

**Second Language Students in
Canadian Literacy Programs:**
current issues and concerns

Prepared by Diane Millar
for
Red River Community College

January 1997

Table of Contents

Chapter 1. Introduction

- [1.1 Terms of Reference](#)
- [1.2 Defining the Target Group](#)
- [1.3 Description of Bridging Students](#)
- [1.4 Organization of the Data](#)

Chapter 2: Bridging Students in Literacy Programs: a national issue

- [2.1 Literature Review](#)
- [2.2 Survey Data Regarding Numbers of Bridging Students in Literacy Programs](#)
- [2.3 Conclusions](#)
- [2.4 Recommendations](#)

Chapter 3: Student Pathways, Referrals and Assessments

- [3.1 Student Pathways](#)
- [3.2 Student Referrals](#)
- [3.3 Student Assessments](#)
- [3.4 Problems with Student Pathways, Referrals and Assessment Procedures](#)
- [3.5 Possible Solutions](#)
- [3.6 Conclusion and Recommendations](#)

Chapter 4: Assistance for Literacy Teachers Working with Bridging Students

- [4.1 Instructional Approaches for Teaching Bridging Students](#)
- [4.2 Teacher Training Needs](#)

Chapter 5: Summary and Recommendations

- [5.1 Survey Data: Concluding Remarks](#)
- [5.2 Summary of Findings and Recommendations](#)
- [5.3 Conclusion](#)

[Appendix A - Contact List](#)
[Appendix B - Survey Data](#)
[Bibliography](#)

Executive Summary

This research project, undertaken by Red River Community College, examined the issue of second language learners in literacy programs in Canada. The students in the target group were termed Bridging Students; they were defined as students who were not born in Canada, and whose first language was neither French nor English. Data was gathered through a literature review of the field, and through a survey designed for this project. The surveys targeted four different groups: literacy practitioners, literacy coalition workers, immigrant settlement agencies, and second language instructors. Responses were collected from British Columbia, Manitoba, Ontario and Quebec. The scope of this study was fairly small, but it does present impressions from the field and suggestions for future research.

The first section of the study examined the national statistics about the number of Bridging Students in Canada and in literacy programs. No large scale studies were found that directly addressed this issue. However, based on a number of other studies and on the survey data, it was concluded that the issue of second language literacy in Canada was indeed a pressing one. On the whole, Bridging Students make up approximately one-third of the students attending literacy programs.

In the second section, questions relating to student pathways, referrals, and assessments were explored. It was found that there are no clearly articulated pathways for Bridging Students and that students do not have enough information to make informed educational choices. In addition, practitioners are referring Bridging Students to programs based solely on either their L1 literacy levels or on their TL oral abilities. Basing referrals and student placement on such limited data means that they are often not very effective. Following are some of the recommendations made to address these issues.

- It is recommended that more research is needed to investigate how the literacy skills of immigrants in their first language, their level of schooling, and their training opportunities in Canada, interact to either facilitate or hinder their ability to acquire second language literacy (Boyd, 1991).
 - It is recommended that awareness be raised in the second language and literacy fields about the particular needs of Bridging Students, and the issues surrounding Second Language Literacy.
 - It is recommended that awareness among literacy practitioners be raised about the necessity of using broader and more in-depth assessment tools when evaluating the abilities and needs of Bridging Students.
 - There needs to be a greater exchange of information about programming options, curriculum, and entrance criteria between second language and literacy practitioners.
 - It is recommended that second language and literacy providers within any one region, jointly discuss ways of offering Bridging Students a wider range of programming options and ways of more clearly articulating student pathways.
-

- Much more coordination and joint planning is needed at the policy level in provincial and federal governments. Policy level discussions are needed to examine how the fields of second language training and literacy overlap. Funding decisions need to be based on the understanding that these two fields are not distinct, and that it is not always possible for programs and practitioners to make clear cut distinctions about the clients they serve.

In the third and final section, ways of assisting literacy teachers who are working with Bridging Students were studied. It was determined that, at the moment, there are very few resources available for literacy teachers working with diverse classes that include Bridging Students. The survey data suggested that teachers need assistance, and in particular, they need ways of helping Bridging Students with stabilized language patterns. The following recommendations were made.

- It is recommended that future research explore the possibility of developing new approaches which assist students to deal with a range of literacies. New approaches are needed which will move students beyond the realm of narrative literacy. A writing-based approach is recommended. Such an approach could address the issue of genre switching, as well as focusing Bridging Students= attention on stabilized language patterns.
- It is recommended that literacy programs serving Bridging Students should actively explore the option of trying to recruit bilingual tutors from the local communities.
- It is also recommended that literacy teachers working with Bridging Students receive more training in cross-cultural linguistic and educational awareness. Any teacher training done in this area must highlight that cross-cultural understanding is a two-way process, which involves having both teachers and students examine their own cultural biases, assumptions and expectations.
- With regard to second language research, it is recommended that literacy teachers be given some training about the findings of contrastive rhetoric research, so that they have a better understanding of how completely culturally determined literacy conventions are.
- Based on interlanguage studies, and in particular Wallace (1988), it is recommended that literacy teachers be given some training in the effects of students' interlanguages on their language and literacy development.

In conclusion, the data obtained through both the literature review and the survey instruments indicates that the issue of Bridging Students in literacy programs is a national and growing concern. Awareness about the issues and difficulties that face Bridging Students and their teachers certainly needs to be raised. All interested parties - literacy practitioners, immigrant settlement agents, second language instructors, governments, and the students themselves - need to start discussing these problems and devising solutions for them. In the meantime, since literacy teachers are now having to work with a diverse range of students, they need support. More teacher training needs to be funded and new approaches need to be developed to further assist these instructors.

Acknowledgements

This research project would not have been possible without the generous sponsorship of Red River Community College and funding from the National Literacy Secretariat. I would sincerely like to thank Paul McGeachie, Audrey Bonham, and Margaret Robinson for their support.

I would also like to acknowledge and thank Linda Mitchell, Joyce White, Audrey Bonham, Nicole Lachapelle, and Robin Millar for all of their advice and encouragement throughout this project. Their support and assistance were essential to both the research process, and to the formulation of the ideas presented here.

Finally, I would sincerely like to thank all of the teachers, literacy practitioners, and agency workers who took part in the surveys. It would not have been possible to write this report without their candid responses and the generous amounts of time that they gave.

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Terms of Reference

Upon observing that in Manitoba, more second language students are currently attending provincial literacy programs, Red River Community College undertook this research project to further explore this situation. From this initial observation, three research questions were formulated:

1. Is the situation of having second language students in literacy programs a national issue?
2. Do second language students need any guidance in moving between language and literacy programs?
3. Do literacy practitioners need additional assistance to work effectively with these students?

The aim of this project was to examine the current situation in Canada and to make recommendations concerning possible areas of future research. The project was divided into three main research stages. First, a literature review on the area of second language literacy was conducted. Second, survey tools were developed, and a small number of practitioners were interviewed in British Columbia, Manitoba, Ontario, and Quebec. (See [Appendix A](#) for the list of people contacted; see [Appendix B](#) for the tools used and the survey data). These surveys targeted four different groups: literacy practitioners, literacy coalitions, immigrant settlement agencies, and second language teachers. Third, recommendations concerning future research were drafted. Before presenting the findings, the target group is first defined and described below.

1.2 Defining the Target Group

Unfortunately, there does not seem to be an agreed upon term to describe second language immigrant students in literacy programs. Some literature discusses the needs of what are termed SL (second language, either ESL or FSL) Literacy students (Bell and Burnaby, 1984; Cumming, 1990; Crandall and Peyton, 1993). However, typically the term "SL Literacy" is used to describe students who have both low oracy and low literacy skills. The students targeted here tend to have high oracy skills, but low literacy skills. Also, the term SL Literacy is usually used to describe students attending SL programs, whereas the target group for this study attend literacy programs. Thus, the term SL Literacy is not a particularly adequate descriptor for this project.

Refugee Students are another group defined in the literature (see for example, Tollefson, 1985). This term is also not adequate, as it is too limiting. The distinction between refugees and immigrants is unimportant for this project. Moreover, many of the students in this target group are now Canadian citizens. Therefore, neither the term Immigrant nor Refugee is appropriate.

Another body of research describes students in reference to language. The literature from Quebec (for example, d'Angeljan and DeKeninck, 1992) tends to use the term Allophone to designate students whose first language is not French. Other terms that are used are Non-English Speaking Background (NESB) students (Hammond et al., 1992) and Language Other than English (LOTE) students (Dixon and Lyons, 1995). Since this project includes students whose first language is neither French nor English, none of these terms seems inclusive enough. On the other hand, a term such as Minority Students (Cummins, 1986) seems too inclusive. Francophone students in English communities, Anglophone students in French communities, and Native Canadians, could all be considered minorities.

The term finally selected for this project was Bridging Students ⁽¹⁾ (Battel et al., 1981). This term seems the most appropriate because, first, in attempting to become biliterate, these students are attempting to bridge two languages. As well, they are trying to bridge two cultures. Lastly, Bridging Students have some needs which are traditionally dealt with in SL programs and some needs which are traditionally dealt with in literacy programs. In many ways these students are trying to bridge the gap that exists in Canada between the two fields.

1.3 Description of Bridging Students

For this study, Bridging Students were broadly defined as students who were not born in Canada and whose first language is neither English nor French. Specifically, this study looked at Bridging Students attending literacy programs.

Bridging Students are learners with diverse literacy needs and goals who are at different stages on the continua of becoming biliterate and bicultural. Some adults coming to Canada are non-reader/writers in their first language (L1) and thus need assistance understanding the functions of print. Others have a range of L1 literacy skills, and they wish to improve their target language (TL) literacy skills. A majority of them have been in Canada for many years, have excellent oral skills and comparatively low literacy skills in the target language (TL) (Battel et al., 1981).

¹ It should be noted that subsequent to choosing this term, several practitioners in Ontario have pointed out the term Bridging has a different use in that province, and so for future research another term may be needed.

Bridging Students, nevertheless, differ from typical literacy students in that they are trying to acquire literacy skills in a second (or for some, third/fourth) language. This means that these students generally do not have the same oral command of English or French as mother tongue speakers. Often these students' oracy "is characterized by 'ingrained' errors in pronunciation and syntax" (Battel et al., 1981), and their vocabulary range may be limited.

In addition, Bridging Students also differ from Native Canadian students. Although, there are probably many similarities between these two groups in terms of language issues, there are other important issues, particular to Native Canadian Literacy, which lie outside the terms of reference for this study. Likewise, the term Bridging Students also excludes Canadian students who are attending literacy programs in a second official language. That is, this study did not look at Francophone students attending English literacy programs or Anglophone students attending French literacy programs. Again, some of the language issues may be the same, but the body of research for these groups is quite distinct from the research on Bridging Students.

1.4 Organization of the Data

The findings of this project are not presented in the conventional form of literature review, then data, followed by recommendations. Instead, they are organized below according to the three research questions outlined above. Accordingly, all of the data, from both the literature review and surveys, relating to the national scope of the situation is first presented in Chapter 2. Next, the issues about student pathways, referrals, and assessments are discussed in Chapter 3. Finally, the findings about approaches and teacher training needs are reviewed in Chapter 4. The recommendations from all three chapters are summarized in Chapter 5.

The literature review and survey data are summarized and discussed throughout all three chapters. The survey data broken down by each question that was asked is presented in [Appendix B](#). In all three chapters the recommendations are highlighted in the text and summarized at the end of each section.

Overall, this study presents an impressionistic overview of a range of issues relating to the needs of Bridging Students in Canada. The scope of the project was fairly small, and only thirty practitioners were surveyed. Consequently, in no way should it be considered exhaustive. However, it does suggest many directions for future research.

Chapter 2: Bridging Students in Literacy Programs: A National Issue

2.1 Literature Review

No studies were found which specifically analyzed the literacy skills of all immigrants to Canada. Also, no particular data was found indicating what proportion of immigrants had high oral skills in French or English, but limited literacy skills. Thus, it is not absolutely clear how many potential Bridging Students there are in Canada.

However, both the Survey of Literacy Skills Used in Daily Activities (LSUDA) and the International Adult Literacy Survey (IALS) do include results which are pertinent to this project. Both of these studies excluded any individuals "who reported having no skills in either of the two official languages" (Boyd, 1991:86). So, while these studies do not accurately reflect the literacy skills of all immigrants, it is likely that these statistics do shed some light on the literacy skills of Bridging Students. In other words, while these studies did not measure oral skills, it seems reasonable to assume that the immigrants who chose to participate had some level of spoken proficiency in one of the official languages.

Both of these studies found that, "immigrants are over represented at both the highest and lowest literacy levels" (Statistics Canada, 1996:35). The LSUDA study found that "only 36% of immigrants who reported a mother tongue other than English or French had assessed abilities allowing them to deal with most Canadian everyday materials (Level 4)" (Statistics Canada, 1991:31), and 39% were assessed at Levels 1 and 2. From this data, Jones (1992) estimates that there are approximately 743,000 second language adults at literacy Levels 1 and 2 in Canada.

Moreover, it is likely that these students may also have limited literacy skills in their L1. In the LSUDA study, "about 13% of immigrants reported their highest level of schooling as 'no schooling or elementary schooling only' compared to 10% for adults born in Canada" (Statistics Canada, 1991:31). Another national study, Immigrants and Language Training, also found that 20.4 % of the immigrants in Ontario, and 25.5% of the immigrants in Quebec have between only one and eight years of schooling.

The figures suggest that the proportion of people with few years of schooling is greater among immigrants in Canada, and especially among immigrant women, than among the Canadian-born and that the gap is widening (Klassen and Burnaby, 1993:381).

On the whole, the national data available indicates that "there are significant numbers of immigrants to Canada for who literacy is a real problem, literacy in an official Canadian language and/or literacy in their mother tongue" (Barker, 1992:12).

With regard to the number of these immigrants who are attending literacy programs, again there is very little data available. No national studies were found regarding this issue. However, a few researchers have commented on this situation. In a review of language training opportunities for immigrants in Canada, Burnaby notes that "it is clear that a great many ESL learners are being served by literacy agencies" (1992a:17), and that these agencies are "providing training for immigrants who are not eligible for other kinds of language training and/or are unwilling to approach public education institutions" (1992a:12). A needs assessment conducted by the Metro Toronto Movement for Literacy also found that "a large component of most workplace literacy programs is ESL" (1992:8). Finally, the Ontario Literacy Coalition (1996) surveyed literacy programs in Ontario about which target groups they felt had specific field development needs. 28% of the respondents identified ESL students. Out of the fifteen possible target groups on the survey, ESL students in literacy programs were frequently identified, second only to Developmentally Challenged students.

To sum up, the literature review in this area indicates that, first, of those immigrants who have enough oral skills in one of the official languages to participate in a national literacy survey, many (39%) have low literacy levels (Level 1 or 2). Additionally, a number of immigrants to Canada have had only a basic education in their country of origin, and hence they may also have low literacy skills in their first language. Finally, although no comprehensive statistics have been compiled, these students do seem to be attending literacy programs. The survey data collected for this project supports these findings.

2.2 Survey Data Regarding Numbers of Bridging Students in Literacy Programs

2.2.1 Literacy Practitioners and Literacy Coalitions

Nine literacy practitioners across the country completed the survey. They reported that their programs were currently serving anywhere from 20 to 700 students, with the average being 184 students. When asked how many of their students were Bridging Students, the practitioners stated that anywhere from 9% to 66% were, with the average being 31%.

Five of the nine practitioners felt that more Bridging Students were attending their programs than in the past, while three others felt that the number was consistently around one-third of their students. The last practitioner reported that their program's mandate had changed somewhat, and thus they were now accepting fewer Bridging Students.

The practitioners were also asked to identify what percentage of the Bridging Students in their programs had been in Canada for a considerable period of time (approximately over five years). One practitioner did not have this information. Two others reported that only 20 to 25% had been in the country that long, whereas the remaining six programs reported that 70% or more had been in Canada for over five years.

Six people from literacy coalitions across the country completed the survey. Five thought more Bridging Students were attending their provincial literacy programs now than in the past, and one reported that she did not know. The literacy coalitions do not keep specific statistics on these students, and thus these answers were based on general impressions. To support their impressions, the coalition workers explained that they have been getting more requests for referrals from second language speakers, that more teachers have been asking for materials to work with second language students, that more of their programs are now offering mother-tongue literacy classes, and that the LEARN line statistics indicate that 23% of the callers were second language speakers.

On the whole, the data from the surveys of literacy practitioners and literacy coalitions indicates that there are a number of Bridging Students currently attending literacy programs across the country, and that the number of these students appears to be increasing.

2.2.2 Immigrant Settlement Agencies and Second Language (ESL / FSL) Teachers

Unlike the results from the literacy practitioner and literacy coalition surveys, the immigrant settlement agencies and second language teachers did not report high numbers of Bridging Students asking for referrals or attending their classes.

Five people working in immigrant settlement agencies were surveyed. When asked about how many students they referred to literacy programs, the majority reported that they referred a small percentage each year (1% to 5%). Most also stated that they usually referred clients to SL programs, and that they had limited contact with literacy programs. Four of the settlement workers stated that Bridging Students definitely fell between the definitions of typical SL students and typical literacy students, and as a result they had trouble making appropriate referrals for these students.

Five second language teachers were interviewed. Like the immigrant settlement agents, the majority of the second language teachers interviewed felt that they assessed very few Bridging Students each year. Three of the five programs offered their own literacy classes, and usually students with literacy needs were placed in these classes. Occasionally, a few students had high oracy skills and low literacy skills. Some programs referred these students to literacy programs, whereas others placed them in regular SL classes.

All in all, when looking at numbers of Bridging Students, there is a discrepancy between the data from literacy practitioners and coalitions, and the data from immigrant settlement agencies and second language teachers. This may be because the latter groups usually work with newcomers to Canada, whereas Bridging Students typically have been in the country for quite some time. Also, considering the probable number of Bridging Students in Canada, as indicated by the LSUDA and IALS data, this discrepancy may indicate that Bridging Students are indeed falling between the fields of Literacy and ESL / FSL. These issues are discussed in more detail in the following chapter.

2.3 Conclusions

The national data available indicates that the issue of second language literacy in Canada is indeed a pressing one. Even though more and more immigrants are now being accepted with both higher education levels and second language skills than in the past (Citizenship and Immigration Canada, 1994), there is still a large number of immigrants, especially women, who cannot deal with everyday print materials in either of the official languages. From the brief survey data collected, it seems that these students are not being identified when they first enter the country. Rather, they access literacy programs after having been in Canada for quite some time. On average, the numbers of Bridging Students in the literacy programs surveyed make up a considerable portion of the total number of students (approximately one-third), and the numbers are increasing in most areas of the country.

2.4 Recommendations

In the area of second language literacy for immigrants, much more detailed research and data is needed. As Klassen and Burnaby succinctly comment, Amuch work remains to be done both to describe literacy issues among adult immigrants and to propose the kinds of services that are appropriate to meet their needs@ (1993:377).

Likewise, after reviewing the LSUDA data Boyd concludes that, English or French literacy proficiency reflects a number of factors including recency of arrival, English or French language ability, literacy proficiency in one=s own language, level of schooling, work-related literacy requirements and literacy training opportunities. Because these factors often are interrelated, information from large numbers of foreign-born are necessary to determine accurately which combinations are the most important for English or French literacy skills (1991:87).

Five years later Boyd=s conclusion is still relevant. Thus, it is recommended that more research into the literacy skills and needs of second language immigrants in Canada be conducted at the national level.

- First, it is recommended that future national literacy surveys incorporate ways of investigating the literacy skills and needs of those individuals who have typically been excluded from these studies, because they do not speak one of the official languages.
-

- Second, it is recommended that, restating Boyd (1991), future research should aim to investigate how the literacy skills of immigrants in their first language, their level of schooling, and their training opportunities in Canada, interact to either facilitate or hinder their ability to acquire sufficient second language literacy. Such data would greatly assist the implementation of more effective literacy programming for these students.

Chapter 3: Student Pathways, Referrals and Assessments

Having established, through both the literature review and the survey data, that large numbers of Bridging Students exist in Canada, and that many of them are attending literacy programs across the country, the next question to answer is whether or not these students need any guidance in moving between and among language and literacy programs.

The original hypothesis was that immigrant students were accessing SL programs and then moving into literacy programs. The assumption was that in this case, students would benefit from some guidance in making the transition from one type of program to the next.

As it turns out, however, on the whole students do not follow one pathway from SL programs into literacy programs. Rather they follow a variety of vaguely defined pathways. Further complicating the situation, the ways that students are assessed and referred vary considerably from one institution to the next. The three issues of student pathways, student referrals and student assessments are examined in the sections below, and then three different solutions to the current problems are also discussed.

