and the ESL program director actively promoted collaboration. The teachers said, however, that the amount of collaboration depended on the particular instructors and typically developed only after several years of working together. The ESL teachers interviewed related both good and not so good working relationships with content professors, but were especially enthusiastic about the effectiveness of the teaching and learning experience when the collaboration worked well.

Is the name "adjunct course" the best label to apply to these classes? The term is not understood by most people, and it is not descriptive. The adjective meaning of the word "adjunct" (to join or associate in a subordinate relationship; not having full status) could convey a lower status image to these courses and may discourage the formation of equal status relationships between instructors. Director Y reported a discussion with a sociology professor at school Y who recommended they abandon the use the term "adjunct course" for this reason. Only the terms adjunct course or adjunct model have been used in this study for consistency, but a number of other labels are used for these classes including: paired course, bridge course, applied English course, content area bridge course, mainstream studies, and support class. Bridge class or bridge program are

widely used terms. ESL programs should give consideration to the name chosen as it may have an impact on the ability to foster collaboration.

Question 7 - How were adjunct courses evaluated?

None of the eight schools in this study had collected data to evaluate the effectiveness of adjunct courses. However, all acknowledged the importance of and need for evaluation of the adjunct model of CBI, and all the programs interviewed did administer course evaluations and used the information to revise and update the adjunct courses.

Few studies evaluating the effectiveness of the adjunct model of CBI can be found in the professional literature. Brinton, Snow, and Wesche (1989) report that little effort has been devoted to evaluating CBI in ESL programs in comparison with the great deal of work on designing and implementing these instructional programs. Crandall (1992), writing about all levels and forms of CBI, adds that there is a:

need for careful research to evaluate the effectiveness of integrated instruction, specifying optimal conditions for various programmatic effects, including the timing of integrated instruction, the relative effectiveness of different program models, and the use of various instructional strategies, texts adapted and authentic, and assessment measures. (p. 119)

Measuring student achievement in adjunct courses is not a clear or simple process. Brinton, Snow, and Wesche (1989) emphasize that content-based instruction presents some problems in determining what to evaluate. Content-based instruction by design integrates language and content teaching, and if one wishes to measure content learning, language factors are involved and must be taken into account. Likewise, measuring

language achievement in an adjunct course entails consideration of content. These authors advise instructors "to be continually aware of the interface between language and content in evaluation . . ." (p. 183).

Thus, determining whether adjunct classes achieve their objectives and are effective can be problematic and complicated. There are a number of different aspects of adjunct courses that could be measured and no one agrees what is sufficient to adequately assess the effectiveness of the adjunct model. One possible assessment would be to measure content learning based on grades in the content course; another possibility would be to measure improvement in English proficiency skills. Yet another avenue to pursue would be to evaluate the use of learning strategies or the application of study skills by the students in the content class. The objectives of integrated CBI instruction are diverse and interrelated, and all the factors above are needed by students to be successful in academic classes. In addition to student achievement, Brinton, Snow, and Wesche (1989) suggest other factors to assess: attitudes of students toward adjunct courses, performance of adjunct teachers, organization and coordination of administration and instruction, curriculum and teaching materials, and cost effectiveness.

The most frequently mentioned rationale for adjunct courses by ESL programs in higher education is to more effectively prepare ESL students to enter college and university classes. If this premise is correct, then ESL students who take adjunct courses should make a smoother transition and perform more effectively in academic courses than ESL students who have not taken these courses. Thus, another avenue for evaluation would be to follow and compare the academic progress of international students who

have and have not taken an adjunct course for several terms or semesters after they leave ESL. This would probably necessitate a large ESL program and one with elective adjunct courses so a control group is available.

As reported in Chapter 2, the UCLA summer program did administer self-assessment instruments, and the students reported improvements in writing, listening, speaking, and in various academic tasks. A pre- and post-composition test confirmed gains in writing skills, according to Brinton (1992). Shore (1993) reports that Passaic County Community College compared the percentage of students passing in three content courses with linked ESL classes over a three-year period of time. In a computer science class 78.8 percent of the students not taking the linked ESL course passed (these values were for all students in the course, not just international students), whereas 92.7 percent of the students taking the linked ESL course passed. In a business course, the comparison of students passing was 60.6 percent (non-linked) and 77.1 percent (linked); in a sociology course, 74.6 percent (non-linked) and 77.9 percent (linked) passed. Thus, the international students in these courses had higher passing percentages than the other students in the class. In addition, questionnaires reported student satisfaction with the adjunct courses. Similar data collected at Rowan State College also showed that the students in linked content classes had higher passing percentages (Shore, 1993). These last studies suggest an additional simple technique to demonstrate effectiveness of adjunct courses.