3.1 Student Pathways

3.1.1 Literature Review: Student Pathways

Obviously, a good number of immigrant students, upon arrival to Canada, do attend SL programs for a period of time. Many attend federally funded programs, such as LINC. For those students who can access these services, the programs provide language instruction up to a certain functional level. Even though many immigrants can and do continue their language training after attending such programs, many others cannot afford to do so, either in terms of finances or time. Considering that even "under the best conditions, it takes people from 2 to 7 years to develop fluency in second language skills" (Klassen and Burnaby, 1993:380), many immigrants leave SL programs before developing fluency in an official language. With limited fluency in an official language, these students are prevented from accessing other training. That is, there is a large "gap between ESL and institutional ABE programs" (Metro Toronto Movement for Literacy, 1992:10).

While some immigrants access language training for a short period of time and then stop, others never attend any language training at all. There are several reasons for this. First of all, "resources are limited;...less than 50% of newcomers needing language training are able to obtain federally funded services" (Citizenship and Immigration Canada, 1994:19). Second, as Cumming found, "before seeking language training, immigrants, particularly women, may take from 3 to 10 years to establish themselves in

other ways in Canada" (1991:701). Third, for immigrants who have little schooling or who are not literate in their first language, "the ESL classroom is one of the few contexts which is difficult to manage effectively" (Klassen and Burnaby, 1993:386). Although these immigrants could benefit from the language content of these classrooms, they do not have the literacy skills needed for these classes. Thus, "ironically the domain of ESL classes which should give access...is itself not manageable" (Klassen, 1992:203).

For those students who only access some SL training, and for those who do not access any training, it seems reasonable to assume that many are likely to "pick up" oral skills while living in Canada. Nonetheless, they probably will not be as likely to "pick up" literacy skills. Once individuals have high oracy skills and low literacy skills, they are then not likely to be accommodated in traditional SL programs. For example, in Toronto it was determined that "non-English speaking immigrants who are now fluent in English, but who have not developed high level reading and writing skills in English" form a particular group, who are under served by current programming (Metro Toronto Movement for Literacy, 1992:10).

3.1.2 Survey Data: Student Pathways

When asked why they thought Bridging Students were attending literacy programs, the literacy practitioners and literacy coalition workers surveyed, gave a range of answers. First, they commented that many of these students are not accommodated by available SL programs. They said that some students cannot cope in LINC classes because they are non-readers/writers in their L1, or they are intimidated by institutional programs. Others do not qualify for LINC because they are citizens, or they have finished LINC and cannot afford to attend other SL programs.

Practitioners also observed that many of these students are more comfortable with the settings and approaches offered in literacy programs. For some Bridging Students, there is a stigma attached to attending a SL program, after having been in the country for a long time. Other students feel they are not having their needs met in multi-level SL programs, or they want one-to-one instruction. Also, students want to interact with mother-tongue speakers, which they cannot do in SL programs.

Many of the practitioners and coalition workers, also explained that Bridging Students do not 'fit' into any of the available SL programs. Since they have been in the country for some time, they do not need the survival information given in many SL programs, and their high oral skills dictate against placing them in SL Literacy classes. Many practitioners do not know where to place, or refer such students.

The data from the SL teachers supports the suggestion that Bridging Students are not being well accommodated in current SL programs. Three of the five SL programs did offer SL literacy classes, but these classes were designed for students with both low TL oracy and low TL literacy. Moreover, these SL literacy classes were likely to have waiting lists. When Bridging Students do turn up at SL programs, they are usually either placed in the SL Literacy class if there is one available, or sometimes they are placed in regular SL classes. Neither was considered a good option, and SL teachers also noted that placing Bridging Students was very problematic.

One SL program did offer a literacy stream, with a range of levels, and two other literacy programs offered both SL and literacy classes at the same institution. **Both of these scenarios seem like steps in the right direction to accommodate Bridging Students' needs.**

Overall, the survey data indicates that Bridging Students are not being well accommodated in SL programs, and that some are trying to access training in literacy programs. However, others are probably having difficulties finding any appropriate training. This is partly due to the lack of effective referrals and assessments. These two issues are outlined below.

3.2 Student Referrals

The literacy practitioners, literacy coalition workers, and SL teachers were all asked about how students find out about their programs, which agencies refer students to their programs, and whether or not they refer students to other programs.

Most students find out about literacy and SL programs by word-of-mouth. Both types of programs also advertise locally. Many students learn about the local literacy networks through ABC Canada's LEARN line. A wide variety of governmental and community agencies refer students to both literacy programs and SL programs, for example Settlement and Immigration Ministries, social services, embassies, immigrant settlement agencies, group homes, corrections officials, learning disabilities agencies, and employment agencies.

SL teachers reported that they did try to refer Bridging Students to literacy programs, but that this was difficult. There were issues around the availability of literacy programs, location and times of the programs, and the criteria for acceptance into the programs. Furthermore, as the literacy practitioners noted, there are often long wait lists at literacy programs, ranging anywhere from two months to a year. Consequently, there are very few referrals from SL programs to literacy programs.

In the other direction, literacy practitioners and literacy coalition workers often refer students to SL programs. The majority of practitioners said that they typically refer students when their oral skills are deemed too low to be able to participate in a literacy class. Others said that the referral depended on the student's needs. If students mentioned that they wanted to work on language development or pronunciation then they were referred to SL programs. If they wanted to work on writing and reading skills, and their oral skills were high enough, then they were referred to literacy programs.

On the whole, the literacy coalitions felt that they did have enough information about local SL programs to make referrals. However, some funders are telling the literacy coalitions that referring SL students is outside of their mandate. This, of course, poses problems for the networks, as there are no clear guidelines about who is and who is not a literacy student. There are no similar referral agencies for SL programs, and thus these students cannot be directed elsewhere. **Literacy coalition workers did not necessarily mind assisting SL students, but they need more support from funders in both fields.** With regard to referrals by immigrant settlement agencies, they said that they had little contact with the ABE / literacy field, and rarely made referrals to these programs.

For the most part, many more referrals for Bridging Students are being made from the literacy field to the SL field, than from the SL/immigrant settlement field to the literacy field. This, in itself, is not necessarily problematic. What is troublesome is the lack of coordination and cooperation between the fields, which means that referrals are rarely followed up and that the information flow about program availability and entrance criteria is far from optimum. What is also worrying is the fact that in many cases referrals are based solely on a brief assessment of the student's oral skills. This difficulty is examined below.

3.3 Student Assessments

The survey data indicates that, on average, Bridging Students are not being effectively assessed. The first problem is that these students are currently assessed in a multitude of ways, depending on each program, and there is little agreement amongst literacy programs about which students they should be serving.

The literacy coalition workers reported that most assessment was done at the literacy programs themselves, and that they did not do any formal assessment. However, they still have to make decisions about whether or not they should refer students to a SL program or to a literacy program. Essentially, the literacy coalition workers were not satisfied with the current system. The problems that they cited were, first, that there is no protocol in place to assist appropriate student placements and referrals. That is, when students are referred to a SL or literacy program, they are then only assessed in terms of their suitability for that particular program. Practitioners are just accepting or rejecting students, instead of assessing what the students need and then making an effective re-referral. The coalition workers also suggested that referrals would also be easier and more effective if there were some standardized criteria in place for literacy assessment, such as the Benchmark levels used in SL programs. Finally, they proposed that it would be useful if assessments were done at a central, neutral site. They pointed out that having stakeholders make the assessments was not the best option.

Literacy Practitioners were also questioned about the types of assessments that they used. The practitioners were first asked to describe the oracy and literacy skills of the Bridging Students currently in their programs. They were given the following four descriptors to choose from:

- A. non-reader/writers in their L1, with very limited oral skills in the TL,
- B. non-reader/writers in their L1, with good or fluent oral skills in the TL,
- C. reader/writers in their L1, with limited oral skills in the TL,
- D. reader/writers in their L1, with good or fluent oral skills in the TL.

For two programs, 100% of the Bridging Students were Type B. These practitioners explained this was because they did not accept any students who were already readers and writers in their L1. They reported that their programs' mandates were only to assist those students who were trying to acquire basic skills, and thus any students with sufficient L1 literacy skills were referred elsewhere.

Except for one program which catered to students with low TL oracy skills, the remaining six programs used oral ability as the criteria for acceptance into the literacy program. If the students could speak enough English or French, so that they were able to carry on a conversation at a fairly fluent level, and they needed assistance in English or French literacy, then they were accepted. Thus, in the majority of programs, students were either Type B (non-reader/writers in their L1 and good TL oral skills) or D (reader/writers in their L1 and good TL oral skills).

Even this small sample indicates that there are two distinct ways of evaluating whether or not second language students should be accepted into literacy programs. The first evaluation is based on whether or not they are readers and writers in any language. If they are readers and writers in their first language, then they are viewed as ineligible, no matter what their literacy skills are in the target language. Considering the fact that programs in general do not have any effective ways of assessing L1 literacy, this type of evaluation is rather problematic. Do students need to be complete non-readers/writers in their L1 to be accepted, or is minimal previous schooling used as the diagnostic? If so, what level of schooling is considered beyond 'basic skills'? Are programs evaluating what types of L1 literacy skills students have? Do programs consider how long it has been since these students have been in school? Do they acknowledge that literacy skills can become weaker over time, if they are not used? Overall, it is not at all clear what measure is being used to discriminate among students.

The second way students are evaluated is on their oral skills. If they can speak and understand enough of the target language, and they need assistance with target language literacy skills then they are accepted, no matter what their literacy skills are in their first language. Again, this type of evaluation is problematic and open to bias. Some respondents mentioned that they used accent as a guideline, while others noted that they evaluated how well students spoke on the telephone. Both of these can be difficult issues even for very fluent SL speakers. Other respondents said that they made their judgements, on whether or not the students could follow a 'normal conversation'. However, what this standard actually is, is not clearly defined. Another danger with this type of assessment is that Bridging Students will be rejected from SL literacy classes because their oral skills are too high, and they will be rejected from literacy classes because their oral skills are too low.

The literacy practitioners and SL teachers also described the assessment procedures they used. All of the programs did their assessments on-site. Some used standardized tests, such as CAAT and ABLE, although the majority used in-house assessment tools. To assess L1 literacy, one program used a procedure which involved identifying L1 sight-words and writing in the L1. This program had the advantage of having bilingual teachers available for such assessments. None of the other programs formally assessed L1 literacy, but most asked about previous levels of schooling or previous experience

with print. One program conducted peer assessments so that students more fluent in the TL could help the teachers with L1 assessments.

Whereas literacy programs use quite a diverse range of assessment procedures, the federal SL programs rely on the standardized LINC Benchmarks assessment. All of the settlement agencies referred students to LINC assessors. Some of the SL in-house assessments being used do not assess writing ability in any way, and none of the assessments includes any evaluation of L1 literacy. Most programs do interview their students about their previous education levels.

One unique SL program which was able to offer both a SL literacy stream and a SL stream, used the following data to place students in a class: an assessment of oral and written TL skills, amount of formal education, age, degree of difference between the L1 and TL, number of languages previously learned, and amount of stress they were currently under. More effective placements can be made with this broader type of assessment.

As well as having difficulties with placement assessments, literacy programs are also having difficulties with assessing Bridging Student learning disabilities. Several of the practitioners maintained that even with the help of a diagnostic tool or a specialist, often it was difficult to separate problems caused by learning disabilities and problems caused by second language issues. These teachers asked for a better diagnostic tool that could discriminate between the two issues. One other teacher reported that they had little information on learning disabilities, and that they would like more information. The final three respondents remarked that they avoided learning disability assessments. They felt that their students, fundamentally, did not need more testing and more labels.

3.4 Summary of Problems with Student Pathways, Referrals and Assessment Procedures

In summary, there are numerous difficulties with the current system of student pathways, referrals and assessment procedures for Bridging Students. Students who do not or cannot attend SL programs upon arrival in Canada may pick up oral skills, without developing literacy skills, in the TL. For these Bridging Students, there is no clear educational pathway for them and they do not have enough information about possible options.

SL programs have difficulty accommodating such students with split-level skills, and many Bridging Students do not approach SL programs. They may not consider themselves immigrants any more, and they tend to view SL programs as for immigrants. Other students are not comfortable either with the approach used in SL classes or with an institutional setting. Some are looking for one-to-one tuition, which is rarely offered in SL programs, and others are looking for opportunities to integrate with mother-tongue speakers.

Thus, these students may approach literacy programs or literacy coalitions. However, student placement and referrals tend to be made based solely on the student's L1 literacy ability or their TL oral ability. Basing student placement and referral decisions on such limited information does not benefit Bridging Students. Often they are referred back to the SL programs which are inappropriate for them. The fact that there is little coordination and cooperation among the various servers only complicates the matter. Instead of making effective re-referrals, based on a broad assessment of the students' needs, both SL and literacy programs tend to either just accept or reject students. All of these factors make it very difficult for Bridging Students to find appropriate training. The following three suggestions are possible ways of alleviating some of these difficulties.

3.5 Possible Solutions

3.5.1 Better and Broader ways of Assessing Bridging Students' Abilities and Needs

As noted above, most practitioners are placing and referring students based solely on either their TL oracy ability, or on their L1 literacy ability. That is, Bridging Students may not be accepted to literacy programs if either their TL oral abilities are considered too low, or if they are already readers/writers in their first language. Both of these strategies are too limited.

What seems to be needed is more awareness among language practitioners about the number of complex factors which affect the process of becoming biliterate. Some of the factors involved in this process are: whether or not the students are literate in their L1, how much experience they have with print, what their educational backgrounds are, whether their L1 is a roman script language, their age, and the importance of literacy in their country of origin (Hammond et al.,1992). This range of variables needs to be considered, if effective referrals are to be made.

Therefore, it is recommended that any needs assessment used with Bridging Students, specifically examines, from the perspective of the learner, what kinds of English, native language, and literacy skills the learner already believes he or she has; the literacy contexts in which the learner lives and works; what the learner wants and needs to know to function in those contexts; what the learner expects to gain from the instructional program (Santopietro and Peyton, 1991:1).

One such assessment tool, which looks at these variables is, An Approach to ESL Literacy Assessment by Klassen and Robinson (1992). In this manual, Klassen and Robinson acknowledge that, "different combinations of ...schooling and literacy can result in a wide variety of repertoires of skills, strategies, attitudes and learning needs" (1992:10). Hence, they recommend that a variety of "literacies" need to be assessed, and "not just any random set of "literacies", but the "literacies" that are appropriate for the learner's needs and expectations" (Klassen and Robinson, 1992:2). The authors go on to give detailed suggestions about how to conduct such assessments effectively.

Since appropriate assessment tools already exist, what is now needed is a greater awareness among practitioners about the importance of using such instruments. Practitioners making these assessments may also need some training in how to use such tools. In addition, administrators and funders need to realize that such assessments, though essential, are more time consuming. Consequently, practitioners will need to be financially supported and encouraged to change their assessment methods.

3.5.2 More Diverse Programming

Conducting more thorough assessments of Bridging Students' abilities and needs should improve student placement and referrals. Nevertheless, it is also essential to realize that if more effective referrals are to be made, then more diverse programming options for Bridging Students will also be necessary. This issue has been raised in much of the research in the field. For example, when discussing the LSUDA data, Boyd notes that "the findings of the survey are consistent with calls for a combination of program types and a flexible approach informed by user characteristics" (1991:93). Citizenship and Immigration Canada focus on the issue that, access to labour market bridging training may be an essential element to providing some newcomers with the opportunity to integrate into the Canadian work force and become fully contributing citizens (1994:20).

While Klassen and Burnaby conclude that, most ESL literacy-level adult immigrants would very much like to participate in training programs of many types both in their first languages and in English, regardless of how long they have lived in Canada (1993:394).

Likewise, the participants in this survey also asked for more diverse programming options. Several literacy practitioners suggested that having special classes for Bridging Students, in addition to the regular literacy program, would be useful. None of the SL teachers felt that they were meeting the needs of SL students who had literacy issues, and they stressed that both more SL literacy and Bridging classes were needed. They also noted that because many classes are multi-level, students with literacy needs tend to drop out of these classes. If SL and literacy programs are going to retain students, and meet their needs, then a greater variety of programming options will have to be made available.

Even though most researchers and practitioners agree that more diverse programming is beneficial, they by no means agree on the type of programming that should be offered. Some researchers call for mother-tongue and bilingual literacy programs. Some think Bridging Students should have special consideration and special classes. Still others endorse diverse heterogeneous classes. These options are examined below.

3.5.2.1 Mother-tongue literacy - Bilingual literacy - Traditional literacy

A large body of research in the field of SL literacy advocates either mother-tongue literacy instruction or some form of bilingual instruction. Much of the data supporting this position, comes from Cummins' work in the area of bilingualism and children. Although Cummins has modified his original position over the years, his initial thesis that, "a cognitively and academically beneficial form of bilingualism can be achieved only on the basis of adequately developed first language (L1) skills" (1979:222), still carries much weight in the field. This thesis applies to biliteracy, as well as bilingualism. Cummins' position is supported by research that shows it is easier for children to become literate in the L2 if they are already literate in their L1 (Swain, et al., 1990), and by research into the benefits of L1 literacy conducted with adults (Bogdan, 1995). Based on this body of work, many practitioners advocate mother-tongue literacy programs.

However, as Hornberger notes, "the findings that a stronger first language leads to a stronger second language, do not necessarily imply that the first language must be fully developed before the second language is introduced" (1994: 123). Therefore, bilingual programs can also be justified. As well, Hood (1990) argues that the importance of L1 literacy for becoming literate in L2 does not apply to high L2 oracy adults because their cognitive maturity helps them to cope with the context-reduced and abstract nature of academic language (Rado and D'Cruz, 1994:23).

Thus, for Bridging Students, uni-lingual target language literacy classes can also be supported.

In Canada, some researchers and practitioners support providing mother-tongue and bilingual programs. In a study in Toronto, Klassen found that, "the majority of my informants commented on the usefulness, not of simply knowing how to read and write, but of knowing how to read and write in Spanish in order to learn English" (Klassen, 1992:257). Likewise Klassen and Burnaby state, that many Canadian students have language and literacy learning needs in English that are not being met by present programs and that they believe that language and literacy learning in their native tongue is an important vehicle for reaching their personal goals as well as for learning English (1993:391).

A needs assessment conducted by the Metro Toronto Movement for Literacy confirmed that there was a lack of programming for "immigrants who would prefer a mother tongue literacy program prior to tackling English language reading and writing" (1992:7)

The majority of literacy coalitions and half of the settlement agencies were aware of mother-tongue or bilingual programs operating in their areas. Yet, they also noted that these were not available for all language groups. Also, one practitioner commented that such programs were not part of the literacy network, and thus they did not refer students there. Literacy practitioners and SL teachers were not directly asked about mother-tongue programs, but one literacy practitioner strongly supported mother-tongue literacy programs.

While some researchers and practitioners support providing such programming, others oppose the idea. Researchers opposing mother-tongue programs argue, immigrant learners need to acquire the practices and genres of literacy particular to the dominant society (not their native societies) in order to gain access to employment and academic opportunities, acquire relevant cultural knowledge, and utilize social services (Hammond cited in Cumming, 1991:698).

Others maintain that "mother tongue instruction is seldom feasible in educational programs with learners from diverse ethnolinguistic backgrounds" (Cumming, 1991:698). While still others assert that providing mother-tongue and bilingual programming is problematic because many immigrants believe they will learn the L2 faster if they do not use their L1 (Swain et al., 1990).

The survey data also highlights some resistance to mother-tongue programs. Several literacy practitioners remarked that mother-tongue programs used to be popular, and they hoped that the field would not follow that direction again. One literacy coalition worker mentioned that students wanted only TL literacy, and that they were not interested in mother-tongue programs.

Overall, it is impossible to say which type of program (mother-tongue, bilingual or TL literacy), is the best in all situations. In some contexts mother-tongue programs may be the best option, whereas in others TL literacy programs may be better. **What is recommended is that programming decisions need to be made in respect to detailed information on the local context, particularly regarding local patterns of literate language use, the status of the minority and majority languages, gender roles, the felt needs of learners, learners' existing knowledge of literacy and the second language, their extent of socioeconomic stability, and certain kinds of program supports** (Cumming, 1991:696).

Moreover, it is recommended that within any one region as many options as possible are offered, so that students can make their own choices about which educational pathway they wish to follow.

In addition, based on the literature, **it is also recommended that biliteracy and bilingualism are promoted and supported in all programs.** In their national study English Literacy Provision for Non-English Speaking Immigrants, conducted for the Australian government, Rado and D'Cruz stress that, "it is...regrettable that many teachers value L1 literacy for its transitional usefulness alone, a crutch to be discarded as soon as literacy in English is achieved" (1994:23). This is regrettable, because the benefits of biliteracy are numerous, ranging from the personal, such as helping in intra-family communications, and social to the global. Bilingualism also increases cognitive flexibility and enhances linguistic transfer and awareness (Rado and D'Cruz, 1994). Finally, in the so-termed global economy, biliteracy is becoming recognized as a marketable skill. Australia, for example, is strongly promoting the teaching of other languages to increase their economic viability (Rado and D'Cruz, 1994).