Limitations

This project was a comparative study of the use of the adjunct model by ESL programs in colleges and universities in Oregon that collected information through personal interviews. The use of personal interviews to collect data creates inherent limitations that must be considered when analyzing the research results. The following identifies and explains a number of the limitations specific to this study:

Sample Size

In Oregon institutions of higher education, only eight schools were found that had adjunct programs. This is a very small sample from which to collect information and draw conclusions. Since this was a complete sample of schools with adjunct courses in this state, it is possible to say the information obtained is representative of the use of the adjunct model in the state of Oregon in 1995 when these interviews were conducted. It is not, however, possible to conclude that the information obtained is representative of the use of the adjunct model of CBI in second language instruction elsewhere in the United States or in the rest of the world.

Also, only institutions of higher education in Oregon were included in this study. There was no attempt to discover if the adjunct model of CBI was used in any other educational settings.

Subjects

The subjects interviewed were the ESL program directors and ESL teachers of adjunct courses that were available and willing to participate in the interviews. It was not possible to interview everyone involved with adjunct courses at every school. In some cases the program director also served as the adjunct course instructor and was able to present both perspectives. In another case, the ESL teacher had planned and developed the adjunct course, and the director was not interviewed. In some instances, scheduling incompatibilities prevented conducting interviews with adjunct teachers that ideally should have been included. By not interviewing everyone connected to the adjunct courses at the eight schools, it is possible that vital information was missed and different viewpoints were omitted that could have changed the results and conclusions.

This project planned to interview program directors and ESL adjunct teachers. One group omitted from this study was the content course instructors. These individuals would have contributed a different point of view that would have provided a more complete picture of the teaching of adjunct courses in these Oregon schools.

Qualitative Nature of Interviews

By design, interviews generate qualitative data. The completeness, accuracy, and quality of the information obtained was dependent on the willingness and ability of the directors and teachers involved to share

information about their adjunct courses. It is possible that the results were limited because individuals interviewed omitted certain information intentionally or unintentionally.

Personal Bias

Personal bias towards content-based instruction or the adjunct model would affect both questions and answers in these interviews. The bias of the interviewer could have affected how the interview was conducted and how the questions were asked. Also, since it was not possible to include all information obtained in the interviews into the results chapter, it was necessary to summarize and select salient points for inclusion. Interviewer bias would affect this selection, interpretation, and summarization process. The answers of the persons interviewed may also have been affected by their personal biases toward content-based instruction and the adjunct model.

Interview Questions

An additional limitation of this project was the lack of a pilot study to test and revise the interview questions. The interview questions were too many for a one to one and one-half hour interview and some of the questions proved redundant. If the questions had been rewritten, the remaining interviews may have been more uniform. The interviews presented the questions in the same order, but the wording was sometimes

slightly different. This could have influenced the nature of the replies obtained.

It was not possible to include questions in the interviews on all possible aspects of adjunct courses. It was necessary to limit questions to cover targeted issues, and, therefore, the results cannot be seen as providing information on all aspects of adjunct courses.

Interviewer Inexperience

Another limitation of this study was related to the inexperience of the interviewer. This was a first experience conducting in-depth interviews, and inexperience led to differences in the interview format that could have influenced the listener's perceptions of what information was requested and the nature of the replies received. After listening to the interview tapes, it became clear that sometimes the interviews lapsed into conversations with the interviewer injecting too many comments. Occasionally the tapes revealed that more information would have been desirable on certain issues; a more experienced interviewer may have elicited more complete data.

The Value of This Study

There is a large body of professional literature available in the field of content based instruction although less exists on the adjunct model than

on other forms. This study contributes to the field of content-based second language instruction in the following ways:

First Comparative Study of Adjunct Model in Oregon

This was the first comparative study of the use of the adjunct model of CBI in Oregon. Literature searches uncovered no similar comparative studies on the adjunct model; however, an unpublished masters thesis that studied the adjunct model in selected schools in New Jersey (Shore, 1993) was discovered during the course of these interviews. Much of the professional literature on the adjunct model is theoretical or provides descriptions of individual courses or programs; comparative studies were not found.