Since the benefits of biliteracy are numerous, students should be encouraged to maintain their L1 literacy skills. This could be done through mother-tongue and bilingual programs, or this encouragement and support can be incorporated into traditional literacy programs. **Lastly, students should also be given information about the benefits of becoming literate in their L1, before or while becoming literate in their L2. Such data is relevant to the educational pathways that they may choose, and it is reasonable that they should have access to this body of research.**

3.5.2.2 Do Bridging Students need Separate Consideration and Classes?

Along with the debate about whether or not mother-tongue and bilingual literacy programs should be offered, there is also some debate about how different Bridging Students' needs are from traditional literacy students, and whether or not these differences dictate separate programs. Many researchers argue that, ESL and adult learners are not the same and cannot be treated as if they have the same learning needs...it is important to recognise that there are significant differences between learning literacy in a mother tongue and learning the spoken and written modes of a second language (Hammond et al., 1992:124).

Jones reiterates this point stating, we need to understand that the needs, goals, and experiences of second-language immigrants are different from those of native-speaking adult literacy students...and to develop programs and research responsive to these needs and goals (Jones, 1992:208).

Cumming (1991), Suave (1990) and Wiley (1993) all support this viewpoint.

Several of the literacy practitioners surveyed also concluded that separate programming was needed. One practitioner stressed that, literacy practitioners have now been put in the position of trying to be 'all things to all people', and that this was not working. She suggested that programs need to be designed specifically for and around the needs and issues of Bridging Students, instead of placing them in traditional literacy programs. One settlement agent also asked for a greater number of participatory programs targeted at specific immigrant communities to meet their particular needs.

On the other hand, proponents of having heterogeneous classes argue that Bridging Students need to integrate with mother-tongue speakers. Rado and D'Cruz found that immigrant students face a major barrier, "because they are not given sufficient help in reducing the social and psychological distance between them and the English-speaking population" (1994:20). Basically the difficulty is that, although ESL goals (employment, communication, interaction with Canadians) are integrative,...[they] conflict with the nature of funding and physical location, both of which tend to be segregated, targeting immigrants specifically (Ho, 1992:79).

Overall, Burnaby's comment that, "it is essential to keep in mind that it is individual contact between real people that effects all the changes" (1992b:130), is pertinent here.

Likewise, several of the literacy practitioners surveyed also stressed the importance of mixed classes. They explained that mixed classes promote integration and that immigrants need opportunities to mix with native speakers. One practitioner commented that although SL programs were useful for giving new immigrants important information about Canada, they also tended to ghettoise immigrant students.

Mixed classes are also supported by the survey data about Bridging Students' needs and goals. Eight out of eleven literacy practitioners reported that they felt Bridging Students' needs and goals were essentially the same as Non-Bridging Students' needs and goals. Broadly, for all of the students, their goals were to improve their employment opportunities, obtain various credentials, and assist their children at school. When asked about learning goals, eight out of nine respondents also said that Bridging Students' goals were essentially identical to Non-Bridging Students' goals.

Again, no definitive answers are available about whether separate or mixed classes are the best option in all cases, and more information is necessary to make such decisions. The literacy practitioners surveyed are not aware of any needs assessments conducted with Bridging Student communities. Consequently, more research describing literacy issues among adult immigrants is required in order "to propose the kinds of services that are appropriate to meet their needs" (Klassen and Burnaby, 1993:377).

Until such research is conducted, the more in-depth assessment procedures, recommended earlier, should assist teachers and administrators when making such programming decisions. **When grouping students, practitioners should take "into account: assessment of the number of years education in mother tongue, nature of mother tongue, education and work experience..., perceived self-esteem, long term goals and other life skills" (Hammond et al., 1992:77).** Obviously, it is likely that mixed classes will work best when the students have some commonalities to build on. Classes where students are very diverse, for example, having a wide range of oral abilities or having students from a wide range of educational backgrounds, may be more problematic.

3.5.2.3 Conclusions and Recommendations about Programming Options

There are no definitive answers concerning the types of programming that are necessary to meet Bridging Students' needs. What is definite is that, in any situation, programming decisions will certainly be more effective when they are based on broad data, instead of just one or two variables. **This means, first, that more research into the issues of immigrant literacy is needed. Furthermore, in-depth student assessments and needs assessments of particular immigrant communities should be promoted and conducted.** These procedures would all contribute to more informed and effective programming decisions. **It is also recommended that biliteracy be encouraged in all programs, and that students are given access to any research information that would influence their educational choices. Finally, it is recommended that a wide range of program options be available and that articulated student pathways be developed.** In order to achieve such options and pathways, much more coordination and cooperation among literacy and SL providers is needed. This issue is explored below.

3.5.3 More Coordination and Cooperation Among Literacy and SL Providers

3.5.3.1 Literature Review: Coordination and Cooperation Needs

In order to address the needs of immigrants and Bridging Students, many researchers have recommended much more coordination and cooperation among the providers of literacy and the providers of language training.

Based on extensive studies into immigrant literacy issues in Australia, Rado and D'Cruz recommend that "provision be planned and publicised in such a way as to ensure that learners have access to a variety of providers with complementary course offerings" (1994:112). Likewise, Hammond et al. argue that student choice must not be impeded by issues of funding and territory...all providers should publish clear descriptions of aims, objectives, and selection criteria of adult ESL and LOTE and literacy programs and their method of student selection in order for potential students to find a learning pathway (Hammond et al., 1992:58).

Historically, in Canada, "co-ordination, co-operation, and consolidation among funders and deliverers of language training for adult immigrants has been the exception rather than the norm in Canada" (Burnaby, 1992a:5), and even though the "calls for comprehensive brokerage of information for immigrants on language training, vocational training, and settlement services are numerous,...[the] responses have been few" (Burnaby, 1992a:14).

Now researchers stress that, with this growing overlap of language training and literacy, there is an urgent need to coordinate teacher training, curriculum development, materials dissemination, and program planning to consolidate initiatives, resources, and knowledge of literacy and official language training (Burnaby, 1992b:124).

The Metro Toronto Movement for Literacy calls for, "better networking/coordination between all kinds of programs such that each program knows about what the others do and can cooperate and collaborate with them" (1992). The Ontario Literacy Coalition found that literacy practitioners wanted: "greater awareness of literacy programs in communities and amongst agencies who refer students," and "more communication/information among agencies - on program expectations, and services provided" (1996:2).

3.5.3.2 Survey Data: Coordination and Cooperation Needs

The survey data collected also supports this call for more coordination and cooperation. The literacy practitioners, literacy coalitions, settlement agencies and SL teachers, were all questioned about how much coordination existed at the moment and whether or not this should be improved. All four groups reported that, for the most part, there was very little coordination and cooperation between the literacy and SL fields. Comments made were: that any coordination is haphazard, that even within some institutions there is no communication between departments, and that effective program planning is hampered by this lack of communication.

Some exceptions to this situation that were mentioned, were that, first, there was better coordination when both programs were administered by one school board or institution. In addition, many others commented on the informal coordination which exists among individual practitioners. Teachers meet at various conferences and often serve on committees together. Therefore they build up networks among themselves. Finally, several respondents noted that workplace programs tend to encourage coordination between training providers.

Almost all of the respondents in all four groups felt that increased coordination and communication would be worthwhile. They concluded that much more awareness among practitioners about SL literacy issues and Bridging Students was needed. At the moment, literacy practitioners do not necessarily have a very clear idea about what happens in SL programs, and likewise SL teachers do not necessarily understand literacy programming. Thus, the respondents also thought that more information from the other field about program availability, curriculums and entrance criteria, would be very useful. If ways of sharing such information were developed, then the practitioners felt that much more effective referrals would be made. Several people also stressed that more cross-discipline teacher training was needed. As cross-discipline programming becomes more common, such as is the case in workplace training, then more teachers with expertise in both fields are needed.

The final issue that was raised about coordination in the survey concerned funding. The literacy practitioners and SL teachers were asked if they felt that they had to compete with each other for funding. Very few respondents thought that there was any direct competition for funds. However, they did explain that as funding is cut back, increased competition is expected. This would seem to be especially true for those programs that are funded solely on the basis of how many bodies they have in a class. This type of funding discourages re-referrals to more appropriate programs. Several literacy coalition workers and settlement agents stated that current funding structures were clearly territorial and that there was little coordination among funders. The problem with these structures is that since Bridging Students fall between the two fields, their needs are not likely to be directly addressed by any single funder. As one respondent stressed, there needs to be intra-governmental and inter-governmental discussions and agreements about who is responsible for funding which types of programs. In any such discussions, funders must realize that the two fields, Second Language and Literacy, are not always clearly demarcated. **Specifically, funders need to acknowledge that in the case of Bridging Students the fields do overlap, and funding structures need to reflect this fact.**

A final issue is that the current funding structures appear to discourage coordination and communication between the fields. Some providers are afraid that if the two fields are viewed as a continuum of language issues, instead of two distinct entities, then their programs are likely to lose funding. In particular, many literacy programs are afraid that any move in the direction of SL literacy or Bridging classes means that traditional literacy programs will eventually become SL programs. They are afraid that then there will be less funding and fewer classes for traditional literacy students. **To alleviate these fears, and therefore, promote the necessary coordination between the fields, a much more stable and long-term funding base for literacy programs is definitely needed.**

3.5.3.3 Conclusion and Recommendations: Coordination and Cooperation Needs

To sum up, much more coordination and communication is needed among practitioners working with Bridging Students. **Specifically, it is necessary to raise awareness in both fields about these students' needs and the issues surrounding second language literacy. As well, practitioners in both fields need to be encouraged to start exchanging more information about the programs they offer.** This should include information about what programs are currently available, what the curriculums in these programs are, and what the entrance requirements for these programs are.

Once this level of communication has been reached, **then administrators and coordinators from both fields need to jointly discuss ways of offering Bridging Students more diverse programming options and ways of articulating pathways for these students. Such discussions and decisions must be based on the local contexts and local needs assessments conducted with the immigrant communities.**

Furthermore, **teacher training programs need to start including courses about both second language and literacy issues.** Teachers with expertise in both areas are needed.

Finally, **more coordination and joint planning is needed among the program funders and those making policy decisions in the provincial and federal governments.** Policy level discussions are needed to examine how the fields of second language training and literacy overlap. Funding decisions need to be based on the understanding that these two fields are not two distinct entities, and that it is impossible for programs and practitioners to make clear cut distinctions about the clients that they serve.

3.6 Conclusion and Recommendations

There certainly are difficulties with student pathways, referrals and assessments for Bridging Students in Canada. To address these difficulties, three solutions have been suggested: the use of broader and more in-depth assessment tools, the provision of more diverse programming options, and the promotion of more coordination and cooperation between the second language and literacy fields. All three of these solutions are supported by the survey data. Based on these findings, the following recommendations were made in this section.

- It is recommended that awareness is raised in both the second language and literacy fields about the particular needs of Bridging Students and about the issues surrounding Second Language Literacy.
- It is recommended that awareness among literacy practitioners be raised about the necessity of using broader and more in-depth assessment tools when evaluating the abilities and needs of Bridging Students. Such instruments need to include assessment and evaluation of a wide range of variables, including: the learner's goals, their level of target language oracy and literacy, their first language literacy ability, their previous educational experience, their cultural and linguistic background, their previous experience with print, and their age. A recommended assessment tool is *An Approach to ESL Literacy Assessment* by Klassen and Robinson (1992). Funders need to support the adoption of such tools.
- It would be useful for practitioners to have a diagnostic instrument for assessing the learning disabilities of Bridging Students.
- There needs to be a greater exchange of information about programming options, curriculum, and entrance criteria between second language practitioners and literacy practitioners.
- It is recommended that all immigrant students be given access to research information about the role of L1 literacy and bilingualism, and that all students be given more information about the programming options that exist in their region and how to access these programs.
- It is recommended that second language and literacy providers within any one region jointly discuss ways of offering Bridging Students a wider range of programming options and ways of more clearly articulating possible student pathways. The provision of both second language training and literacy classes by the same institution tends to lead to greater coordination and clearer student pathways. Thus, this option should be considered.
- Programming and student grouping decisions need to be based on local conditions. Therefore, more community needs assessments targeting specific immigrant groups should be conducted. Such assessments and programming decisions need to take into account: Alocal patterns of literate language use, the status of minority and majority languages, gender roles, felt needs of learners, learners' existing knowledge of literacy and the second language, their extent of socioeconomic stability, and certain kinds of program supports (Cumming, 1991:696).

- Biliteracy and bilingualism should be promoted and encouraged in all literacy programs.
 - Teacher training programs need to incorporate more cross-discipline training between the fields of second language instruction and literacy. For many program options, teachers will need expertise in both fields.
 - Much more coordination and joint planning is needed at the policy level in the provincial and federal governments. Policy level discussions are needed to examine how the fields of second language training and literacy overlap. Funding decisions need to be based on the understanding that these two fields are not distinct and that it is impossible for programs and practitioners to make clear cut distinctions about the clients they serve. A more stable funding structure for literacy programming would promote more coordination. Finally, more funding is needed to support centralized referral agencies, such as the literacy networks.
-

Chapter 4: Assistance for Literacy Teachers Working with Bridging Students

Earlier in this report it was established that Bridging Students are indeed currently attending literacy programs across the country. Therefore, the final question to address is whether or not literacy practitioners need more assistance when working with these students. To answer this question, the findings have been divided below into two sections: one on teaching approaches and one on teacher training.

4.1 Instructional Approaches for Teaching Bridging Students

4.1.1 Literature Review: Current Literacy Resources

Only recently has second language literacy gained much recognition, and thus the resources in this field are extremely limited. In terms of materials, it seems that most often SL teachers must adapt literacy materials, and literacy teachers must adapt SL materials to suit their students' needs. In terms of teaching approaches, however, some valuable resources have been published.

First, there are a number of texts aimed at SL teachers who are teaching SL Literacy students. Primarily, these texts inform SL teachers about literacy approaches. Thus, much of the information in these texts will be familiar to literacy teachers but new to SL teachers. One of the most thorough of these resources is Bringing Literacy to Life (Wrigley and Guth, 1992). In their chapter on approaches they outline seven popular approaches to SL literacy and give suggestions for teaching initial literacy and for developing appropriate materials. Likewise, Bell and Burnaby's A Handbook for ESL Literacy (1984), Gunderson's ESL Literacy Instruction (1991), and the TESL Talk: issue on ESL literacy (1990), all provide sound theoretical and practical information for SL teachers who need to teach literacy skills to their students. More specifically, Wallerstein's Language and Culture in Conflict (1983) focuses on using a Freirean problem-posing approach in the SL classroom. All of these resources are valuable for SL teachers teaching classes of SL Literacy students. However, they do not directly address the issue of having both immigrants and native speakers in the same class.

There are also a number of resources directed at literacy teachers who are teaching second language speakers. These texts, for the most part, explain how literacy teachers can expand upon their current literacy approaches in order to address the needs of second language students. For example, in Approaches to Adult ESL Literacy Instruction, Crandall and Peyton (1993) outline how a variety of approaches (competency based, whole language, language experience, student writing and Freirean) can be used with SL students. Auerbach's Making Meaning, Making Change (1992) focuses particularly on using a participatory approach with SL students, while Belifore and Burnaby's Teaching English in the Workplace (1995), focuses on workplace issues. Again, while providing many good suggestions, and much needed information for literacy teachers, none of these resources specifically focuses on the issue of teaching a class of both Bridging and traditional students.

4.1.2 Literature Review: Current Second Language Resources

Literacy teachers will be familiar with most of the approaches discussed in the resources mentioned above. There is, of course, also a whole range of approaches from the field of second language instruction and there are a vast number of resources describing second language instructional approaches. Literacy teachers may or may not be familiar with these.

Providing just one example, in State of the Art TESOL Essays (Silberstein, 1993), the primary trends in second language reading and writing instruction are reviewed. In the article "Current Developments in Second Language Reading Research", Grabe (1993) notes that, presently, in the field, reading is being viewed as an interactive process, instead of only a bottom-up or only a top-down process. Based on this, many second language reading researchers are concentrating on the roles of schema and background knowledge in text comprehension and on the necessary levels of vocabulary and syntax needed for fluid reading (Grabe, 1993).

With regard to writing instruction, in her article "Out of the Woods: emerging traditions in the teaching of writing," Raimes (1993) describes five main issues in the field. The first concerns how personal and academic topics influence writing, and the second questions the validity of only teaching writing as a process, instead of also as a product. The third issue, which is not of primary concern here, discusses the role of academic discourse communities on writing styles. The fourth topic is the role contrastive rhetoric has on informing teachers about writing. The final issue is about how teachers should respond to students' writing, in terms of what type of correction and comments are the most useful.

These particular articles, and a vast number of other resources, are aimed primarily at SL instructors. However, there are very few texts which explicitly outline how literacy teachers can incorporate SL theories into their classrooms. Wallace's Learning to Read in a Multicultural Society (1988) does take this perspective, but it is mainly directed at teaching children. Dixon and Lyons' A Teacher's Guide to Enhancing Literacy for Learners with diverse language and cultural backgrounds, who are studying in Adult Basic Education Programs (1995), also deals with this issue, and it concentrates primarily on the genre-based approach which is popular in second language teaching in Australia.

4.1.3 Survey Data: Approaches

The survey questions for this topic aimed to clarify how much literacy teachers know about the above mentioned SL approaches and trends. Thus, all of the literacy practitioners were asked about the approaches that they currently use, and they were specifically asked if they use SL approaches to reading and writing instruction.

In response to the first question, nine literacy practitioners responded that they used a variety of approaches, namely: language experience approach (LEA), phonics, sight words, process writing, group discussions, and journals. They said that they based the choice of approach on the learners' goals, their learning styles, and their previous experiences. One other practitioner said that they used an approach which was totally based on the students' writing.

When asked if they made any changes to their approaches for Bridging Students, six practitioners said that they did not make any changes. They noted that since the choice of approach was already learner-centred, this accommodated for Bridging Students' particular needs. Four other respondents said that they did make some changes. Two explained that they used the language experience approach more often, supplemented with more group discussions, and phonics work focussing particularly on the Bridging Students' needs. The practitioner who used the writing-based approach said that teachers encourage Bridging Students to focus on the process of becoming bicultural. The last respondent observed that teaching writing skills to Bridging Students was more challenging, but she did not mention any approaches they used to address this issue.

The literacy practitioners were then asked if they ever used any of the second language approaches outlined above. When asked if they did any work on cross-cultural awareness issues, for example, comparing the literacy practices of the students in their L1 and TL, discussing issues about bilingualism, or analysing different cultural approaches to education and learning, seven of the respondents said that they did. Two replied that they did not. However, the impression that these teachers gave was that these topics were covered in a very informal manner. They explained that these issues were generally discussed in groups, and they did not mention any specific activities that they used.

Next, they were asked if the teachers in their programs did any work on the cultural background knowledge necessary to understand a text, or if they did any work concerning schemas and genres. Eight of them said that they did, and one said some teachers do and some do not. The majority of the practitioners commented that they did work on cultural background knowledge with all of their students. With regard to schema, several of the respondents stated that they did not think this was important for Bridging Students as they had been in the country for a long time. For work on genres, several teachers noted that they touched on this, and one remarked that she thought this type of work was too high-level for her students. Only one teacher said that in their program students are strongly encouraged to try a range of genres. Again, the overall impression given was that schemas and genres were touched on, but not through any formal approach.

When asked about vocabulary skills, all of the respondents confirmed that this was strongly emphasized with all of their students. Teachers were also asked if they did any work on cross-cultural issues when teaching writing. Four practitioners said that they do some work on this, and one commented that they did a lot of work on the differences between speaking and writing. The remaining four did not do any work on this, and one teacher maintained that she did not think her students needed any work in this area.

Finally, teachers were asked if they felt that the Bridging Students' oral skills influence or affect their TL reading and writing skills, and whether they used any approaches to assist students with this difficulty. Nine teachers said oracy did have a substantial impact, and one said it did not. Some comments that the practitioners made were that fossilized grammar patterns were hard to change, that students do not hear many of the sounds of the TL, that students have difficulty with the differences between graphic and phonic realizations, and that their interlanguage is directly reflected in their writing. None of the teachers had any particular approaches that they used to address these issues, except for one, who noted that by using a writing based approach, some of the stabilized patterns began to change. In general, however, teachers expressed a lot of frustration with the issue of fossilized or stabilized language patterns.

In addition to these questions about various approaches, the literacy practitioners were also asked about any particular materials and curriculum that they would recommend for use with Bridging Students. The majority of practitioners said that they did not have any particular materials for teaching Bridging Students, and most of them adapt various SL and literacy materials for these students. Some types of materials that they did recommend were using picture dictionaries, picture stories, dialogue journals, and literature from their own country. Several teachers recommended using the local SL newspapers, either The Westcoast Reader (see Acosta, 1990), or the Ontario Times ⁽²⁾ . Although several teachers mentioned particular SL texts that they liked (see [Appendix B](#) for details), only one text particular to Bridging Students was recommended. This was a new book entitled A Guide to Using Theme Units with an ABE/ESL Literacy Class (Lenning and Richardson, 1996). Only one particular curriculum was mentioned, which was the Bookbridges program in Manitoba.

4.1.4 Approaches that are Available and What is Being Used

The field of second language literacy instruction has only recently been recognized, and thus there are not many resources available in the field. The resources that are available either teach SL teachers how to use literacy approaches, or they discuss how literacy teachers can adapt their current literacy approaches to accommodate a class of Bridging Students. These resources do not discuss the situation of teaching a diverse class of both Bridging and traditional literacy students. Also, there are very few resources which inform literacy teachers about how to adapt and use SL approaches in their classes. The survey data indicates that literacy teachers touch on SL issues informally, but that they are not necessarily informed about SL theory and approaches. Moreover, the literacy practitioners commented that Bridging Students have particular difficulties with writing, due to their stabilized language patterns.

4.1.5 Genre Switching: a problem for all students

As more and more Bridging Students attend literacy programs, what is now needed is a way for literacy teachers to address Bridging Students' needs while also teaching a heterogeneous class. The literature, outlined below, highlights one particular problem facing all literacy students. That is the ability to deal with organizational, as opposed to narrative, literacy. This problem, and the suggestions for addressing this difficulty, present viable areas for future development of teaching approaches to use with diverse literacy classes.

² It should be noted that the Ontario Times program was cut, and several teachers proposed that their programs were willing to pay to have it back.

In the literature, many researchers recommend using the Language Experience Approach (LEA) with all literacy students, especially at lower levels. Both Cumming (1991) and Rigg (1990) also endorse using LEA with SL Literacy and Bridging Students. As noted earlier, most of the literacy practitioners interviewed do use LEA, and some stated that they use LEA more with Bridging Students.

However, other researchers argue that students also need strategies for moving beyond the narrative genre which is predominant in the language experience approach. As Darville (1989) outlines, there are two primary types of literacy: narrative and organizational. Darville explains that, "organizational literacy is not about personal experience" (1989:31), and that "organizational accounts disorganize the narrative" (1989:33). Organizational literacy is characterized by different temporal sequences, more agent-less sentences, a greater number of nominalizations, and more presupposed background knowledge, than in narrative literacy (Darville, 1989).

The problem is that, since organizational literacy is so different from narrative literacy, "readers who depend upon narrative practices of reading...often misread organizational literacy" (Darville, 1989:33). However, most literacy learners need to be able to read organizational literacy as they are confronted with it "on the job, in dealings with government agencies, and in contact with educational or social work and psychiatric interventions" (Darville, 1989:36).

Thus, Darville argues, teachers need to assist literacy students to move beyond LEA and to read and understand organizational literacy. He notes that, "it is striking that, in the face of diverse forms of literacy, literacy workers often choose, and are advised to choose, to work with a concrete and specifically narrative form of literacy" (Darville, 1989:26). This is problematic because, language experience does not extend to the uses of literacy as a means of power in the organizations that dominate our society. And the empowerment of language experience becomes condescension and disempowerment when we treat students merely as repositories of personal experience; or when we act as if, once they write their stories, they are empowered, and we have done what we can do (Darville, 1989:35).

The problem is further complicated for Bridging Students. These students not only have to cope with the differences between narrative and organizational literacy, they also have to cope with the differences between their TL oracy and the standard written TL and with the differences between their L1 literacy practices and the TL literacy practices. As Leki points out, all writing conventions, "not simply rhetorical style but also purpose, task, and audience are culturally informed" (1993:361). Thus, "the idea of 'being yourself' or writing elegantly, or communicating clearly and convincingly has no reality outside of a particular cultural and rhetorical context" (Leki, 1993:366).

4.1.6 Suggestions for Teaching Genre Switching

Suggestions about ways to help literacy students with organizational literacy come from three different areas in the literature.

4.1.6.1 Focussing on Product, through Direct Instruction

First, based on her work with minority children in the United States, Delpit suggests putting more emphasis on written products and providing more direct instruction for students. While process writing is certainly an essential approach to teaching writing which should be maintained, Delpit argues that "teachers do students no service to suggest, even implicitly, that "product" is not important...students will be judged on their product regardless of the process they utilized to achieve it" (1991:490).

Delpit frames her arguments in reference to the culture of power and student empowerment. She argues that, "if you are not already a participant in the culture of power, being told explicitly the rules of that culture makes acquiring power easier" (Delpit, 1991:486). Since writing is based "on the specific codes of a particular culture, [it] is more readily produced when the directives of how to produce it are made explicit" (Delpit, 1991:490).

However, endorsement of direct instruction about the rules and standards of the culture of power does not mean that students must either give up or deny their cultures and languages. Rather, students need to be assisted to see that, while their languages and cultures are valuable, the language that is valued outside of the classroom is the culture of power's standard. Students do not necessarily have to embrace this standard, but they need to realize it exists. Edelsky (1991) argues that students should be encouraged to add the standard language, not as a replacement for student's current language, but as another voice which they have at their disposal.

Although these suggestions for more direct writing instruction may seem to conflict with the approaches used in many literacy programs, Delpit (1991) argues that they can be reconciled. She suggests doing this in the following way:

students must be taught the codes needed to participate fully in the mainstream...not by being forced to attend to hollow, inane, decontextualized subskills, but rather within the context of meaningful communicative endeavours; that they must be allowed the resource of the teacher's expert knowledge, while being helped to acknowledge their own "expertness" as well; and that even while students are assisted in learning the culture of power they must also be helped to learn about the arbitrariness of those codes and about power relationships they represent (Delpit, 1991:500).

4.1.6.2 Building on Narrative Literacy

Another suggestion is provided by Darville, who argues that literacy teachers need ways of "dealing with organizational literacy - without abandoning the gains of language experience and the anchoring of literacy in everyday life" (1989:36). One way to do this is by having teachers compose "stories which lead up to organization, when their characters find themselves in situations where they need organizational knowledge and need to read or write organizational texts" (Darville, 1989:37). He also suggests developing materials contrasting narrative and organizational literacy; "so the student's story should be contrasted with the school records, the worker's account with the foreman's, the patient's testimony with the psychiatrists's case history" (Darville, 1989:37). By contrasting literacy types in different contexts, teachers can inform students about "the systems of rules / conventions / constraints for exercising freedom within cultural bounds, for making one's own meaning for culturally possible purposes in particular situations" (Edelsky, 1991:50).

4.1.6.3 Using a Genre-based Approach

The third suggestion for teaching literacy students organizational literacy comes mainly from Australian practitioners and researchers. Similar to Delpit's (1991) views, they argue that the process writing approach does not provide enough explicit instruction for Bridging Students (Hammond et al., 1992). These researchers endorse using the genre approach, which is based on Halliday's work in systemic linguistics. This approach "provides a systematic basis for exploring how cultural and social differences are realised in speaking and writing" (Hammond et al., 1992:55). They claim that the analytic approach to texts, provided by the notion of genre, enables teachers and learners to focus on text structure and grammatical patterning in ways that assist learners to develop effective control of a range of spoken and written texts (Hammond et al., 1992:55).

In the genre approach, teachers choose a model authentic text for a particular genre, and then jointly analyse its structure and features with the students. This text then serves as a model for students. Then a more process based approach can be used, in which students are encouraged to draft and revise texts for real purposes and audiences. What is being advocated is a balance between prescriptive direct teaching and the ABE/literacy approach (Dixon and Lyons, 1995).

While there are few specific references to the genre-based approach in literacy research outside of Australia, there is some support in the literature for the use of a combined product-modelling / process-writing approach. In their work with Native American children, Shields and Matheson found that, "understanding the way content material is organized is a much more powerful tool for improving students' concepts and language than, for instance, vocabulary study" (1990:219). In the field of adult literacy, Edelsky points out that considerable research and theory take the position that writers learn to write by seeing demonstrations of authentic written language, by writing for real and varied purposes, by sharing what they have written with varied audiences, by utilizing the reactions of others to revisit and revise some of what they create, by working through changes in order to express their intentions in written form (1991:53).

Overall, all three of the suggestions outlined above seem like viable ways to begin addressing the concerns of literacy teachers working with diverse classes.

4.1.7 Conclusion Recommendations about Instructional Approaches

In the beginning of this section, it was pointed out that there are very few resources available for teachers working with mixed classes of Bridging and traditional literacy students, nor are there many resources explaining how SL approaches could be integrated into literacy programs.

The survey data indicates that while teachers do use a variety of literacy approaches with their students, they only informally touch on SL theories and techniques. The respondents also asserted that while Bridging Students have particular difficulties with writing due to their stabilized language patterns, they did not have any particular approaches to address this issue.

In addition, it was also explained that all literacy students need assistance in understanding and producing organizational literacy, and teachers need to help all literacy students to move beyond the narrative literacy realm. It was then suggested that this can be accomplished through a new writing-based approach. Such an approach could be useful for all literacy students, while helping Bridging Students in particular, to change their stabilized language patterns.

Thus, in conclusion, the following recommendations are made.

- It is recommended that more research be done on ways to integrate second language approaches into literacy programs so that teachers can assist Bridging Students while working with heterogeneous classes.
 - Specifically, it is recommended that future research explore the possibility of developing new approaches which assist students in understanding and dealing with a range of literacies. While accepting the benefits of using the language experience approach with lower levels, new approaches are needed which will move students beyond the realm of narrative literacy. A writing-based approach is recommended.
-

- If such a writing-based approach is to be developed, then it is recommended that future research should explore the issues of: providing students with more explicit instruction, focussing students' attention on the written product, building links between the students' understanding of narrative literacy and the realm of organizational literacy, and using genre as the basis for examining texts.

4.2 Teacher Training Needs

As well as looking at what approaches literacy teachers use and need when working with Bridging Students, the surveys and literature review also explored the issue of teacher training. Two particular topics were examined. The first was whether programs have bilingual³ teachers and/or tutors and whether they train members of the students' communities as tutors. The second topic concerned the areas in which teachers wanted more training.

4.2.1 Bilingual Teachers and the Recruitment of Tutors

As Auerbach points out, teachers working with Bridging Students, "often share neither language nor socio-cultural background with the students" (1990:164). Obviously, this makes communication more difficult and increases the possibility for misunderstandings. Thus, it is worthwhile exploring the option of having more bilingual teachers and tutors in literacy programs. As there are a limited number of trained literacy teachers who are bilingual, it is probably easier to train bilingual community members as literacy tutors.

This would be beneficial because, as Crandall notes, "members of the community are more likely to understand and focus on culturally relevant and appropriate literacy practices," and "if the practitioners are newly literate, they are also likely to be more sensitized to the hopes, fears, and other experiences of the learners with whom they are working" (1993:503). Both Auerbach (1990) and D'Annunzio (1995) outline effective ways of recruiting and training tutors from immigrant communities.

To explore this issue further, the literacy programs were asked about how many bilingual teachers and tutors they had. Of the nine respondents, only two had any bilingual teachers on staff, and four had some bilingual tutors. Both the literacy programs and coalitions were also asked if they actively recruited tutors from Bridging Students' communities. Three of the nine literacy programs said that they did recruit tutors from these communities, and two of the five coalitions said that this was done in their region. One practitioner remarked that in their one-to-one program, students did not want tutors from their own communities, as they felt that they would use their L1 too often. While another noted that having such tutors was very successful, and that it was indeed valuable having such models for students.

³ Bilingual here is used to mean not bilingual French / English, but bilingual in the target language and a language used by the Bridging Students; examples would be French / Vietnamese or English / Cantonese.

Overall, based on the literature, there does seem to be considerable merit in recruiting tutors from the students' communities. Not only could these tutors assist students with cross-linguistic issues, but they could also serve as sources of information for teachers and as role models for current students. **Therefore, it is recommended that literacy programs who serve Bridging Students should actively explore the option of trying to recruit bilingual tutors from the local communities. Programs are referred to Auerbach (1990) and D'Annunzio (1995) for more information on this topic.**

4.2.2 Establishing the Need for Future Teacher Training

Next, the literacy practitioners were asked about the training teachers receive and about the training they would like. Specifically, the literacy practitioners were asked if teachers received training in either SL methods or in cross-cultural awareness. Four out of the nine respondents said that some teachers did have some SL training, but that the teachers had sought this on their own time, and it was not provided by the programs. Six of the nine programs said that they would like more SL training.

Five of the nine programs said that teachers receive some cross-cultural awareness training, either at professional development sessions, or when they start teaching. However, in general, this training did not deal with linguistic issues; rather it covered such topics as racism, discrimination, and harassment. Six of the nine said that more cross-cultural training would be useful. One teacher noted that since most of her teachers were immigrants, they did not need such training; a comment that reinforces the above position on teacher and tutor recruitment. Another respondent said cross-cultural training was useful only if it avoided the usual promotion of cultural stereotypes.

Finally, the literacy practitioners were then asked if they thought teacher training in additional approaches would be useful, and all ten respondents agreed that it would be. Supporting this data, the Ontario Literacy Coalition's (1996) recent provincial needs assessment also found that 66% of the respondents who had identified SL students as a prominent target group, saw a need for more staff/volunteer training in this area.

4.2.3 Teacher Training in Cross Cultural Issues

When working with any students, "the potential for conflicting expectations and evaluations of behaviour between teachers and learners is evident" (McGroarty, 1993:1). This potential is increased when teachers are working with students from different cultures. As Zuss points out, the danger is that, ignorance or rejection by educators of the forms of language use and values pertinent to diverse cultural groups attempting to participate in Adult Basic Education (ABE)...can create and sustain some measure of the profound alienation experienced by both teachers and students within the cross-linguistic classroom (1994:240).

Obviously it is worthwhile for teachers to try to avoid such conflicts and alienation.

To do this, teachers first need to realize that the way they "teach is determined by very deeply held notions of learning which are not normally available to conscious scrutiny" (Bell, 1993:469). Teacher training in cross-cultural issues must try to help teachers to explore such notions. As Zuss argues, it is crucial that teachers and researchers reflect on their own self-representation in terms of the implicit values and forms of ideology implicated by the linguistic practices that they bring to their teaching or research and to the assessment of students (1994:253).

In conjunction with such self-reflection, teachers also "need to learn how to participate with learners in identifying culturally appropriate instructional processes, topics, and materials that promote language progress" (McGroarty, 1993:2). It should be stressed that this means working together with students, and that this is quite different than the imposition of what the teacher considers culturally appropriate instruction. Moreover, in this process of working with Bridging Students, "educators must also allow for the emergence of critique and reflection on the part of students in their own engagement with and relations to language use" (Zuss, 1994:263). Students need to be encouraged to examine where they are on the continuum of becoming bicultural, and where they want to be. The affirmation strategy, discussed in Crandall and Pharness (1991), is one possible way to explore such issues with Bridging Students.

Overall, based on this literature, it is recommended that any teacher training done on cross-cultural awareness issues, highlights the fact that cross-cultural understanding is not a one-way process. It is not just teachers understanding the student's culture, nor student's just accepting and adapting to Canadian culture. **Rather, the process should involve having both teachers and students reflect and examine their own cultural biases, assumptions and expectations.** Only after this has been done is it possible to discuss differences and commonalities so that cross-cultural understanding can be achieved.

4.2.4 Teacher Training in Second Language Methodology

As noted earlier, in the field of SL instruction there is a vast body of literature about instructional theory, methodology, approaches and techniques. Obviously, while containing much valuable information, there is no way that teacher training can be conducted in all of these areas. However, two SL topics, contrastive rhetoric and the influence of interlanguage, do seem particularly relevant for literacy teachers working with Bridging Students.

4.2.4.1 Findings from Contrastive Rhetoric

As the name implies, the aim of contrastive rhetoric is to compare and contrast the ways different literacies are used in different cultures. While it is certainly unreasonable to expect that literacy teachers should be aware of all of these differences for all of their students' first languages, it would be useful for teachers to have some general information about the types of differences which exist.

A few general examples, as Kaplan (1988) outlines, are that there are typically different composing conventions in different cultures. That is, the types of texts written in Canada may not be written in other cultures. Moreover, all discourse conventions are also culturally determined, and they differ from culture to culture. Also, the interpretation of reader/writer responsibility differs among cultures. What the writer is expected to provide for the reader in one culture may not be the same in another.

Again, it is not necessary for literacy teachers to know all of the precise ways that these differences are manifested. Rather, **it is more important for literacy teachers to have a broader understanding how completely culturally determined literacy conventions are. Therefore, it is recommended that literacy teachers be given some training about the findings of contrastive rhetoric research.** This information would help them to understand that, when working with Bridging Students, it is essential not to assume that Canadian literacy practices and conventions are in any way transparent. Two articles which give good introductory perspectives about contrastive rhetoric and literacy are Sampson (1990) and Bell (1995).

4.2.4.2 Findings from Interlanguage Studies

In the SL field, the term 'interlanguage' is the label for the student's current language use, while they are in the process of acquiring the target language. That is, when acquiring a second language, at different stages students do not have full command of the target language. For some students, their interlanguage continues to change until fluency in the target language is reached; for others, certain language patterns become stabilized in their interlanguage. As Wallace (1988) highlights, the language of a learners can be fluent, still acquiring or fossilized.

It is important for literacy teachers to understand that they can learn a lot about Bridging Students' progress and problems by examining the student's interlanguage. As Hornberger notes, "just as miscues and invented spellings provide clues as to the development of reading and writing, interlanguage provides clues as to the development of the second language" (1994:121). Unlike traditional literacy students, who only need to focus on reading and writing, Bridging Students need to continue developing both their literacy skills and their second language skills. To assist them in both, literacy teachers need strategies for analysing and understanding interlanguage clues.

In particular, Wallace (1988) is an excellent source of information about how important it is for teachers to understand the effects of interlanguage. An example she provides is that in a student's interlanguage, stress and intonation may well be different from the standard language. Therefore, when reading aloud, "stress and intonation will not reliably indicate a second language learner's interpretation of the text" (Wallace, 1988:50), and the problem is that second language pronunciation and intonation differences may be perceived as a lack of oral and reading proficiency by teachers unfamiliar with the development of English second language learners (Miramontes, 1987:148).

Another example is that when teaching reading, if rest and lest are homophones for the second language learner at a certain stage in language learning, then our concern should be not to get him to discriminate...but to be sure that he has not made a meaning confusion (Wallace, 1988:72).

Wallace (1988) goes on to stress that more interlanguage miscues tend to occur when students are reading fluently and with confidence. Thus, it is essential for literacy teachers to interpret such miscues as such, and not to interpret them as poor reading ability or poor comprehension. In other sections of her book, Wallace provides ways of analysing the student's interlanguage and she makes suggestions for constructing effective instructional approaches based on this analysis.

Based on interlanguage studies, and in particular Wallace (1988), it is recommended that literacy teachers be given some training in the effects of students' interlanguages on their language and literacy development. Such information would help teachers to correctly assess Bridging Students' problems, and it would assist teachers in developing effective instructional approaches for these students.

4.2.5 Conclusion of Teacher Training Section and Recommendations

In the latter half of this chapter, the literature and survey data concerning the teacher training needs of literacy programs was presented. It was argued that, first, for literacy programs working with Bridging Students, they should look into ways of recruiting and training more bilingual teachers and tutors. It was then pointed out that more teacher training would also be beneficial. In particular, the areas of cross-cultural awareness, contrastive rhetoric, and interlanguage seem like viable topics for future training materials development.

However, as one literacy coalition worker and one literacy practitioner noted, although teachers request additional training, it is difficult to get them to attend workshops. Incentives may be needed. As Auerbach found "paid time for preparation, professional development, and nonteaching activities" (1992:29) was a key factor to effective literacy program development. Thus, **it is also recommended that teacher training workshops for literacy teachers not only be developed, but also be financially supported within each region.**

In conclusion, all of the recommendations concerning teacher training are restated below.