Contributes Practical Knowledge of the Adjunct Model

This study contributes practical knowledge of how adjunct courses are planned, administered, and taught in institutions of higher education. Information of this type is limited in professional CBI literature. Several books and manuals are available for those interested in content-based instruction at the K-12 level (Crandall, 1987; Zimmerman, 1989; Kidd & Marquardson, 1993; Chamot & O'Malley, 1994; Kidd & Marquardson, 1994), but less has been published that applies to higher education (Brinton, Snow, & Wesche, 1989; Adamson, 1993; Snow & Brinton, 1997).

Resource for New Programs

This information can assist other ESL programs that want to use and adapt the adjunct model in their second language instruction. The use of content-based instruction in higher education ESL programs is steadily growing, and the adjunct model is becoming more widely used. A number of program directors contacted in the phone survey expressed interest in the adjunct model for their programs, and a presentation at TESOL 97 (Percival, 1997) in Orlando suggested that people were eager for practical details of implementation. The most effective means of learning about implementation of the adjunct model (or any other) is to consult with others that have been through the same process. A comparative study can be a useful resource for those seeking this information.

Implications for ESL

Content-based instruction is an approach to second language teaching that is here to stay, and interest in the adjunct model by ESL programs in higher education continues to increase. However, CBI should be viewed as still in an innovative stage where many ESL programs are experimenting with different models of CBI to find what is suitable for specific programs and groups of students. Management of innovative programs and developing program consistency are important for successful CBI implementation.

The results of this study offer several implications for ESL programs seeking ways to create smoother transitions for their students to academic

courses and for building bridges between ESL and other departments on college or university campuses. It should be noted that the professional literature emphasizes the benefits of adjunct model courses, and the programs in this study reported many of these same benefits. However, it is important to recognize there are also difficulties many programs have encountered with the adjunct model of CBI. If these potential difficulties are recognized at the onset, they can be factored into the planning and implementation of adjunct courses. The following reports on benefits and difficulties encountered by the ESL programs in this study.

First, the results of this study illustrate the flexibility and adaptability of the adjunct model. Not only can the model be used in its classic form linking one ESL support course to an introductory level content course to help ESL students make the transition to academic degree programs, a number of other successful adaptations were found in Oregon schools. This study found two different modifications to accommodate students of lower levels of English proficiency, one for graduate students, and another for students in a vocational job-training program. Shore (1993) reported on a tutorial-adjunct adaptation. ESL programs should continue to be creative in designing and adapting the adjunct model to meet the unique needs of their students and programs.

Community colleges are encouraged to consider the possibility of developing more VESL courses and linking ESL classes to various occupational training programs. Surveys of vocational departments and their students to measure the concerns and problems of non-native

speakers in vocational classes could document the need for the services of ESL professionals and help convince administrators to support these departmental linkages. With the continuing increase in non-native English speakers in the United States that require occupational training, the success of the courses developed at school R could create an avenue for community college ESL programs to expand in a new direction. In the same vein, ESL professionals should also exploit the possibility of linking with worksite literacy programs.

The results of this study suggest that administrative issues were the most problematic aspect of developing and continuing adjunct courses. ESL programs that plan to develop adjunct courses should recognize the importance of careful planning and give attention to administrative issues. Administrative concerns reported as significant for some but not all schools in this study included (a) finding financial resources to support adjunct courses, (b) developing a functional system of registration for students, (c) learning how to work within the institutional hierarchy to get approval for innovative courses, and (d) selecting content courses and professors carefully.

It is recommended that at least some compensation for the extra time spent by ESL adjunct instructors to develop adjunct courses and to attend the content classes is appropriate and needs to be awarded. Without it, attracting and keeping good adjunct instructors and preventing instructor burn-out and frustration may be difficult. Most ESL instructors

in this study reported that at least some attendance at the content class was essential to plan lessons and coordinate activities between the two courses.

Another recommendation that may be especially important in large universities is to understand the hierarchy of the institution and how to work within the system effectively for approval of innovative courses and programs. This is especially important for adjunct courses since other departments and faculty are involved in the process, which may add a new dimension for ESL programs. In addition, the registration of students in content courses can prove problematic, especially when ESL programs are housed in separate institutes with a different fee structure and registration process. These potential problems are unique to adjunct courses, and the awareness of the difficulties of others and the careful planning and consideration of these details can help to smoothly implement adjunct classes.

Another issue identified in this study was the importance of careful selection of content courses and finding an interested and cooperative professor. All directors and teachers interviewed stressed the significance of this issue and detailed the criteria they used when selecting content courses. ESL programs considering adjunct courses are encouraged to take advantage of their advice on course selection that was detailed earlier.

Since adjunct courses have multiple course objectives, teachers of these classes are continually seeking the appropriate balance between content learning, language learning, and the integration of study skills and learning strategies. Awareness of this balancing act and the continued

search for effective means to integrate these objectives is one of the biggest challenges of teaching these courses. Observing other adjunct classes and sharing ideas is a most effective way to learn and develop these skills, and adjunct teachers are encouraged to share with each other.

Another implication for ESL programs is the importance of the relationship between the ESL and content instructors to the success of adjunct courses. It is necessary to carefully establish and nurture these relationships to build cooperation that can enhance the adjunct course. True collaborative relationships are probably difficult to cultivate in typical adjunct courses that link to content courses in the academic curriculum, but efforts need to be made to establish more collaboration. Sheltered-adjunct courses, such as were found at school M, offered a format more conducive to the establishment of collaborative relationships. In this study, the development of collaboration took much time and required considerable effort on the part of both the ESL and content faculty.

A further implication of adjunct courses in higher education is that they can be seen as an opportunity to achieve better visibility for ESL programs and for others on campus to recognize the expertise of ESL teachers in educational pedagogy. Teaching adjunct courses can provide a means to establish relationships with other faculty and create opportunities for professors to discuss teaching pedagogy. Efforts to build collaboration between ESL and content faculty should be viewed as not only important for the success of adjunct courses but, also, as a means for others to recognize how expertise in language learning could serve as a resource on

pedagogy for college and university campuses. For example, experiences with CBI and the adjunct model in the LEAP program (Learning English-for-Academic Purposes) at California State University, Los Angeles, led Tricamo and Snow (1995) to produce an instructional video, Improving University Instruction for Language Minority Students: Strategies from Project LEAP.

A final implication is the curricular change being planned at two schools in this study that would begin a post-ESL semester to house adjunct courses. Students would enter this transition semester after completing the top level of ESL courses. One school aspired to obtaining non-ESL prefixes for the adjunct courses; the other program had already accomplished this for one adjunct course. This suggests another mechanism to consider for delivery of adjunct courses and an innovative adaptation for an ESL curriculum for students entering a degree program.

Suggestions for Future Research

Considering the increasing use of the adjunct model of CBI in ESL programs in higher education, more research is needed in several areas. The following are some specific suggestions for future research:

1. Future researchers who conduct comparative studies should include the viewpoint of content instructors.

2. Future research is needed to study the application of the adjunct model with other audiences, such as public schools and workplace ESL programs.
3. Several schools reported one benefit of establishing adjunct courses was to make the ESL programs more visible and respected on campus. Research is needed to measure the effect of adjunct model courses on the perception of ESL programs and to identify other measures that could increase the status of ESL programs in institutions of higher education.
4. The most important need for research on the adjunct model is in the area of evaluation. The primary rationale for adjunct courses reported in this study and in all of the professional literature is to prepare students more effectively for academic classes when they leave the ESL program, yet data to validate this hypothesis are very limited. Future research is needed in the following areas of evaluation:
 - A. To measure if adjunct courses improve student's English proficiency in reading, writing, listening, and speaking to the same degree, or more, or less than traditional skills courses.
 - B. To measure the effect of adjunct courses on ESL student confidence level and other affective factors that can influence success in academic courses.
 - C. To measure if adjunct courses affect how ESL students apply learning strategies and study skills in later academic courses.

- D. To do a longitudinal study of grade point averages of ESL students that do and do not take adjunct courses for several academic terms after leaving the ESL program.
 - E. To determine if taking adjunct courses affects the retention rate of ESL students in academic classes the first year out of ESL.
 - F. To determine if adjunct courses increase the number of ESL students moving into and finishing degree programs.
 - G. To develop valid assessment instruments to perform these evaluations.
- 5. Research projects should study the methodologies and teaching strategies used in adjunct courses using longitudinal observations and descriptions of the adjunct classroom.
 - 6. ESL adjunct instructors need better resources to help them develop content activities that integrate language skills, learning strategies, and study skills. A system is needed for adjunct instructors to disseminate and share sample teaching materials in humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences.

Summary

The taped in-depth interviews provided a wealth of data about how the adjunct model was planned, administered, and taught by eight Oregon colleges and universities. The results of the interviews showed similarities between the eight schools in rationale for adjunct courses; the most

frequently and consistently mentioned was to prepare students for effectively for non-ESL academic classes. The eight schools reported being satisfied with the pedagogy of the adjunct model, but none had collected data to investigate its effectiveness in preparing students for academic classes. Administrative difficulties related to increased financial costs, low enrollments, and registration concerns were reported and led to two schools discontinuing adjunct courses although both still reported satisfaction with its educational aspects. In this study the adjunct model was adapted by Oregon schools to meet very different needs of ESL programs and students.