- It is recommended that literacy programs who serve Bridging Students should actively explore the option of trying to recruit bilingual tutors from the local communities.
 - It is also recommended that literacy teachers working with Bridging Students receive more training in cross-cultural awareness issues. Any teacher training done in this area must avoid the presentation of cultural stereotypes as facts that teachers need to learn, and it must not be based on the assumption that it is only the students who have to adapt. Rather, the training needs to highlight the fact that cross-cultural understanding is a two-way process. Cross-cultural awareness involves having both teachers and students reflect and examine their own cultural biases, assumptions and expectations. Only after this has been done is it possible to discuss cultural differences and commonalities so that cross-cultural understanding can be achieved.
 - With regard to SL research, it is recommended that literacy teachers be given some training about the findings of contrastive rhetoric research. This information would give literacy teachers a broader understanding of how completely culturally determined literacy conventions are. This would in turn help teachers to understand that, when working with Bridging Students, it is essential not to assume that Canadian literacy practices and conventions are in any way transparent.
 - Based on interlanguage studies, and in particular Wallace (1988), it is recommended that literacy teachers be given some training in the effects of students' interlanguages on their language and literacy development. Such information would help teachers to more effectively assess Bridging Students' language difficulties, and it would assist them in developing effective instructional approaches for these students.
 - Finally, it is also recommended that teacher training workshops for literacy teachers not only be developed, but also be financially supported within each region.
-

Chapter 5: Summary and Recommendations

5.1 Survey Data: Concluding Remarks

At the end of each survey, there were questions which allowed for the respondents to make any additional comments. Many of these comments reiterate points that have already been raised in this report, and thus they will not be restated here. (Readers can refer to [Appendix B](#) for the details of their responses.)

However, it does seem worthwhile to present the responses to the question posed to the literacy practitioners, literacy coalitions, and immigrant settlement agencies: "Do you think the issue of Bridging Students is a major or minor concern?"

Four of the eleven literacy practitioners surveyed thought that the issue of Bridging Students was a minor concern. Some of their comments were that they did not have large numbers of Bridging Students, and that as long as federal funding for SL programs continues, it should not be an issue. On the other hand, seven of the eleven respondents thought that it was a major concern. These are some of their comments.

- *Bridging students were neither 'fish nor fowl' and teachers had difficulties placing and referring such students.*
- *There are a number of students who, although born in Canada, were raised in L1 households and have similar problems as Bridging Students.*
- *Meeting both the needs of Bridging Students and Non-Bridging Students in one class is difficult, and it is difficult to group these students together.*
- *Bridging Students have many non-linguistic difficulties, such as dealing with various types of trauma, and tutors are now having to do more counselling, which they are not trained to do.*
- *Bridging Students often attend workplace programs.*
- *It is important to focus on biliteracy, and students need encouragement to maintain or develop their L1 literacy skills while developing TL literacy.*
- *Although there are numerous Bridging Students, funding for them is not seen as a priority.*

Of the six literacy coalition workers who answered the question, three thought the issue of Bridging Students was a growing concern, one thought it was a minor issue, and one thought it was a major issue. Again, below are some of their comments.

- *Coalitions are getting more and more requests for materials to use with Bridging Students.*
- *Literacy programs are avoiding the issue by not accepting students whose first language is not English.*
- *Bridging Students move from program to program without finding any that address their needs.*
- *The main issue for teachers is not teaching Bridging Students, but having to cope with new diverse classrooms.*
- *Bridging Students are a minor concern, but there needs to be more awareness in both fields about the issue of SL literacy and these students' needs.*
- *The mix between Bridging Students and Non-Bridging Students in literacy programs is not always congenial*
- *A major concern is that funders are asking practitioners to make impossible distinctions between SL students and literacy students.*

Finally of the six immigrant settlement agents who responded, five thought that the issue of literacy was a major concern for the communities that they work with, and one thought it was a minor concern. Below are some of their comments.

- *Literacy programming for Bridging Students is a big issue if Canada wants informed citizens.*
- *Literacy is an issue, especially for smaller immigrant communities, women and families.*
- *There are no suitable programs for Bridging Students between the ages of 16 to 20.*
- *There needs to be much more coordination among programs so that students are not shuffled back and forth.*
- *Literacy teachers need more support to work with Bridging Students.*
- *With current funding cutbacks and restructuring, it is likely that gaps in programming will grow.*

Overall, of twenty-three respondents, sixteen thought that the issue of Bridging Students in literacy programs was a major or growing concern. Therefore, the indication from this small sample is that it would certainly be worthwhile looking into appropriate and effective ways of addressing Bridging Students' needs.

5.2 Summary of Findings and Recommendations

This research project aimed to examine the issue of second language learners in literacy programs in Canada by conducting a literature review of the field and by interviewing a number of targeted practitioners. The scope of this study was fairly small, and thus it can only present impressions from the field and suggest areas for future research. To define the target group for the study, the term Bridging Students was selected, and this term was used for students who were not born in Canada, and whose first language is neither French nor English.

The first section of the study examined the national statistics about the number of Bridging Students in Canada and the number in literacy programs. No large scale studies were found that directly addressed this issue. However, based on a number of other studies and on the survey data, it was concluded that the issue of second language literacy in Canada was indeed a pressing one. On the whole, Bridging Students make up approximately one-third of the students attending literacy programs. Based on these findings, the following recommendations were made.

- First, it is recommended that future national literacy surveys incorporate ways of investigating the literacy skills and needs of those individuals who have typically been excluded from these studies because they do not speak one of the official languages.
- Second, it is recommended that, restating Boyd (1991), future research should aim to investigate how the literacy skills of immigrants in their first language, their level of schooling, and their training opportunities in Canada, interact to either facilitate or hinder their ability to acquire sufficient second language literacy. Such data would greatly assist the implementation of more effective literacy programming for these students.

In the second section, questions relating to student pathways, referrals and assessments were explored. Again based on the literature and data, it was found that there are no clearly articulated pathways for Bridging Students and that students do not have enough relevant information available to make informed educational choices. In addition, practitioners are referring Bridging Students to programs based solely on either their L1 literacy levels or on their TL oral abilities. Basing referrals and student placement on such limited data means that they are often not very effective. To address these issues, the following recommendations were made.

- It is recommended that awareness is raised in both the second language and literacy fields about the particular needs of Bridging Students and about the issues surrounding Second Language Literacy.
-

- It is recommended that awareness among literacy practitioners be raised about the necessity of using broader and more in-depth assessment tools when evaluating the abilities and needs of Bridging Students. Such instruments need to include assessment and evaluation of a wide range of variables, including: the learner's goals, their level of target language oracy and literacy, their first language literacy ability, their previous educational experience, their cultural and linguistic background, their previous experience with print, and their age. A recommended assessment tool is An Approach to ESL Literacy Assessment by Klassen and Robinson (1992). Funders need to support the adoption of such tools.
 - It would be useful for practitioners to have a diagnostic instrument for assessing the learning disabilities of Bridging Students.
 - There needs to be a greater exchange of information about programming options, curriculum and entrance criteria between second language practitioners and literacy practitioners.
 - It is recommended that all immigrant students be given access to research findings about the role of L1 literacy and bilingualism, and that all students be given more information about the programming options that exist in their region and how to access these programs.
 - It is recommended that second language and literacy providers within any one region jointly discuss ways of offering Bridging Students a wider range of programming options and ways of more clearly articulating possible student pathways. The provision of both second language training and literacy classes by the same institution tends to lead to greater coordination and clearer student pathways. This option should be considered.
 - Programming and student grouping decisions need to be based on local conditions. Therefore, more community needs assessments targeting specific immigrant groups should be conducted. Such assessments and programming decisions need to take into account: "local patterns of literate language use, the status of minority and majority languages, gender roles, felt needs of learners, learners' existing knowledge of literacy and the second language, their extent of socioeconomic stability, and certain kinds of program supports" (Cumming, 1991:696).
 - Biliteracy and bilingualism should be promoted and encouraged in all literacy programs.
 - Teacher training programs need to incorporate more cross-discipline training between the fields of second language instruction and literacy. For many programs, teachers will need expertise in both fields.
-

- Much more coordination and joint planning is needed at the policy level in provincial and federal governments. Policy level discussions are needed to examine how the fields of second language training and literacy overlap. Funding decisions need to be based on the understanding that these two fields are not distinct, and that it is impossible for programs and practitioners to always make clear cut distinctions about the clients they serve. A more stable funding structure for literacy programming would promote more coordination. Finally, more funding from both fields is needed to support centralized referral agencies, such as the literacy networks.

In the third and final section, ways of assisting literacy teachers who are working with Bridging Students were studied. It was determined that, at the moment, there are very few resources available for literacy teachers working with diverse classes that include Bridging Students. The survey data also suggested that teachers need assistance, and in particular, they need ways of helping Bridging Students with stabilized language patterns. The following recommendations were made.

- It is recommended that more research be done on ways to integrate second language approaches into literacy programs so that teachers can assist Bridging Students while working with heterogeneous classes.
 - Specifically, it is recommended that future research explore the possibility of developing new approaches which assist students to deal with a range of literacies. While accepting the benefits of using the language experience approach with lower levels, new approaches are needed which will move students beyond the realm of narrative literacy. A writing-based approach is recommended.
 - If such a writing-based approach is to be developed, then it is recommended that future research should explore the issues of: providing students with more explicit instruction, focussing students' attention on the written product, building links between the students' understanding of narrative literacy and the realm of organizational literacy, and using genre as the basis for examining texts.
 - It is recommended that literacy programs that serve Bridging Students should actively explore the option of trying to recruit bilingual tutors from the local communities.
 - It is also recommended that literacy teachers working with Bridging Students receive more training in cross-cultural awareness about linguistic and educational issues. Any teacher training done in this area must avoid the presentation of cultural stereotypes as facts that teachers need to learn, and it must not be based on the assumption that it is only the students who have to adapt. Rather, the training needs to highlight the fact that cross-cultural understanding is a two-way process. Cross-cultural awareness involves having both teachers and students reflect and examine their own cultural biases, assumptions and expectations.
-

- With regard to SL research, it is recommended that literacy teachers be given training about the findings of contrastive rhetoric research. This information would give literacy teachers a broader understanding about how completely culturally determined literacy conventions are. This would, in turn, help teachers to understand that, when working with Bridging Students, it is essential not to assume that Canadian literacy practices and conventions are in any way transparent.
- Based on interlanguage studies, and in particular Wallace (1988), it is recommended that literacy teachers be given some training in the effects of students' interlanguages on their language and literacy development. Such information would help teachers to assess Bridging Students' language difficulties more effectively, and it would assist them in developing effective instructional approaches for these students.
- Finally, it is also recommended that teacher training workshops for literacy teachers not only be developed, but also be financially supported within each region.

5.3 Conclusion

In conclusion, the data obtained through both the literature review and the survey instruments indicates that the issue of Bridging Students in literacy programs is a national and growing concern. Awareness about the issues and difficulties that face Bridging Students and their teachers certainly needs to be raised. All interested parties - literacy practitioners, immigrant settlement agents, second language instructors, and the students themselves - need to start discussing these problems and devising solutions for them. In the meantime, since literacy teachers are now having to work with a diverse range of students, they need support. More teacher training needs to be funded and new approaches need to be developed to further assist these instructors.

Appendix A - Contact List

Below is the list of the people interviewed for this project. For ninety percent of the participants, the survey was faxed to them, and then the interviews were conducted either in person or over the telephone. For the remaining ten percent, interviews or discussions were conducted without a formal survey. All data collected informally is indicated with an O (other) in the following appendix.

Dharini Abeysekera - Toronto Alfa Centre, Literacy Program, Toronto

Jill Barber - Metro Toronto Movement for Literacy, Literacy Coalition, Toronto

Shelly Bates - Red River Community College, ESL Program, Winnipeg

Ming Berka - Success, Immigrant Settlement Agency, Vancouver

Barbara Burnaby - Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Toronto

Brian Conway - Ontario Council of Agencies Serving Immigrants, Immigrant Settlement Agency, Toronto

Richard Darville - Carleton University, Ottawa

Grace Eidse - Citizenship and Immigration Canada, Immigrant Settlement Department, Winnipeg

Marlene Gelfand (and colleagues), Carleton Roman Catholic School Board, ESL program, Ottawa

Karen Geraci - LINC Benchmarks Assessment Developer, Toronto

Elma Gerwin - Winnipeg Volunteer Reading Aides, Literacy Program, Winnipeg

Nilambri Ghai - Ottawa-Carleton Coalition of Literacy, Literacy Coalition, Ottawa

Bev Krieger - Kwantlen College, Literacy Program, Langley

Nicole Lachapelle - Regroupement des groupes populaires en alphabétisation du Québec, Literacy Coalition, Montreal

Colette LeCrois - Magie des Lettres, Literacy Program, Ottawa

Maisie Lo - Woodgreen Community Centre, ESL Program, Toronto

Mark McCue - Invegarry Centre, Literacy Program, Vancouver

Linda Mitchell - Literacy BC, Literacy Coalition, Vancouver

Eyob Naizghi - Mosaic, Immigrant Settlement Agency, Vancouver

Joanne Pettis - Manitoba Language Settlement Branch, Immigrant Settlement Branch, Winnipeg

Gary Pharness - Hastings Institute, Literacy Program, Vancouver

Lucilla Pigelblatt - Ottawa-Carleton Immigrant Services, Immigrant Settlement Agency, Ottawa

Manual Pinto - The Canadian Multilingual Literacy Centre, Literacy Program, Toronto

Yvette Rampal - Winnipeg #1 School Division, ESL Program, Winnipeg

Doug Rankin - Ontario Literacy Coalition, Literacy Coalition, Toronto

Joan Robinson - North York Public Libraries, Literacy Program, North York

Marg Rose- Literacy Partners of Manitoba, Literacy Coalition, Winnipeg

Wes Schroeder - Western ESL Services, LINC Assessment Centre, Vancouver

Joy So - Journeys, Literacy Program, Winnipeg

Fatima Sores - Employment Projects for Women, Winnipeg

Lawrie Timberg - Mosaic, ESL Program, Vancouver

Gladys Watson - Alpha Ontario, Literacy Resource Centre, Toronto

Jan Weiten - Vancouver Community College, Literacy Program, Vancouver

Vilma Wright - Harambee Centre, Literacy Program, Toronto

Appendix B - Survey Data

Below is the survey data collected for this project. Four different surveys were developed: one for literacy programs, one for literacy coalitions, one for second language programs and one for immigrant settlement agencies. These surveys were formally administered to twenty-four participants, while nine others participated in an informal survey or discussion. All information garnered through the informal discussions is marked below with an O (other). The numbers in parentheses after each question indicate the sections in the report where the data is discussed.

In order to ensure confidentiality of the participants the following steps were taken. First the data from the other interviews is labeled with a letter only. Also throughout the data 'she' is used as the pronoun, although several men participated. Finally, the cover term SL (second - language) is generally used, instead of making the distinction between ESL and FSL.

Originally, all of the surveys had a question concerning how Bridging Students can get their professional qualifications recognized in Canada. However, half way through the project it was decided that this issue was outside the terms of reference for this project. Although some participants answered these questions, it was not asked to all of the participants and thus the data is not included here.

1) ABE / LITERACY PROGRAM SURVEY

SECTION 1 - Program and Student Details

1) On average how many students (Bridging and Non-Bridging) attend ABE / Literacy classes at your institution? (2.2.1)

A = 165

D = 50 - 60

G = 15 - 20

B = 700

E = 90

H = 60

C = 300

F = 123

I = 140

2) Of these, approximately how many are Bridging Students (first language not English or French no matter how long they have been in Canada and no matter what level of TL skills they have)? (2.2.1)

A = 33% G = 20%-25%

B = 66% H = 9%

C = 60%-65% I = 33%

D = 33%

E = 9%

F = 10%

3) Of the Bridging Students, approximately how many, or what percentage, are: (3.3)

- non-reader/writers in their L1, with very limited oral skills in the TL

A = 1-2%, B= 5%, C = low, D = 0%, E = 0%, F = 0%, H = 0%, I = 0%

- non-reader/writers in their L1, with good or fluent oral skills in the TL

A = 3%, B = 5%, C = 10%, D = 20%, E = 20%, F = 100%, H = 45%, I = 100%

- reader/writers in their L1, with limited oral skills in the TL

A = 25%, B = 75%, C = 5%, D = 10%, E = 0%, F = 0%, H = 0%, I = 0%

- reader/writers in their L1, with good or fluent oral skills in the TL

A = 71%, B = 15%, C = 85%, D = 70%, E = 80%, F = 0%, H = 55%, I = 0%

G, O1 and O3 = answered that they have a mix of students of all types

Note = F and I, did not accept students who had high level literacy skills in their L1, and thus 100% of their students were in the second category.

O2 = Of 1500 immigrants that they served over the last year, about a third had literacy issues, and they had a range of oral skills.

4) Are more Bridging Students attending your program now than in the past? Why do you think this is so? (2.2.1 and 3.1.2)

A = The number is consistently about one-third of the students.

B = Yes, there are more now. The change follows a change in immigration demographics.

C = Yes, there are more now. Again, the change is due to immigration demographics.

D = Yes, there are more now. This is due to cutbacks in SL funding and changes in the job market which now demand more literacy skills.

E = No, there are less now. This program used to accept a variety of SL students, but now they only accept those who wish to work on higher level academic writing skills.

F = Yes, the number is growing.

G = The number is consistently about one quarter of the students.

H = Yes, there are more now. The change follows a change in immigration demographics.

I = The number is consistently about one third of the students.

5) How many or what percentage of the Bridging Students in your program, have been in Canada for a considerable amount of time (as a rough estimate, over five years)? (2.2.1)

A = 75%

D = 80 - 90%

G = 25%

B = 25%

E = 100%

H = NA

C = 70%

F = 80%

I = Most

O1 = 50%

6) Do you find that Bridging Students who have lived in Canada for a considerable period, have any different needs or goals than Non-Bridging Students? Or is it assumed that after such a long time in Canada, their needs and goals are essentially the same as Non-Bridging Students? (3.5.2)

A = Their goals and needs are essentially the same, except that Non-Bridging Students may request things such as Grade 12, which Bridging Students usually don't ask for.

B = Their goals and needs are essentially the same. However, if the students have only been in the country for a short time then they need more acculturation information. If they have been here for a longer period of time, then their goals are to pursue further education. Bridging Students have additional language needs.

C = Their goals and needs are essentially the same. They are all interested in advancing their employment opportunities.

D = Their goals and needs are different. Bridging Students need more work on formal grammar and spelling rules. In general, Bridging Students are already employed and are looking for job advancement. Bridging Students are more interested in upgrading than in basic skills.

E = Their goals and needs are essentially the same. They are all interested in family literacy issues and assisting their children.

F = Their goals and needs are essentially the same. They are all interested in family literacy issues, employment issues and getting qualifications such as the GED.

G = Their goals and needs are essentially the same. They are all interested in employment issues, obtaining basic skills and family literacy issues. However, for the Bridging Students the family literacy issues concern keeping up with their children's second language abilities, whereas Non-Bridging Students are more concerned with keeping up with their children's academic abilities.

H = Their goals and needs are different. Many of their Non-Bridging Students have learning disabilities and progress quite slowly, whereas the Bridging Students progress quite rapidly.

I = Their goals and needs are essentially the same.

O1 = Their goals and needs are essentially the same; they want to improve their performance at work.

O3 = Many Bridging Students do not have much previous formal education and are not literate in their L1. Thus they need more time to learn.

7) In your province, why do you think Bridging Students attend ABE / Literacy programs, instead of ESL or FSL programs? (3.1.2)

A = There is a stigma attached to attending SL programs after having been in the country for a considerable period of time. Students want to integrate with mother-tongue speakers of the language. They no longer want to be seen as immigrants and different.

B = They have either finished LINC classes, or they do not qualify for LINC and they still want to pursue their educational goals.

C = Students like the approach of literacy programs, instead of the SL approach which tends to be very test-based and very grammar-based. Students want to integrate with mother-tongue speakers. Literacy classes are free.

D = Students want one-to-one instruction. They do not think their needs are being met in multi-level SL classes. Students feel there is a stigma attached to attending SL classes and that attending literacy classes has more cache.

E = In terms of their oracy, these students are beyond the most advanced SL classes and they wish to continue working on their writing.

F = These students have high oral skills and low literacy skills and thus they are not accommodated for in most SL programs.

G = There is a stigma attached to attending SL classes after having been in the country for so long. Students want to integrate with mother-tongue speakers.

H = SL programs do not meet the needs of these students. Many SL classes are multi-level and so students feel they are not getting the attention that they need. Students want more one-to-one instruction.

I = Students have achieved high oracy and wish to work on their reading and writing.

O1 = The students have been in the country for a considerable period of time, but now they find that for their jobs they need to improve their literacy skills.

O2 = Traditionally immigrants have obtained work in various 'job ghettos' which required very few language skills. These sectors are now being restructured and these jobs are being eliminated. More jobs now are requiring higher literacy, numeracy and computer literacy skills.

O3 = They are attending their program because they want bilingual support.

8) In general, how would you describe the Bridging Students= = learning goals? Again, are they the same or different from Non-Bridging Students= = learning goals? (3.5.2)

A = They are the same. They want to access further training.

B = They are somewhat different. Bridging Students' primary aim is language development. If they have been in the country for a long time, then their goals are similar to Non-Bridging Students' goals.

C = They are the same. They want to work on basic skills and they want to assist their children.