Limitations presented in the chapter include small sample size, limitation on selecting subjects for interviews, the qualitative nature of interview data, bias of interviewees and interviewer, the need to limit interview questions, and interviewer inexperience. The value of the study included (a) its role as the first comparative study of the adjunct model in Oregon, (b) its contribution to practical knowledge of implementing adjunct courses in ESL programs in higher education, and (c) its potential use as a resource of information for other ESL programs wanting to use the adjunct model. Several implications were presented to help ESL programs implement adjunct courses and included suggestions to: (a) recognize the adaptability of the adjunct model for different students and programs; (b) encourage community colleges to pursue linking ESL courses to vocational programs; (c) recognize the importance of careful planning and attention to administrative issues, such as appropriate compensation for adjunct

teachers and registration of students for content courses; (d) carefully select content courses and find an interested and cooperative content instructor; (e) encourage ESL adjunct teachers to share ideas to balance the multiple objectives of adjunct courses and develop integrated activities; and (f) carefully establish and nurture the relationships between ESL and content teachers and to make efforts towards collaboration. The chapter concluded with suggestions for future research with emphasis on the need for evaluation of the effectiveness of the adjunct model.

REFERENCES

- Adamson, H. D. (1993). Academic competence: Theory and classroom practice: Preparing ESL students for content courses. New York: Longman.
- Allen, B. (1990). Content-based second language instruction: Teaching English through mathematics in grades 1-4. Unpublished manuscript. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 328 085).
- Brinton, D. M., (1992, April). What challenges do content-based program administrators face? The CATESOL Journal, 5, 149-155.
- Brinton, D. M., Snow, M. A., & Wesche, M. B. (1989). Content-based second language instruction. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Cantoni-Harvey, G. (1987). Content-area language instruction. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (Ed.). (1991). Teaching English as a second or foreign language. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Chamot, A. U. (1985). English language development through a content-based approach. Proceedings of a Conference on Issues in English Language Development for Minority Language Education (pp. 49-55). Arlington, VA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 273 150)
- Chamot, A. U., & O'Malley, J. M. (1985). A cognitive academic language learning approach: An ESL content-based curriculum. Wheaton, MD: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 338 108)
- Chamot, A. U., & O'Malley, J. M. (1987). The cognitive academic language learning approach: A bridge to the mainstream. TESOL Quarterly, 21, 227-249.
- Chamot, A. U., & O'Malley, J. M. (1994). The CALLA handbook: Implementing the cognitive academic language learning approach. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

- Clark, J. L. D. (1987). Developments in language education. Washington, DC: Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC), Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education.
- Collier, V. P. (1989). How long? A synthesis of research on academic achievement in a second language. TESOL Quarterly, 23, 509-531.
- Crandall, J. (1992). Content-centered learning in the United States. Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 13, 111-126.
- Crandall, J. (Ed.). (1987). ESL through content-area instruction: Mathematics, science, social studies. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Regents/Prentice Hall.
- Cummins, J. (1984). Bilingualism and special education: Issues in assessment and pedagogy. San Diego: College-Hill Press.
- Cummins, J. (1989). Empowering minority students. Sacramento: California Association for Bilingual Education.
- Cummins, J., & Swain, M. (1986). Bilingualism in education: Aspects of theory, research and practice. London: Longman.
- Dowling, B. T., & Larson, A. L. (1996, November). Bridge to academic success: An effective, low-cost option. Paper presented at the meeting of the Sixth International Tri-TESOL Conference, Seattle, WA.
- Duffy, C. B. (1992, March). Content-based instruction: Procedures for implementing an adjunct model course: Determining student readiness for an adjunct model course: Testing and placement. Paper presented at the meeting of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.
- Duffy, C. B. (1995, March-April). Adjunct model of CBLI: Effects on interlanguage development. Paper presented at the meeting of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Long Beach, CA.
- Enright, D. S., & McCloskey, M. (1988). Integrating English. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Gee, Young, (1992). How can ESL and content teachers work effectively together in adjunct courses? The CATESOL Journal, 5, 85-92.

- Guyer, E., & Peterson, P. W. (1988). Language and/or content? Principles and procedures for materials development in an adjunct course. In S. Benesch (Ed.), Ending remediation: Linking ESL and content in higher education (pp. 91-110). Washington, DC: TESOL.
- Henze, R., & Katz, A. (1997). The role of content-based instruction in workplace literacy. In M. A. Snow & D. M. Brinton (Eds.), The content-based classroom: Perspectives on integrating language and content (pp. 355-358). White Plains, N. Y.: Longman.
- Kelly, L. G. (1969). 25 centuries of language teaching. New York: Newbury House.
- Kessler, C. (Ed.). (1992). Cooperative language learning: A teacher's resource book. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Kidd, R., & Marquardson, B. (1993). A sourcebook for integrating ESL and content instruction using the Foresee approach. Winnipeg, Manitoba: Manitoba Education and Training.
- Kidd, T., & Marquardson, B. (1994). Secondary sourcebook for integrating ESL and content instruction using the Foresee approach. Winnipeg, Manitoba: Manitoba Education and Training.
- Krashen, S. D. (1982). Principles and practice in second language acquisition. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Krueger, M., & Ryan, F. (Eds.). (1993). Language and content: Discipline and content-based approaches to language study. Lexington, MA: Heath.
- Lewis, M., Connell, E., Harrison, M., Kling, J., Tickle, A., & Turner, J. (1995, March-April). Building a content-based program: A dynamic dialogue. Paper presented at the meeting of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Long Beach, CA.
- Mohan, B. A. (1986). Language and content. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Percival, G. S. (1997, March). The adjunct model bridges ESL and university courses. Paper presented at the meeting of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Orlando, FL.

- Prator, C. H. (1991). Cornerstones of method and names for the profession. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), Teaching English as a second or foreign language (pp. 11-22). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Robinson, P. (1991). ESP today: A practitioner's guide. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Saville-Troike, M. (1984). What really matters in second language learning for academic achievement? TESOL Quarterly, 18, 199-219.
- Shore, H. J. (1993). Content-based ESL: The use of the adjunct model. Unpublished master's thesis, Kean College of New Jersey, Union, NJ.
- Short, D. (1991). Integrating language and content instruction: Strategies and techniques. Washington, DC: National Clearing House for Bilingual Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 338 111).
- Snow, M. A. (Ed.). (n.d.). Project LEAP: Learning English-for-academic-purposes: Training manual - year one. Los Angeles, CA: California State University, Learning Resource Center.
- Snow, M. A. (Ed.). (1994). Project LEAP: Learning English-for academic - purposes: Training manual - year three. Los Angeles, CA: California State University, Learning Resource Center.
- Snow, M. A., & Brinton, D. M. (1984). Linking ESL courses with university content courses: The adjunct model. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the California Association of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, San Jose, California. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 244 515)
- Snow, M. A. & Brinton, D. M. (1988a). The adjunct model of language instruction: Integrating language and content at the university. Technical Report 8. University of California, Los Angeles: Center for Language Education and Research. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 298 764)
- Snow, M. A., & Brinton, D. M. (1988b). Content-based language instruction: Investigating the effectiveness of the adjunct model. TESOL Quarterly, 22, 553-574.

- Snow, M. A., & Brinton, D. M. (Eds.) (1997). The content-based classroom: Perspectives on integrating language and content. White Plains, N. Y.: Longman.
- Snow, M. A., & Buchanan, K. (1995, March-April). Worldnet telecast #1: Content-based language instruction in EFL settings. Telecast presented at the meeting of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Long Beach, CA.
- Snow, M. A., Met, M., & Genesee, F. (1989). A conceptual framework for the integration of language and context in second/foreign language instruction. TESOL Quarterly, 23, 201-217.
- Spanos, F. (1989). On the integration of language and content instruction. Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 10, 227-240.
- Stoller, F. (1994, October). Looking at content-based instruction from a new perspective. Paper presented at the meeting of Oregon Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Beaverton, OR.
- Swain, M. (1988). Manipulating and complementing content teaching to maximize second language learning, TESL Canada Journal, 6, 68-83.
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1981). Bilingual education in Ontario: A decade of research. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 214 363)
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1989). Canadian immersion and adult second language teaching: What's the connection? The Modern Language Journal, 73, 150-159.
- Teemant, A., Bernhardt, E., & Rodríguez-Muñoz, M. Collaborating with content-area teachers: What we need to share. In M. A. Snow & D. M. Brinton (Eds.), The content-based classroom: Perspectives on integrating language and content (pp. 311-318). White Plains, N. Y.: Longman.
- Tickle, A. L. (1992, March). Developing and teaching ESL adjunct courses. Paper presented at the 26th annual convention of TESOL, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.