D = They are essentially the same, though Bridging Students tend to be working at a higher level.

E = They are the same; they want to improve their skills for jobs and qualifications.

F = They are essentially the same. However, Bridging Students have not necessarily had negative educational experiences in the past. More often they have not had the opportunity to learn, and now that they have the opportunity they are quite motivated. Bridging Students also have higher self-esteem and they believe that they will succeed.

G = They are the same; they want to work on their basic skills.

H = They are the same; Bridging Students and Non-Bridging Students work well as a group.

I = They are the same, but learning basic skills for Bridging Students is more challenging.

9) Is there a waiting list for your program? If yes, approximately how long do students have to wait, and is there a greater demand for certain types of classes? (3.2)

A = Yes, it depends on the location.

B = Yes, 6 to 8 weeks to get assessed and then 2 to 3 months for a class. There is a greater waiting list for the Bridging Classes.

C = Yes, up to 4 months, but this is considerably shorter than the waiting list for ESL.

D = Yes, depends on the program location.

E = Yes, from 8 months to a year.

F = Yes, from 2 to 6 months depending on the level of the class.

G = At the moment there isn't, but there is usually a waiting list of 3 to 4 months.

H = Yes, from 3 to 6 months.

I = Yes, but they try to keep it as short as possible by finding a tutor as soon as possible.

10) How are the classes funded (federal or provincial monies, student fees)? Are your classes funded differently from ESL / FSL programs? In your province, do ABE / Literacy programs have to compete with ESL / FSL programs for funding? (3.5.3)

A = It is a combination of federal and provincial funding. There is no competition for funding.

B = It is provincially funded and there is a minimal student fee. Within the school district there is some competition for funding.

C = It is provincially funded. There doesn't seem to be any competition for funding between the fields.

D = It is a combination of federal and provincial funding. There is a small degree of competition.

E = It is a combination of federal, provincial and local funding. There is definitely competition among literacy programs, but there doesn't seem to be much competition with SL programs.

F = It is a combination of federal and provincial funding. There is no competition for funding.

G = It is provincially funded. There is no competition.

H = It is provincially and locally funded. At the local level there is some competition for funding.

I = It is municipally funded. There is no competition with SL programs.

O2 = It is difficult to get funding beyond the pilot stage for many programs, which is a large issue.

O3 = Funding is being cut, which is a large problem.

SECTION 2 - Referral and Assessment Issues

1) In general, how do students find out about the classes at your institution? (3.2)

A = Primarily by word of mouth and referrals within the institution.

B = Through the Continuing Education brochure, word of mouth, and referrals from community organizations.

C = Through brochures and various mailout.

D = Through friends, from more basic SL programs, and from the LEARN campaign.

E = They are referred by social assistance workers, other literacy programs, and they hear about the program by word of mouth.

F = They find out by word of mouth, the LEARN campaign, and through referrals from other agencies.

G = They find out from other students, counseling services, intra-program referrals, the literacy access network and the community newspaper.

H = They find out by word of mouth, from referrals from other colleges, SL programs, and employment programs.

I = They have established a strong community referral network with public health officials, churches, and community groups. They promote the program through the community cable channel and the local literacy network.

2) Are students referred to your program by other agencies? If so, which agencies? (3.2)

A = The Ministry of Education and Training, Employment Insurance and Vocational Rehabilitation agencies refer students.

B = Social Services used to refer a lot of students, but now they tend to be referring all literacy students to community colleges.

C = The Ministry of Social Services, Learning Disabilities agencies, Mental Health agencies and Recovery programs refer students.

D = Unemployment Insurance workers, programs for immigrant women, and the local literacy coalition refer students to their program.

E = Social assistance and workers compensation advisors refer students to their program. Now that the regulations have changed and students have to be attending training programs to receive funding, they are getting more student referrals this way.

F = Social services, assessment centres, and community groups refer students to their program.

G = Women's shelters, the Children's Aid society, group homes, social insurance workers all refer students to their program.

H = Social workers, and employment agencies refer students to their program.

I = Social services' workers and corrections officials refer students to their program.

3) Is the assessment of the students' language abilities done at your institution, or are they assessed and referred by a different agency? (3.3)

A = Except for external tests such as the TOEFL, all assessment is done on-site.

B = On-site.

C = On-site.

D = On-site.

E = On-site.

F = They offer both literacy and SL programs and the SL LINC assessment is done by a central LINC assessment centre. The literacy assessment is done on-site.

G = Agencies informally establish that some form of upgrading is needed before the students are referred to them. Then assessment is done on-site.

H = On-site

I = On-site

4) For on-site assessment what tool does your institution use (i.e. an in-house test, TABE)?

Does this tool assess both the student's TL literacy and TL oral skills?

Do you assess the student's L1 literacy skills? If so, how?

What other information do you use to place students in classes? (3.3)

A = It is an in-house test, but they also use the CAAT, and WRAP word recognition tests. The test contains sections in auditory vocabulary, word recognition, spelling and writing. They only formally assess TL literacy skills. L1 literacy skills are assessed through an assessment interview.

B = It is an in-house assessment. If students need to work on very basic literacy skills they are placed in one level (both Non-Bridging and Bridging students together). If they are low intermediate speakers of the TL, then there are placed in classes which concentrate on oral skills. If they have higher oral skills then they are placed at the third level which focuses mainly on writing.

C = They use an in-house test which assesses the student's TL oral and literacy skills. The only way they assess L1 literacy is through the interview, by asking about the student's educational background. They also use scheduling considerations and student preferences about working in a group or one-to-one to place students.

D = It is an in-house assessment, that assesses both the TL literacy and TL oral skills. L1 literacy is assessed through an interview (what grade level, what they can do in first language). Other information that they use concerns support issues, such as the time of day and location desired, and whether a male or female tutor is wanted. Bridging Students tend to want a more formal approach. Ex-teacher tutors suit the Bridging Students' learning styles, which seem to differ from Non-Bridging Students who want a less formal approach.

E = They use the ABLE test and occasionally the READ test, plus the GED for assessment. They also conduct interviews to determine the students' oral skills and to roughly assess their L1 literacy skills. They would be interested in knowing about other ways to assess L1 literacy.

F = When students first arrive, then they spend 2 weeks with an assessor in a "welcome class." During these two weeks, the assessor works with the students to establish goals. They are interviewed about L1 literacy skills and translators are available to assist. They do a lot of work identifying students' specific goals and preferred ways of learning.

G = They mainly assess students' needs and goals through a formal / informal interview. After the students have registered, a series of reviews are done to assess appropriate levels for students.

H = They assess the students' TL written and oral skills in an interview. They do not formally assess L1 literacy skills, but they ask about previous education levels.

I = First the person must first contact them to make an appointment (if they have difficulty communicating or ask for SL, then they are automatically referred elsewhere. If they request work on conversation, they are also referred elsewhere). Then in an initial interview they assess if students are motivated, self-directed and can make the commitment. They do not assess L1 literacy, though they would ask them their level of education.

O1 = She uses peer assessment for assessing L1 literacy. That is another student, from the same language background, will help to assess the new students' ability to read and write in their L1. level of education.

O3 = They use sight words in the L1 and they ask their students to write their names and addresses in their L1. They also ask them to write whatever they can in either their L1 or the TL. However, they need a better tool to assess L1 literacy. They have mentioned this to the Benchmarks committee.

5) Does your program ever use miscue analysis for assessment purposes? (3.3)

A = No.

B = No, not formally.

C = Yes, but not formally.

D = Sometimes they do.

E = Rarely.

F = The assessor uses a range of assessment approaches.

G = Yes, as part of the review process.

H = No.

I = No.

6) Does your program have a way of assessing whether or not students have a learning disability? If yes, are any adjustments made to this assessment for Bridging Students? If no, is the assessment of learning disabilities of Bridging Students an important issue for your program? (3.3)

A = If a student has a large discrepancy amongst various test scores or skills, or if their test results seem abnormal in some way, then they are referred to the on-site Learning Specialist. The issue of learning in a second language does seem to mask some learning disabilities, but the best way to assess such problems is by working with the student over a period of time.

B = No, they are not formally assessed and they have little or no information on how to deal with these issues. More information would be useful.

C = Once the students are in the program and a teacher then notices problems, they will then refer them to a learning disabilities specialist. This is definitely a concern with Bridging Students, as often when these students are referred to the specialist, they do not assess them (assuming that their difficulties are caused by language issues). It is very frustrating, as some students never seem to get beyond certain stages.

D = Yes, they have a tool to assess learning disabilities, but they find it hard to use with Bridging Students. This is because it is difficult to separate out the L2 issues from any potential LD issues. Usually tutors can spot LD difficulties along the way and then probe the students (for example, do you have trouble with letter reversal in your L1). Sometimes parts of the LD assessment is given to Bridging Students and parts of it work okay. If possible, they would like a better tool which could discriminate between L2 and LD issues.

E = If it is highly apparent that something is going on, then they ask an outside specialist to come in to assess the student. However, she feels that it is not a huge issue, and that it is too easy to use LD as just a label. If the student has been labeled as LD in the past, then they will discuss it. They still could use more training in this issue.

F = She thinks literacy students in general have been over tested and she resists testing them any more. She finds that most students can self-identify learning problems and preferred styles. They know they are LD, and they don't need to be tested again. Teachers should observe the students and adjust their teaching to students' preferences.

G = Identification of LD is done through observation by the teachers working with the students. Then they consult with qualified teachers or counselors. It is important that the tutor needs to be sensitive to this issue.

H = They have an assessment tool for LD, but teachers don't feel proficient to use it and so students are usually referred out to a specialist.

I = She feels that the label is irrelevant, and she is not interested in testing these students again. It is up to the student to tell their tutors what their experience has been and if they have been tested elsewhere. If they have, then the tutor discusses this with the student and devises appropriate teaching strategies.

**7) Do you ever refer students to a local ESL / FSL program? Why or why not?
(3.2)**

A = Yes, if they have a low auditory vocabulary or a low listening score on the intake assessment. Within the institution they have set certain assessment criteria for listening skills which determines whether or not they are referred to SL or literacy.

B = Yes, especially if they have low oral skills and low writing skills.

C = Yes, definitely if they are not fluent enough. They have an assessment tool for evaluating fluency, though in general the standard is that the students have to be able to understand and participate in a conversation at a pretty normal pace.

D = Yes, if they do not have enough tutors and they also refer them to SL programs if their oral skills are low.

E = Yes, they refer those students with low oral skills.

F = They offer SL at their institution and students are placed there first if their oral skills are low.

G = Sometimes they do and this is mostly when there are access issues (i.e. they live too far from their program). However, many students are not comfortable in an SL situation.

H = Yes, they refer students to the local school board programs if their oral skills are low.

I = Yes, if students say that language development is their priority, or if they have trouble communicating on the telephone, then they are referred to SL programs.

8) Is there any coordination in your province between providers of language instruction (ESL / FSL) and providers of ABE / Literacy instruction? What type (conferences together, discussions between the professional associations, shared professional development)? (3.5.3)

A = At the ministry level there is some coordination and at the school board level there is some coordination. The rest is rather informal; many ABE teachers attend ESL conferences, though not many ESL teachers attend ABE conferences.

B = There is some informal coordination in the fact that teachers from the two disciplines attend each others conferences. However, there is little coordination between the departments. ABE instructors seem resistant to change to accommodate second language speakers and more work in this area would be useful.

C = There isn't any formal coordination, but there is a lot of discussion among SL and Literacy teachers within the institution. Sometimes there are common professional development days.

D = There is certainly not enough coordination. Some attempts have been made in the past (i.e. shared PD, and mutual conferences). Now there is not any coordination on a formal basis, though there is more informal sharing of information.

E = She is not aware of any. At previous literacy conferences there used to be quite a few SL workshops, but recently there have been fewer. There are some new employment programs which are covering the gap between the two fields a bit more.

F = They work with the other ABE and SL programs in the area and there is a lot of coordination as there are only three in the whole area.

G = She is not aware of any formal coordination. There is a community literacy planning process and they sometimes talk about the overlaps between ABE and SL.

H = So far there hasn't been any coordination. At the school board level there is some discussion of mutual issues and sometimes there are shared professional development sessions. However, the coordination doesn't work very well.

I = The literacy access network's guide lists SL programs. However, there is no formal coordination as the different ministries. In the libraries there are joint collections and some overlapping professional development is offered. She also thinks that there are no grey areas between the two fields. She feels that SL programs deal solely with language development and literacy programs deal solely with reading and writing development.

SECTION 3 - Programming and Curriculum Issues

1) Is your program primarily self-access, class-based, or one-to-one tutoring? (3.5.2)

A = It is both class-based and one-to-one. There are group lessons and also tutors.

B = Depends on the level.

C = It is both self-access and class-based. Students with learning disabilities might get one-to-one tutoring.

D = It is one-to-one tutoring.

E = It is mainly one-to-one, with some class-based worked around that.

F = It is class-based and one-to-one tutoring.

G = It is a combination of class-based work and one-to-one tutoring. Students come together for group discussions a couple times a week, and the rest of the time they work in small groups or on their own learning plans.

H = It is small group based and one-to-one tutoring.

I = They offer one-to-one tutoring.

O1 = It is class-based and this is integral to the program.

2) If it is class-based, are Bridging and Non-Bridging Students usually in the same classes? Are there ever any classes specifically for Bridging Students? (3.5.2)

A = They are usually in the same classes. There are occasionally specific classes for Bridging Students for things like pronunciation and grammar. Ideally, there would be more opportunities to have classes specifically for Bridging Students.

B = At the lower basic skills level the students are mixed. At the other two levels the classes are entirely Bridging Students.

C = They are usually in the same class. At their institution there is a special class for Bridging Students, which is taught jointly between the ESL and Literacy departments. This Bridging Class is designed for students who are quite fluent in English, but who need more work on grammar issues than Non-Bridging Students.

D = They used to run a special class for Bridging Students, but they found it difficult to find an appropriate time to run it. They did find that dialogue journals worked well with this group, especially for sharing cultural differences.

E = The students work all together in one group.

F = All of the students are in the same class and she believes this is important to promote integration.

G = Sometimes they work together and sometimes they are in separate groups.

H = All students work together in small groups. They can't put all the Bridging Students together, as they are at different levels. However, sometimes there is some tension in group dynamics amongst different groups.

I = NA

O1 = All students are together in one class and this is important so as to discourage 'ghettoizing'. Within the class, students are actively discouraged from forming sub-groups. The more advanced students are told that they have an obligation to help the other students. Although some students do not like being in the same class as newer immigrants, it is important for these students to mix with other students. Although SL classes do give new immigrants important information, it also ghettoizes them, by having them not mix with other Canadians.

3) Do you have access to any materials or curriculums developed specifically for Bridging Students' needs?

If yes, do you know of any particularly good materials or curriculums which have been developed? (4.1.3)

A = No, but they would love to have some.

B = No, teachers pick and choose amongst literacy and SL materials and develop a lot of their own materials.

C = There is a new book by Lyn Lennig and Don Richardson called A Guide for Using Theme Units with an ABE / ESL Literacy Class (1996) which is very good. Global Stories for People Working for Change, Children and Danger (Dragmen and Szasz), and Coast to Coast Reader (Acosta) are all recommended.

D = General ESL material is used. Jill Bell's multilevel book is recommended. Also she recommends the Challenger series (which has lots of new vocabulary and idioms), Picture Dictionaries (Bridging Students seem to love dictionaries), Oxford Learner's Dictionary (she likes it with both Bridging Students and Non Bridging Students) and dialogue journals. She would like to see more packages of materials developed that include: good ways to teach verb endings, CVC spelling rules, idioms, and methods for teaching articles and difficult grammar. She also likes the book Bare Essentials, which is a Canadian based grammar book.

E = They have to adapt materials. She recommends: Spelling Words for Writing, which seems to work well with EAP students and Math Master 1, which offers instruction is at the students' literacy level.

F = She doesn't feel that Bridging Students need any special materials. They use a theme approach, which includes cultural information about such things as health care, Canada etc. Non-Bridging Students also need this information. They use lots of everyday materials.

G = They either adapt ESL material or ABE materials.

H = They occasionally look at ESL materials. She recommends: Pregnancy and Childbirth an ESL guide by Teresa Grellette (ed) and Making Connections by Canadian Labour for Women.

I = She feels it is difficult to get good current and up-to-date materials. Teachers need materials to help Bridging Students with vocabulary, prepositions, idioms, spelling, and life skills. She recommends: the new Canadian version of the Oxford Picture Dictionary, the Gage Canadian Intermediate Dictionary. With regard to software she recommends: English Express, Perfect Copy and a CD-rom encyclopedia.

O1 = No, as her entire approach is based on student's writings. However, she also recommends using literature from the student's country of origin. In this way the student is given a greater opportunity to bring what they know about their culture to the text.

O3 = They are currently working on developing a curriculum for mother tongue literacy programs.

4) In your program are there any materials, curriculums, or assistance for Bridging Students who want to transfer their professional credentials to Canada? Again, if yes, do you know of any particularly good materials or curriculums?
(Question Eliminated)

SECTION 4 - Approaches

1) In general, what are the main approaches used by your program for all students (ie. LEA, sight words, phonics, process writing etc.)? (4.1.3)

A = A great variety of approaches are used depending on the students. They use intense systematic phonics, audio tutorials, oral reading, process writing, and work on discrete skills. Basically it is an eclectic approach.

B = They use a great mix of different approaches and techniques depending on the students. They primarily concentrate on starting from students' experiences and working on communication.

C = They use a mixture of approaches, but especially LEA, process writing and group work.

D = They use whatever works and they use a learning styles assessment to help guide the tutors.

E = They use all of the approaches that were mentioned above, plus discussions and journals.

F = They use anything that works, and this depends on the learners' goals and preferred learning styles.

G = They use most of the approaches mentioned above. Any approach used must account for the fact that the students are adults, that they come from a different culture and that they are learning in a second language.

H = They use a very learner-centred approach especially at the basic levels. Overall, it is rather eclectic, and they tend to treat phonics with care. In the higher class (roughly grade 3 to 6), then they incorporate more work on basic grammar and writing at the paragraph level.

I = They use multiple approaches depending on the students' goals. They use approaches which focus on meaning.

O1 = It is an approach based on the students' writing. The students write in the class, negotiate the texts with the teachers, the text is typed, and then it is read and discussed in the group. She has found that as the students writing improves, their language improves. Also this approach means that students' are always starting from what they know.

2) Are any changes made to these approaches to accommodate the particular needs of Bridging Students? Can you give some examples of these changes? (4.1.3)

A = The curriculum is always learner-centred, so changes are made for each individual student.

B = Yes, they have definitely had to change their approaches with the great influx of second language speakers. Their program used to use a one-to-one approach and now they are running a class-based program. There is a lot more class work now and for example group LEA, instead of working with tutors.

C = Changes haven't been made to the approach.

D = The approach used depends on the student's goals. With Bridging Students they usually want more grammar, vocabulary, spelling and pronunciation. She also felt that tutors need to be more aware of how they speak (gave example of students spelling 'little' as 'liddle').

E = They do not really change their approach, but they always use the students' experiences as the basis for instruction.

F = They do not make any changes.

G = In general they use LEA quite a bit, as people on the whole like it when interest is shown in them. They haven't made that many changes to the approaches, though they do some specialized work on phonics (i.e. P/B differences with Arab speakers).

H = They do not make any changes in the group situation. However they are sensitive to cultural differences, and they try to bring in students experiences. Really, there is no different treatment and no need for it. The traditional population that they work with has many of the same problems (i.e. they have difference between their dialect and the standard language). With lower level students they start with LEA, and if they need to then they introduce formal grammar.

I = Teaching writing is more challenging with Bridging Students.

O1 = For this approach to work, teachers need to engage with their students and be open to their experiences and cultures. Teachers need to think about what they are doing and why. They need to be aware of the students' backgrounds and build on this foundation. Bridging Students also need to be encouraged and challenged to build a new life in Canada. That is, now that they have reached a level where they can cope in Canada, they need to be pushed to carry on with their goals. Also, it is important that Bridging Students have the opportunity to bring what they know in their L1 into the TL. The bridge between the two cultures should be in both directions.

O2 = An integrated approach with a heterogeneous group works the best. If students are isolated into homogeneous sub-groups, they cannot establish the necessary networks that they need.

3) Do you feel that the approaches being used in your program adequately address the needs of Bridging Students or do you think teacher training in additional approaches would be useful? (4.2.2)

A = The approaches are not really meeting these students' needs and more teacher training would be useful.

B = Yes, somewhat. They are always looking for new ways of doing things. They have been accommodating second language speakers for quite some time, so they feel much more comfortable now working with these students. Many of the teachers have sought out additional training in ESL approaches and this information has been useful.

C = Yes, but any kind of additional training in this area would be useful.

D = More approaches are always useful and whatever they do never seems adequate enough.

E = She thinks that they do meet these students' needs. However, if there were more approaches or materials, they would be helpful. The feedback from this group is usually favourable.

F = She thinks they do address their needs, but overall more teacher training in additional approaches would be useful. She would like to see more approaches in : how to build self-esteem, how to animate a group and group dynamic issues, how to better establish learner goals, and non-negative evaluation methods.

G = She thinks that they do meet their needs, but there is always room for improvement and they are always interested in training.

H = She would like more information and training on LD issues.

I = Train-the-trainer material for those working with SL Literacy students would be useful.

O2 = A manual on a cross-cultural, participatory approach would be useful.

4) Do the classes include any discussion about cross-cultural language awareness issues:

-for example, comparing the literacy practices of the students in their L1 and TL, discussing issues about bilingualism, analyzing different cultural approaches to education/learning? (4.1.3)

A = This is not explicitly dealt with and more information or awareness of these issues would be useful for teachers.

B = Yes, definitely. They are always encouraging the students to think about their learning.

C = On a very general level, for example they discuss different cultures and things like different holidays.

D = Yes, these things usually emerge in the discussions with the tutors, (i.e. discussions about how it wasn't important for girls to get an education). There is cross-cultural sensitivity training given to tutors during training.

E = They do this at in a very general way, but nothing specific to language awareness. Issues are discussed on an individual basis.

F = This is done mainly in the SL section of the program, but with the mix of students they do inform each other about cultural differences.

G = Yes, they discuss different cultural approaches to learning. They have a lot of women students, and they discuss why they didn't get an education, and issues around raising children, and their reluctance to use their L1.

H = In small groups, they bring it up in discussions. However, sometimes students don't want to talk about cultural differences, and they want to concentrate on what is done in Canada.

I = No.

5) When teaching reading, do the teachers do any work on the cultural background knowledge necessary to understand a text? Do they do any work concerning schemas and genres? (4.1.3)

A = Yes, this is done for all students.

B = Some teachers do and some don't. It is done on a rather informal basis and they would be interested in more formal materials.

C = Yes, they do some of this. Though teachers try to avoid the "what do you do in your country" type of questions as this alienates the Non-Bridging students. They want to make sure that the Non-Bridging students feel they are included.

D = Yes, they do work on cultural background knowledge and they touch on schemas and genres.

E = Yes, they do this with all students.

F = Most teachers at her program are immigrants themselves so they are aware of these issues.

G = Yes, they bring up this information in pre-reading tasks. She feels that Bridging Students have been in the country long enough that they don't need work on schemas.

H = If necessary, yes, they deal with this information. Again, she feels that if they have high oral skills then working on schemas is not important and she feels that any work on genres is too high for the level of their students.

I = The students choose texts that they are interested in, which she feels will give them enough information to begin with. The tutors do some work on forecasting and prediction. In general, tutors are not trained in these areas. The students are to read for meaning and the volunteers are told it is not their job to interpret the material. They do some work on genres when teaching writing. However, overall they use an active writing technique in which they encourage students to envision themselves in different circumstances. They also encourage them to write about their emotions.

O1 = With regard to genres and writing, teachers need to push and encourage students to try new genres. Students need to be challenged to move onto different topics, different sentence constructions and different genres. This is also a matter of changing teacher's expectations. To call the student's texts "student writing" is to devalue it. It is writing and teachers should evaluate it as such. This means that the students need to be actively encouraged to expand their writing range.

6) How much emphasis do teachers place on building students' vocabulary skills? (4.1.3)

A = A fair amount of emphasis is placed on vocabulary and at certain locations there are specific student groups to work on vocabulary issues. Students are encouraged to keep personal vocabulary logs and the teachers do a lot of work on things such as word roots and affixes.

B = Vocabulary skills are emphasized in all of the reading and writing tasks and students are quite interested to work on this area.

C = A lot of work is done on vocabulary for all students.

D = Teachers put a great deal of emphasis on vocabulary, though usually the teachers deal with it as it comes up. She feels the Non-Bridging Students need more work on vocabulary, as they do not have the same level of world knowledge that many educated Bridging Students already have. She would like an annotated bibliography of texts to use.

E = They do a lot of vocabulary work with all students.

F = They do a lot of work on vocabulary and it is usually the starting point for most of their theme units.

G = They do an adequate amount in class, and because the students are self-motivated they are not afraid to ask when they come across new words.

H = Yes, they do a lot with all students.

I = Yes, they do a lot with all students.

7) When teaching writing, do the teachers do any work on cross-cultural approaches:

- for example, on contrastive rhetoric (i.e. how different cultures use print), discussing the reader-writer expectations in different cultures? (4.1.3)

A = No, not much is done on this.

B = Informally this is discussed.

C = No, not really.

D = Some teachers do, and some don't.

E = These issues are discussed in general way, but they do not have any information on L1/ L2 differences.

F = This is covered in SL section of their program.

G = Yes, they do a lot on the differences between speaking and writing.

H = She feels that by the time they are in their program, the students don't need work on this.

I = No

8) Do you find that the Bridging Students = = oral skills influence or affect their TL reading and writing skills? How would you describe this influence and what, if any, approaches do you use to assist the students with these issues? (4.1.3)

A = Yes, their oral skills definitely affect their writing skills. These students write exactly how they speak. They offer various grammar classes and also concentrate on proof-reading and peer-editing which are useful.

B = Yes, students have many fossilized errors which affect their writing. Many of the students need to work on their pronunciation skills. This is a very difficult area to make progress in.

C = Yes, very much so. These students have a lot of fossilized grammar patterns. Occasionally teachers will refer students to grammar exercises, but this doesn't seem to help very much. It is a very frustrating topic and any materials or information on this would be very useful.

D = Yes, of course. The students are not pronouncing or hearing certain sounds. To deal with this a variety of approaches are used, including doing lots more listening, modeling on a tape recording, and using books on tape. Fossilized errors in speech affect the students' writing and though she realizes this is important, she is not sure how to cope with this. She finds students are not eager writers, but when they come to publish their stories, they want to have it right.

E = Yes, of course. Bridging Students have different approaches to reading (i.e. literal readers). Also, their interlanguage causes problems when writing. The teachers do some grammar work in one-to-one sessions and some do some pronunciation work when needed.

F = She feels that Bridging Students pick up very fast, faster than traditional students, and that they are not having any more difficulties with writing.

G = To an extent they pick up a lot of slang, and this comes out in their writing. Also students have difficulties with the differences between graphic and phonic realizations. Teachers emphasize the difference between written and verbal and the difference between languages. Bridging Students need assistance with articles.

H = Accent is an issue with all students, as they feel they need to fit into the mainstream. If they can be understood, then teachers don't focus on this. However, it does cause some interference and the level of impact seems to depend on the students level.

I = Yes of course. If students are not fluent and they need to develop language skills, then the tutors adjust the task for them. However it depends on the aims of the task. If it is a personal narrative, then the tutors don't worry about interlanguage. If it is more technical writing, then they work on this. However, she feels things published in dialect have greater verisimilitude, relevance, power, and validity.

O1 = Yes, but as the students' writing improves, their oral skills also improve. Through concentrating on writing, some of these stabilized patterns can be changed.

SECTION 5 - Teachers , Tutors and Training

1) How many of the teachers are bilingual in the students L1 (i.e. not bilingual in French/English, but for example, bilingual in Spanish / English, or Spanish / French)? (4.2.1)

A = None.

B = Some are.

C = None

D = NA

E = None

F = Yes, some.

G = None - some in the past.

H = None

I = None

**2) If your program uses tutors, how many of them are bilingual in the students L1?
(4.2.1)**

A = None.

B = Some are.

C = None

D = 4 or 5 bilingual tutors

E = Some are - about one third.

F = Some are.

G = None.

H = None.

I = None.

**3) Do you attempt to recruit tutors from the Bridging Students' communities?
Why or Why not? (4.2.1)**

A = The tutors are all volunteers and so no specific communities are targeted in recruitment.

B = Yes, they encourage former students to come back and be tutors or teachers' assistants.

C = No, but they are setting up a peer-tutoring program with the SL department.

D = Not usually. because the students usually say that they do not want L1 tutors, as then they will speak in the L1 with them. It is good if tutors have some cultural knowledge of student's country.

E = They haven't purposefully targeted this group, though three of their current tutors are second language speakers.

F = Yes, and it is very successful, as it is good for the students to have a model of people from their communities working as teachers or tutors.

G = No, not specifically, as they have found it difficult to recruit from the community. Most people are trying to get established and don't have much free time to spare

H = Yes, they do outreach in the community, and about one third of the tutors are from there.

I = None

4) Do the teachers / tutors at your program receive any cross-cultural awareness training? Do you think such training would be useful? (4.2.2)

A = Occasionally there have been some professional development sessions on these issues, but more training would be useful.

B = Some workshops have been given, but more training would be useful.

C = Once in a while there are professional day sessions on things like being sensitive to cultural differences.

D = Yes, they get some initial training and tutors become pretty sensitive, pretty quickly.

E = There are occasional workshops and, of course, training is useful. However, a lot of times this training is quite general (i.e. cultural stereotypes) which is not so useful. It is good for teachers to have this information at the front of their minds.

F = Since many of their teachers are immigrants, they don't need as much training in this area. The teachers help tutors with these issues during on the job training.

G = Yes and its useful.

H = They do some general training on things such as discrimination, racism and ageism. She feels that it is necessary, but its usefulness is hard to judge.

I = They screen volunteers on cultural tolerance issues and give extensive orientation on discrimination issues. They also do learner orientation sessions about anti-harassment and anti-discrimination. More training would probably be good.

O1 = Some cross cultural information is useful, but a lot of it is about stereotypes, which is not at all useful.

5) Do the teachers / tutors at your program receive any training in ESL / FSL teaching approaches? Do you think such training would be useful? (4.2.2)

A = Some of the teachers do have a SL teaching background, but there is no professional development on this topic. Training in this area would be useful.

B = Teachers have sought out additional training on their own, but the school board has not funded any re-training.

C = Many teachers take courses on their own time, but more training would be useful.

D = Yes, some have received training and some teachers attend extra classes. The province has offered some training in this area. Overall, she feels that the training is out there, but they are having trouble getting teachers to attend.

E = One of their teachers has an SL background. It would be useful if they were dealing with SL students, but she doesn't consider their students as falling in this group. She feels Bridging Students have more in common with literacy students than with SL students.

F = Yes, since they have SL programs in the same building, there is a lot of cross-over. Teachers have staff meetings together and discuss mutual issues.

G = She did a certificate in SL, but she didn't think it was that useful. She would like to have more emphasis on cross-cultural issues and sensitivity training.

H = About one third of the teachers already have SL training. Yes it is useful, as there is a lot of overlap between the two fields.

I = No they don't receive any training, but she is very interested in ways to help the tutors deal with these issues. More training materials would be wonderful.

SECTION 6 - The Current Situation and Future Directions

1) Overall is the issue of Bridging Students in your program a major or minor concern? Why? (5.1)

A = It is a major concern, because these students are "neither fish nor fowl" and teachers have a hard time placing them in programs. Also there are numerous 'latent' Bridging Students who had their schooling in Canada, but who have maintained their L1 at home. These students speak a variation of English, which interferes with their writing skills and academic success.

B = Although they don't feel as desperate as they did several years ago when they first started accepting many more Bridging Students, this issue is still a major concern. They are still concerned with adequately addressing these students' needs and they are also concerned about still addressing the Non-Bridging Students' needs. Meeting both groups' needs is challenging.

C = It is a fairly major issue as there are many more Bridging Students now. Sometimes the groups don't work well together and this is problematic. This usually happens when the Bridging Students are quite educated in their own country. The mix of education level sets up different expectations about pace and content of the course which can cause conflicts.

D = It is a major concern because there are increasing numbers of Bridging students. Also, these students are motivated and stay in the programs longer. One big problem is that students want to adopt their tutors and tutors need help coping with this issue. Tutors need guidance on how to draw the line between being a counselor and a tutor. Tutors do have lists of where to send students for additional counseling, but Bridging Students tend to want more attention than Non-Bridging Students. She is worried especially about tutors dealing with women who are trying to become more independent, against their husbands' wishes.

E = It is a minor concern, as they don't have huge numbers of Bridging Students.

F = As long as the federal government continues to finance the SL section of their program, and there is funding available, then it is not a major issue.

G = It is a minor concern. The learners themselves are not a problem, as they are very motivated and consistent attenders. Teachers just accommodate whatever learners there are.

H = It is a minor concern. Though this situation may change with funding cutbacks and changes in demographics.

I = About one third of their students are Bridging Students, so it is a substantial concern.

O1 = It is especially important in workplace situations. However, many more of the recent immigrants tend to have higher levels of L1 literacy. Still is important to focus on biliteracy. Students need to be encouraged to maintain or develop their L1 literacy, while developing the TL literacy.

O3 = It is a major issue for the population that they serve. However, this target group does not seem to be a priority in terms of funding.

2) If it is rather a major issue, what do you think could be done to assist literacy program providers and teachers? (5.1)

A = More in-service training for teachers in this area would be the most beneficial.

B = The best approach would be to set up a mentoring program in which experienced SL teachers would come and work closely with the teachers in their program. In this way the teachers could observe and understand how SL approaches are used and work. This is a better approach than presenting information through workshops.

C = More training would be useful. Teachers need materials they can use in the classroom. Also teachers need to discuss where to refer these students after attending literacy classes. Often when they are referred to ABE classes, they are rejected because of their writing skills.

D = Basically, they need separate classes to deal with these students or separate programs for them. She feels literacy programs are trying to be all things, to all people, and it isn't working.

E = NA

F = NA

G = NA

H = NA

I = Train-the-trainer material on cross-cultural issues and approaches to writing would be useful.

O3 = Teachers need to understand the influence and importance of first language literacy, when students are trying to become literate in a second language. For many students, working with both languages when starting is essential.

3) Do you feel that in order to assist the Bridging Students in your program, teachers would benefit from additional training? If so, what form would you like this training to take (i.e. workshops, a distance education package, a curriculum, packages of materials)? (4.2)

A = Yes definitely. A curriculum or package of materials would be useful.

B = Yes. Any materials that are developed should include advocacy training for the students, so that they can start lobbying for themselves.

C = Yes, materials that the teachers can actually use in class.

D = Although she feels these students should be in separate programs, given that they aren't, she thinks teachers could benefit from curriculum and materials. She is not advocating additional training, as it is difficult to get tutors to attend training sessions.

E = More training is always beneficial and packages of materials would be useful.

F = Yes, more training would be useful, but not in the area of teaching Bridging Students. More essential material would be workshops in the differences between teaching children and adults and those mentioned above in Section 4.3.

G = She is not aware of any materials geared to these students and such materials would be useful. Since the literacy movement itself is quite young, and just getting materials together, now is the appropriate time to analyze students' needs more specifically and to gear materials to their needs.

H = A curriculum would be useful. They need materials that tutors can use. It needs to be flexible.

I = Train the trainer material on cross-cultural issues and writing approaches would be useful.

4) Do you think it is worthwhile trying to establish better links between the ABE / Literacy and ESL / FSL programs in your area? If so, how would you recommend doing this? (3.5.3)

A = Yes, but she doesn't know how. More networking opportunities would be useful.

B = Yes, definitely. People need to start talking informally about these issues. Teachers should be encouraged to meet together to discuss these issues and they need to be compensated for doing so. These groups could then be given some cross-cultural training and then they could meet again later to discuss the changes in the field. This is especially important for ABE teachers.

C = Yes, it might be a good idea. Allowing instructors to get together to network and exchange ideas would be useful.

D = She's not sure how useful this would be. She would be interested in knowing exactly what SL teachers are offering in their classes and what students get. This would give her a better idea about what they have done, when they come to her program.

E = Certainly better referrals would be useful.

F = She thinks it is best if the administrators stay out of it and let the teachers do the networking and peer training.

G = Yes, it would be good, but she doesn't know it would be done, maybe some joint meetings, or a newsletter.

H = Yes, she thinks it would be useful. There is some local movement at the school board level in this direction.

I = The Ministry of Education and Training is mandating a literacy planning process at moment. She doesn't think another alliance would be useful. She feels the two fields are distinct and that the literacy access guide provides a clear enough picture for referrals.

O3 = In both fields, awareness about L1 literacy and its effects on TL literacy needs to be raised.

5) Are there any other comments you would like to make regarding Bridging Students in your program? (throughout report)

A = No

B = No

C = The demographics have changed dramatically and teachers are constantly commenting about these changes.

D = For some students, it is okay that they are in the same program with traditional literacy students, but overall she really feels that they should have separate programs. They have very different needs and their social backgrounds are very different. The issue of social background can become an issue for some tutors (i.e. why am I tutoring this student if they can afford to pay).

E = The issue of transferring credentials is very important, as the whole process is ludicrous and causes undue stress for students.

F = They have tons of SL material, but more teacher training on general literacy issues would be useful. They have worked very hard to establish the program that they have and it works very well. They have all of the courses under the same roof (4 levels of SL and 6 levels of ABE). This gives the students a sense of continuity and community. They then gently transfer students out of the program, encouraging them to take one course in the morning at a different institute, but they can still return in the afternoon.

G = She would like to reiterate, that she thinks programs should accommodate all different kinds of learners and learners with different types of needs. The mix makes the class dynamic and learners learn from each other.

H = The Ministry is into streamlining and providing a seamless system. However, SL and Literacy are not entirely the same, and she fears they will be lumped together.

I = If students have good reading skills in their L1, they need different programs. She doesn't advocate returning to mother-tongue model either. She thinks an annotated bibliography of resources would be useful. Also she would really like to see the Ontario Times back in print. The Ministry cut this program, without even asking programs if they would mind paying for it.

O1 = It is dangerous for any of us to think that we know the language. Language development is a continuous process, and the image of a continuum is a valid and important one, not just for students.

6) Are there any other questions or concerns you have about this survey and project?

No additional comments.

2) LITERACY PRACTITIONERS ASSOCIATION SURVEY

SURVEY QUESTIONS

1) Are more Bridging Students attending your provincial literacy programs now than in the past? Why do you think this is so? (2.2.1 and 3.1.2)

A = No statistics are kept on this issue. In general, she thinks the numbers are increasing as more groups are now offering SL classes than in the past. Also there are now more mother-tongue literacy programs being offered.

B = Overall, in terms of the number of immigrants to the province, the numbers are down. However, the coalition still has had many more requests from teachers for materials to use with Bridging Students. In workplace programs, teachers can't afford to differentiate between SL and Literacy students. She recommends an integrated model, in which programs offer both SL programs and literacy, so that they can sub-stream students.

C = Yes, there are more now as there are many second language Canadian citizens, with work histories, who now need assistance with literacy. There is a fairly large contingent of students with this profile. Also, due to the restructuring in the manufacturing sector, there are now large numbers of students who are seeking new jobs or are interested in upgrading.

D = There are lots of SL students now in literacy programs. However, it is not solely an issue of Bridging Students. Rather, it is more an issue of teachers dealing with a diverse multi-level, multi-lingual group. In this sense traditional learners need to adjust just as much as Bridging Students need to adjust. This new diverse mix of students is a dilemma for teachers and they are trying to cope with this new makeup of classes. Still, this diversity should be seen as complimentary, rather than saying to Bridging Students who have been in the country for many years are still somehow different.

E = They don't have any statistics on this issue, so it is impossible to answer. However, Bridging Students are an important group of students who are falling through the cracks between SL and literacy.

F = They don't know, but her best guess is yes. The statistics that they keep on who calls their literacy hotline, don't include information on second language speakers. They have just started to keep these statistics, so more information will be available soon. She thinks that more and more second language students are calling the hotline. The coalition doesn't formally house a directory of SL programs, but they are referring students to the SL classes that they know of. The study conducted by ABC Canada, shows that 77% of the calls are from first language students and 23% of the calls are from speakers of other languages.

2) Why do you think these students are attending ABE / Literacy programs, instead of an SL or FSL programs? (3.1.2)

A = The criteria to qualify for SL classes is quite demanding (i.e. the person cannot have been in the province for longer than 3 years) and this excludes many students. Also there are many immigrant students who have low levels of education in their L1, and they cannot cope with SL classes. For these students, the approach used in literacy programs is more appropriate.

B = She thinks that these students are more interested in attending community based programs, rather than institutional programs. Students are looking for learner-centred programs, which offer short-term assistance for particular needs. Literacy programs tend to be flexible programs, in terms of accessibility, curriculum and times.

C = She thinks literacy classes are more appropriate for these students' needs, since they have been in the country a long time and they do not need the basic survival introduction information about Canada offered in SL programs. However, these students are also concerned with non-literacy issues, such as pronunciation . Thus they fall between the two camps. She has been recommending that students go to literacy programs for reading and writing issues, and then that they also attend pronunciation classes at a SL institution. In the province, there are many more SL places than there are literacy places available, and the waiting lists for literacy programs are much longer.