- Tricamo, J. (Producer), & Snow, A. (Producer). (1995). Improving university instruction for lanugage minority students: Strategies from project LEAP [Videotape]. (Available from Ann Snow, Co-Director, Project LEAP, 5151 State University Dr., King Hall C2036, Los Angeles, CA 90032)
- Valentine, J. F., & Repath-Martos, L. M. (1992). How relevant is relevance?: An examination of student needs, interests, and motivation in the content-based university classroom. The CATESOL Journal, 5, 25-42.
- Wade, W. A. (Ed.). (1992). 1991-92 Accredited institutions of postsecondary education. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Wegrzecka-Kowalewski, E. (1997). Content-based instruction: Is it possible in high school? In M. A. Snow & D. M. Brinton (Eds.), The content-based classroom: Perspectives on integrating language and content. White Plains, N. Y.: Longman.
- Willetts, K. F. (1986). Integrating language and content instruction. Los Angeles, California: University of California, Center for Language Education and Research. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 278 262)
- Williams, A. (1995, March-April). Content-based language teaching: Making which connections? Paper presented at the meeting of Teachers of English to Speakers of other Languages, Long Beach, CA.
- Wong, K. (1992). What do VESL and content-based instruction have in common? The CATESOL Journal, 5, 97-101.
- Zimmerman, F. (1989). English for science. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.

APPENDIX A

Phone Survey: Institutions of Higher Education in the State of Oregon
Included in Survey

**Institutions of Higher Education in the State of Oregon
Included in Survey**

I. Community Colleges

Blue Mountain Community College
Central Oregon Community College
Chemeketa Community College
Clackamas Community College
Clatsop Community College
Columbia Gorge Community College
Lane Community College
Linn Benton Community College
Mount Hood Community College
Oregon Coast Community College
Portland Community College
Rogue Community College
Southwestern Oregon Community College
Tillamook Bay Community College
Treasure Valley Community College
Umpqua Community College

II. State Colleges/Universities

Eastern Oregon State College
Oregon Health Sciences University
Oregon Institute of Technology
Oregon State University
Portland State University
Southern Oregon State College
University of Oregon
Western Oregon State College

III. Private Colleges and Universities

Bassett College
Cascade College (previously Columbia Christian College)
Concordia College
Eugene Bible College
George Fox College
Lewis and Clark College
Linfield College
Marylhurst College

Mount Angel Seminary
Multnomah School of the Bible
Northwest Christian College
Oregon Graduate Institute of Science and Technology
Pacific Northwest College of Art
Pacific University
Reed College
University of Portland
Warner Pacific College
Western Baptist College
Western Conservative Baptist Seminary
Western Evangelical Seminary
Western State Chiropractic College
Willamette University (Tokyo International University of America)

APPENDIX B

CBI Phone Survey Form

CBI Phone Survey

_____ Theme-Based Model

_____ Sheltered Model

_____ Sheltered Model

_____ Other

If program not currently offering classes patterned after the adjunct/bridge model, have you ever offered these types of classes in the past?

_____ Yes _____ No

If yes:

A. When was the last time you offered this type of course?

B. During how many different semesters/quarters did you offer this type of course?

If no:

A. Has your program ever discussed offering this type of course?

_____ Yes _____ No

B. Do you have any plans or interest in developing this type of course in the foreseeable future?

_____ Yes _____ No

Interviews

Would you be willing to be interviewed about your program?

_____ Yes _____ No

If you currently offer adjunct-type courses, would it be possible for me to observe some classes?

_____ Yes _____ No

When adjunct courses taught?

Institution _____ ESL Prog.Dir. _____

CBI adjunct course contact/instructor _____

Mail Address: _____

Phone # _____ Fax # _____

E-mail Address _____

APPENDIX C

Interview Consent Form

Interview Consent Form

I, _____, agree to take part in this research project on content-based second language instruction.

I understand that the study involves being interviewed on the adjunct model classes that are offered in our ESL program.

Georgann Percival has told me that the purpose of this study is to investigate how the adjunct model of instruction is currently being used in ESL programs in post-secondary institutions in Oregon and to investigate a number of issues related to the development, teaching and administration of adjunct classes.

I understand that the information from this interview will be used as part of a comparative study of selected post-secondary institutions and will be written up in a master's thesis.

Georgann Percival has offered to answer any questions I have about the study and what I am expected to do.

I may not receive any direct benefit from taking part in this study, but the study may help to increase knowledge that could help others in the future.

Georgann has promised that all information I give will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by law, and that the names of all people in the study will be kept confidential.

I understand that this interview will be audio taped, and that the tapes will be used only by Georgann Percival for the purpose of writing her thesis.

I understand that I do not have to do this interview, and that this will not affect my relationship with Portland State University. I also understand that I can agree to stop the interview at any point or decline to answer any question.

I have read and understand the above information and agree to take part in this study.

Date: _____ Signature: _____

*If you have concerns or questions about this study, please contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Research Review Committee, Office of Research and Sponsored Projects, 105 Neuberger Hall, Portland State University, 503/725/3417.
Georgann Percival, International Programs Office, Linfield College, McMinnville, OR, 97128; 503-434-2587*

APPENDIX D

Interview Questions

Interview Questions

I. Rationale for Adjunct Course

1. For what reasons did the ESL program add an adjunct course to the curriculum?
2. How long have adjunct courses been offered?
3. How frequently are these courses offered? Each term/ semester? Other?
4. Do you intend to keep this course in the curriculum?

II. Administrative Decisions

1. When you began using the adjunct model did you find it necessary for your program to "sell" the concept to administrators at your institution? What kinds of barriers or problems did you encounter initially in instituting this type of course?
2. How many class hours per week are allotted to the ESL support class in proportion to the weekly hours in the content courses?
3. Do the ESL instructors regularly attend the content classes? If not, how do they coordinate activities between the adjunct and content classes?
4. Do you think teaching an adjunct course is more time consuming than other ESL courses?
5. Are ESL teachers compensated in time or money for their preparation of teaching materials? For attendance at the content class?
- 6 Has load credit or compensation for adjunct courses been an issue or concern at your institution?

III. Syllabus and Teaching Materials

1. Do individual ESL instructors plan syllabi, or does the ESL program try to standardize the curriculum of all adjunct courses?
2. What are the primary objectives of the adjunct course?
3. How are the objectives of adjunct courses explained to the students?
4. To what extent are specific study skills integrated into the adjunct course?
5. Is a textbook used in the adjunct course?
6. What is the primary source of teaching materials used by the ESL instructors in the adjunct classes?
7. How are class activities planned on a day-to-day basis to accomplish the course objectives? To coordinate with the content course?
8. Do what extent does the adjunct course become tutoring for the content course? Has this ever been a concern?
9. Is separate tutoring for the content course available for the ESL students? Is it required? Who does the tutoring?

IV. Selection and Recruitment of Content Course

1. What criteria does the program use when selecting a content course?
2. Are courses selected primarily for the course itself or for the instructor?
3. What specific content courses has the program used with your adjunct course?
4. Are some content courses more successful than others in this instructional model? Is it possible to identify any characteristics of a content course that lead to success or lack of success in the adjunct model?
5. Do the content classes fulfill any graduation requirement for the ESL students?
6. How many adjunct model courses are offered each term/semester by the ESL program?
7. Have you surveyed ESL students for their preference for content course?
8. How does the ESL program recruit courses and faculty to participate in adjunct model classes? Were there any special difficulties in recruiting when the program began?

V. ESL Student Placement.

1. Are adjunct courses required or optional in your ESL program?
2. Are the adjunct courses in the most advanced level of your program?
3. What criteria are used to place ESL students in these courses? Do you have a set level of English proficiency?
4. Are students allowed or encouraged to repeat an adjunct course?

VI. Cooperation between Content and ESL Faculty

1. How much consultation do you feel is necessary between content and ESL faculty? Before the course begins? During the course?
2. What procedure does your program use to facilitate cooperation and contact between content and ESL faculty?
3. Does the ESL program have a formal "training" program or is the relationship left to individual instructors to develop on their own?
4. How are content instructors oriented to the goals and objectives of an adjunct model course?

VII. Program Evaluation

1. Have you developed any process to evaluate adjunct courses?
 - A. What evaluation instruments are used?
 - B. What does the evaluation measure?
2. Have you ever attempted to measure the preferences of your ESL students for the adjunct model courses versus more traditional ESL courses?
3. Have student attitudes about adjunct courses been studied?
4. Have instructors' feelings about teaching adjunct courses been assessed?
5. Grading of ESL students
 - A. Do you believe grading standards for the ESL students were the same as for other students in the content class?
 - B. How do ESL student grades compare in the content course and the adjunct course?