D = These students attend literacy classes, because they do not have basic literacy skills in their L1. She does not consider educated Bridging Students as appropriate for literacy classes. It should be the same need for all students in the classes and that is for basic skills.

E = Some students are in literacy programs, because they have good speaking skills. Also SL practitioners don't know where to place them. She thinks that there are a lot of Bridging Students who are lost in the SL system. In general, people just don't recognize these students as a distinct group and there is no shared understanding of which courses would be best for them.

F = There are not enough SL programs and the need is high. Students are placed in SL programs, but these programs are usually multi-leveled and their needs aren't being met. Thus, they turn to literacy programs.

O1 = It is often difficult and intimidating for these students to attend institutional programs. They are more comfortable and need the environment provided in literacy programs.

3) In general, how do all students find out about the literacy programs available in your province? (3.2)

A = They find out about literacy classes through a 1-800 line and by word of mouth.

B = Forty percent of the students learn about the network through the LEARN campaign and the rest hear about programs by word of mouth.

C = Through the LEARN campaign and the network's hotline, they give about 4000 referrals per year. Programs do their own outreach, but this is difficult.

D = Seventy-five percent find out about programs from the LEARN campaign. There is also a municipal Blue Book which lists community organizations. The coalition also does some outreach.

E = The LEARN campaign is instrumental and each regional network does its own outreach.

F = They find out about programs through the LEARN campaign, friends, and family.

4) Are students referred to you by other agencies? If so, which agencies? (3.2)

A = Their coalition doesn't actually offer any courses and so she has no data on this.

B = Counselors at various agencies send students their way. They also get calls from psychologists, hospitals, and occupational therapy people. They are now partnering more often with a variety of provincial employment programs.

C = Various training organizations, doctors, counselors, family, friends, employment counselors, and social service workers refer students to the network.

D = Social services, employment agencies, and a variety of non-profit organizations refer students to the literacy network.

E = A variety of agencies refer students to the literacy networks.

F = Social services, human resources, NGOs, job clubs, and hospitals all refer students.

5) Do you ever refer students to a local ESL / FSL program? Why or why not? (3.2)

A = Yes, they try to do this. However, most of the students who telephone the coalition are those who are ineligible for SL classes. (see [question #2](#))

B = Yes, they refer students to SL, if they detect an accent or language problems on the phone. They probe students about their needs, but they tend to screen students by ability to communicate on the phone, and then refer them to SL programs. They often refer students to a local employment project which has bi-lingual counselors. When they refer students to SL programs, there are often waiting lists, and that is frustrating. The coalition is currently updating their referral lists, and working on developing better connections to SL programs.

C = It depends on the students' needs. There are some linked skill SL classes which focus more on writing and reading which they refer students to. Basically, what they try to do is give the students information about all the possibilities, and then let them choose. If pronunciation is an issue for these students, then they are referred to SL programs. There is a directory which lists over 200 SL and Literacy programs, so they do have adequate information about SL programs in the area. However, many students want to stay in the institution they are in, or nearby, rather than shifting locations.

D = Yes, they refer students to the LINC Language Assessment Centre. If they are not eligible for LINC, then students are directed to the school boards. Usually they will call the programs for students and get back to them. It is very difficult keeping up-to-date information on which classes are being offered. However, their coalition does have members on the board from all of the school boards and community groups, which makes it easier to deal with referrals and to keep abreast of program availability.

E = They don't do any referrals.

F = Yes, they refer students to SL programs when they are not ready for literacy. They don't have all the information about available SL programs, but they know in general what's available. If they are newcomers, they are referred to an immigrant settlement agency or to LINC. If they have been here for a while, they are usually referred to a literacy program. In smaller communities, they are usually referred to the community college. Overall, she thinks one central referral agency would be the best solution. Their coalition is doing a longitudinal study of referrals, to see how effective their line is and the interim study is due in February.

O1 = Yes, they refer students to SL programs. However, one big issue is where to refer these students to for resources. There are no resource centres in the area that provide a sufficient amount of SL materials for students to use.

6) Is the assessment of the students' language abilities done at the literacy program sites or are they tested and referred by a different agency? (3.3)

A = Each program does its own assessments.

B = Assessment is done both on-site and by various agencies. She thinks it is well worth developing some material about L1 assessment. It is difficult, as there is no protocol in place for actually assisting the students. That is if they go to a SL program, they are assessed as to their suitability for that program only. SL and literacy practitioners are not really looking at what the student needs and then making a referral. They are just accepting or rejecting them from their particular program.



C = Assessment is done at the programs, except for LINC. Even if the students bring an assessment from another organization, there is no way of telling what that means. It would be nice if there were some standardized criteria for literacy (like Benchmarks). There is some movement in this direction, and work is already being done on a Recognition of Adult Learning Outcomes.

D = All students are assessed on-site.

E = In most cases assessment is done on-site, and in some communities assessment is done regionally. That is some literacy networks do both assessment and referral. Her own feeling is that it would be a good idea to have a central processing / assessment centre, and that way all referrals would be neutral (vs. having referrals made by stakeholders).

F = All assessments are done on-site.

7) Is there any co-ordination in your province between providers of language instruction (ESL / FSL) and providers of ABE / Literacy instruction? What type? Do you think this co-ordination could or should be improved? How? (3.5.3)

A = There is little coordination in the province and there is much work to be done on this issue. Their coalition's mandate is to promote literacy and it is not their mandate to work at the level of coordination. However, there are some needs that should be addressed. The provincial government is beginning to look into these issues.

B = There is good coordination at the ministry policy level. There are also some interdisciplinary classes and programs for teacher training. Their coalition would like to get more involved with the SL groups and she thinks coordination needs to be improved. This is especially important now that there is more pressure to measure program outcomes in terms of obtaining jobs. If the focus is to be on workplace issues, then there is going to be a greater overlap between SL and literacy.

C = Any coordination is rather haphazard, and it is done on a more individual basis than in a formal manner. There are some micro-examples of coordination within certain school boards. Also there is some coordination, in small ways, such as the fact that the same people work on various committees. However, even some large institutions have no internal communication, (i.e. she knows of cases of the SL branch calling the literacy coalition, and the coalition then referring them to a program within the same building, that they were not aware of). Some regional organizations are trying to link SL and literacy at the policy level and there are certain basic structures already established that could be built upon. However, there is also the fear among literacy people, that SL will swallow literacy if they are combined. The fear is that the programs for traditional students will be eroded and literacy programs will be lost.

D = In many ways SL literacy is not recognized as a distinct issue. If the learner has an accent then they are sent to a SL program, which is often not suitable. A major part of the problem is the funding structure which separates the two. To some extent coordination is happening on a local basis, however, the fields are still very territorial, and practitioners fear loss of funding. For her it is clear that it is an issue of basic education. That is, if students need basic education, then they should be in a literacy class, and if they don't then they should be in a SL class.

E = There is very little coordination between the fields. There is some at the local level and it depends on the communities. At the provincial level there is very little coordination and it could be improved. It would be useful to articulate who these people are, and what their needs are. At the moment literacy networks are making SL referrals, but since there is no coordination between the fields, little can be done in terms of program planning.

F = No, there is very little coordination.

O1 = There is not much coordination between the fields and more partnerships are needed. Many SL teachers do not have the basic literacy training that they need to work effectively with these students. Also the two fields need to come together to recognize SL Literacy as a different field, requiring expertise from both specializations.

8) Are you aware of any materials, curriculums, or programs available specifically for Bridging Students with literacy needs?

If yes, do you know of any particularly good materials, curriculums, or programs which have been developed? (4.1.3)

A = The groups that offer literacy are searching for such material. The coalition does have a documentation centre on Adult Education and the Status of Women. She will inquire as to whether or not there is any information on this issue.

B = There is an excellent curriculum called Bookbridges, which combines listening, speaking, reading, and writing. It has just been launched, and it is an excellent model which includes learner support issues. The Job Search Handbook is a good literacy text which has an SL slant to it and People Express is a good series. Some employment programs are running ESP courses with literacy components.

C = Check with Alpha Ontario and the Canadian Multilingual Association for sources.

D = There are lots of SL materials, though she is not aware of any which deal directly with the diversity issue. Good Morning Canada, by the Ottawa Board Education and CBC, is a new package of materials designed for the ABE/ SL learner.

E = She hasn't heard of anything in particular.

F = She doesn't know of any particular materials.

9) Are there any materials, curriculums, or programs for Bridging Students who want to transfer their professional credentials to Canada?

Again, if yes, do you know of any particularly good materials, curriculums, or programs?

(Question Eliminated)

10) Are you aware of any mother-tongue literacy programs running in your area? (3.5.2)

A = Yes, there are many groups who offer programs in Creole, Portuguese and Spanish. Though of course, it is not possible to cover the needs of all first languages.

B = There is one family literacy program which is directed at second language communities. Also, there are some programs in Punjabi and Spanish. However, these programs are outside of the literacy network and so it is difficult to refer students there. They need a list of these programs. There is a greater push these days to connect service providers, and some work is being done in this area.

C = The school boards do offer some mother-tongue literacy programs and some bilingual SL programs. By and large though, students want English literacy and they are not interested in mother-tongue programs. The coalition gets very few requests a year for this.

D = There was one once for Somali women, but they don't know what happened to it. In general, they do not seem to be that popular, and they are expensive to run. It seems that part of the problem is that students are reluctant to go within their own community for help. She thinks this is a problem of confidentiality, and credibility of the courses in the community. She feels that if mother-tongue programs were run from the school boards, this would be better.

E = There are some in the urban centres, though SL programs are doing more and more in this area.

F = No, she is not aware of any.

11) Are you aware of any provincial literacy needs assessments that have been conducted which include Bridging Students' needs? (3.5.2)

A = No.

B = No, they are just aware of the IALS data, which reflects the current immigration policy, that there are more and more educated immigrants, and also more refugees with only basic skills.

C = The local literacy committees have done broad needs assessments, but there is nothing specific to immigrants. A provincial needs assessment, which tried to identify gaps in programming, was done in 1991, but she thinks it is quite outdated. She would be interested in getting funding to do this again.

D = Not answered.

E = The Ontario Literacy Coalition completed a broad program needs assessment this year.

F = She is not aware of one.

12) Do provincial programs attempt to recruit tutors from the Bridging Students' communities? Why or Why not? (4.2.1)

A = Not answered.

B = Yes, some programs do and she thinks this issue is worth exploring.

C = It varies from program to program. Basically programs are happy to get anyone. Usually the tutor training contains a lot of information on cultural sensitivity. Also, more often than not students don't want tutors from their own L1. There are also numerous SL Literacy classes with bilingual tutors for that type of thing.

D = There are not enough teachers available from minority communities and this is probably an issue of recognizing credentials. There is no direct outreach to communities for tutors that she knows of.

E = Don't know

F = It is done from program to program and not centralized, so it would vary.

13) Overall is the issue of Bridging Students in your programs a major or minor concern? Why? (5.1)

A = Not answered.

B = It is a growing concern, as they are getting more and more requests for materials. However, it should be noted that they get a lot more calls for materials on learning disabilities. Also, since immigration is declining in the province, it is not a top priority. Many literacy programs differentiate between students. If the students first language is not English, they are not accepted into the program. This is a way of it not being an issue.

C = It is a growing concern, though it is not yet a major issue. However, if these students' needs are not addressed now, it will become a bigger and bigger issue. Students keep moving from program to program, trying to find the one that addresses their needs. What they are finding is that their programs aren't there.

D = Diversity of students in classrooms is a major issue. This is not solely about Bridging Students. There are Aboriginal, Bridging, francophone and traditional students. It is becoming a bigger and bigger concern.

E = It is a minor concern as it is probably a small number of people. However, their needs should be articulated. SL people say there are lots of students with high oracy and low literacy. There is no shared understanding of these people as a group, either within the SL nor the literacy fields.

F = As programs fill up with SL students, and there are also traditional students working on basic skills, it is not always a congenial mix. Surely we need to know more about this.

O1 = It is a major concern, because the funders are asking them to make distinctions that cannot be made. That is funders are saying 'only do literacy' or 'only do ESL', but the issue is not always that clear cut. The funders need to understand this.

14) If it is rather a major issue, what do you think could be done to assist literacy program providers and teachers? (5.1)

A = Not answered.

B = Stable funding would always help. Also recruitment of more tutors is needed. The waiting lists for various programs need to be examined to see who is on them and why. Teachers need more assistance in how to assist refugees (grieving issues, trauma) and they could use more information about programs available to assist these students.

C = More training in SL and Literacy issues is needed. They get numerous calls from instructors for training. Also more alliances between SL and Literacy are needed. Traditionally the two have stayed in their own camps, but we now need to look at it as a continuum of language issues. Coordination is acerbated by funding issues. That is literacy funders say practitioners can't do it if it is SL, but there are no guidelines to differentiate the two. There needs to be a major policy and funding overhaul in this area. With regard to training, she recommends workshops in both cultural awareness and SL issues. Teachers get training cultural sensitivity stuff, but this isn't a teaching approach. Also there is the problem that, when teachers work with Bridging Students, they can't articulate what the problems are. That is teachers have no background in assessing SL learning difficulties, thus they can't describe the problem, and this complicates re-referrals. A common vocabulary between the two camps is needed.

D = She thinks that people need to work together more, so that partnerships and links can be formed between programs and communities. Workplace programs are good places to start. Also work needs to be done on effective referrals. That is, if students are not suited for their program, then they need to be appropriately re-referred, and not just sent back to the beginning of the process.

E = The whole field would benefit from some literature about these students. People need to be made aware of their needs as they are often misplaced. More practitioner education is needed and this project is a good start in the right direction.

F = Not answered.

O1 = Awareness and recognition of SL Literacy is needed. Funders and practitioners need to discuss and understand the needs of these students and pathways for them need to be articulated.

15) Are there any other comments you would like to make regarding Bridging Students in your program? and

16) Are there any questions or concerns that you have about this survey or project? (throughout report)

A = Not answered.

B = She is concerned about moving to modular base curriculum, imposed from above. She thinks curriculum planning should be kept in the communities, and learner-centred. Bridging Students often need to be at a non-institutional site. Institutions should assist in things like distance delivery. She is also concerned about teacher training; teachers say they want it and then they don't show up for the workshops. She hopes that the momentum of IALS study and the trend to build more ties within the communities, will reinvigorate the field.

C = She is in favour of pursuing these issues further in phase 2.

D = Learning disabilities is a big issue for teachers as the only place to send these students is to private organizations, which charge fees for assessment. Bridging Students usually do quite well in programs, as they are survivors in general, and quite motivated. They also have a strong cultural community base for support, which the other students don't have. In this way Bridging Students are at an advantage. Since they have become integrated to some extent, after so many years, and they don't want to be labeled as immigrants again. What is needed is that everyone needs to adapt to the new diversity. Offering workshops is difficult with budget cutbacks. The programs do not have the resources to give teachers time to attend. Teachers are more interested in clear, easy-to-use, cheap material. They want practical no-nonsense material. Overall, this is a good project and she sees it as a move in the right direction, since the shift to diversity is occurring. Teachers are quite desperate for ways to cope with this. Also, programs need to work together. There needs to be an improved flow of students from one program to the next. At the moment, there is no flexibility and students just stay in one program.

E = She thinks articulating pathways for these students is really important. The next phase should try to state these students' needs and then articulate ways to deal with them. At the moment there is lots of confusion.

F = Not answered.

O1 = She is very glad to see that the NLS is sponsoring research into this area, as it is very important. The two fields need to begin to work together to discuss the issues surrounding the literacy needs of immigrants. These discussions must include the issue of funding.

3) ESL / FSL PROGRAM SURVEY

SECTION 1 - Brief Program Details

1) On average how many students attend classes at your institution?

A = 500

B = Approximately 80 to 100

C = 170

D = 1000

E = 180 - 190

2) Approximately how many classes are available? How many students are in each class?

A = There are 33 classes, with approximately 15 students in each class.

B = There are four day-time classes and two evening classes, with 8 to 16 students in each class depending on the level.

C = There are 8 to 10 classes, with 18 students in each class.

D = There are 42 to 45 classes. The federal stipulation is that they have to have up to 30 on the register and an average attendance of 20 students in their regular stream. In the literacy stream, they have to have 25 on the register and an average attendance of 15 students. The majority of students, especially in the literacy stream, are employed and attendance is a difficult issue.

E = There are 11 classes, with 15 to 20 students in each.

3) What range of classes is available both in terms of level (i.e. from basic beginners to advanced) and in terms of focus (i.e. general language classes, citizenship classes, academic preparation, employment skills, etc.)? (3.1.2)

A = They offer a range of classes from beginner level to TOEFL preparation. They also offer an ESL literacy class, a bilingual ESL literacy class, an ESL computer class and citizenship classes.

B = They offer one ESL literacy class, a beginner, an intermediate, and an advanced class. The evening classes are multi-level.

C = They offer 6 basic ESL LINC classes, plus 2 labour market training classes. One of these is an English for Academic Purposes class and one is a bridge class for college entry.

D = They offer a whole range of classes. They have 7 levels in their ESL Literacy stream and 10 in the regular ESL stream. They have also started a new branch in the Literacy stream, which is termed the "special learning stream." This stream is for those students with no formal experience with literacy in their L1. They are trying to convince funders for translators for this group. There is one class for employment skills.

E = At their centre they just have LINC classes (Levels 1 to 3). At their other centre there are programs designed for employment skills; some of these are language-skills based and some are generic job skills.

4) Are there waiting lists for these classes? If yes, approximately how long do students have to wait, and is there a greater demand for certain types of classes? (3.1.2)

A = It depends on the class. For the bilingual literacy class there is always a waiting list and the computer class has a waiting list.

B = It depends on the class. For the ESL literacy class there is a small, but long waiting list. There is the demand for another ESL literacy class, but they do not have the space available.

C = There is not a formal waiting list as LINC is continuous entry. When they need students they let the assessment centre know, but they are not sent before this. For the LMLT classes there is a wait list of 20 students or more.

D = No, not usually. Occasionally there is a waiting list depending on the location.

E = No, because of the way LINC is functioning. They just notify the A-Linc office when they have space. Also the numbers of students going to A-Linc assessment centre are currently down.

5) How are the classes funded (federal or provincial monies, student fees)? Are your classes funded differently from ABE / Literacy programs? In your province do ESL / FSL programs have to compete with ABE / Literacy programs for funding? (3.5.3)

A = They are funded provincially and federally. The bilingual program is run by the school board. The literacy class is funded provincially, but through a different ministry. Since the programs are administered by different ministries, they are not competing for funding.

B = They are funded provincially and by the school board. The programs get funding by the number of students they have in the class. She is not sure if they have to compete for funding or not.

C = The LMLT classes are funded by UI, and workers compensation. There are a few non-sponsored seats, though UI students have priority. The rest of their classes are funded through LINC. They are not in competition for funds with literacy.

D = Federal and provincial monies are integrated to cover both streams. They are not competing for money with literacy.

E = It is all federally funded and they are not competing with literacy. However, within the next year or so, if the settlement renewal program goes through, then it will be a provincial domain and there will probably be more competition for funding.

SECTION 2 - Referral and Assessment Issues

1) In general, how do students find out about the classes at your institution? (3.2)

A = Students find out about the classes by word of mouth, and through the local newspapers and media.

B = The school board puts out a continuing education brochure and posters, and by word of mouth.

C = They find out about classes through settlement and immigration, and by word of mouth. They are the only full-time program offering work experience, so that is a big attraction for students.

D = Students find out about classes through the A-Linc assessment centre and by word of mouth.

E = They find out about classes through the A-Linc assessment centre, by word of mouth, and some are referred by bilingual counselors at settlement agencies.

2) Are students referred to your program by other agencies? If so, which agencies? (3.2)

A = Some community services refer students, but not very many do.

B = Immigrant services and embassies refer students to their program.

C = Settlement and Immigration and the International Centre refer students.

D = Social assistance workers, and immigrant settlement agencies refer students.

E = Immigrant settlement agencies refer students.

3) Is the assessment of the students' language abilities done at your institution or are they tested and referred by a different agency? (3.3)

A = The assessment is done at the A-Linc centre for those classes. They use an in-house instrument for the rest.

B = Assessment is done on-site.

C = LINC does the initial assessment which is then fine-tuned at their institution.

D = Both. The federal program uses the A-LINC assessment and Benchmarks. The students then take another test when they enrol. They hope that once Benchmarks is up and running, they can scale back this duplication.

E = The A-Linc centre uses the Benchmarks.

4) For on-site assessment what tool does your institution use (i.e. an in-house test, TOEFL, etc.)? Does this tool assess both the student's TL literacy and TL oral skills?

Do you assess the student's L1 literacy skills? What other information do you use to place students in classes? (3.3)

A = They use an in-house test. Writing skills are not formally assessed except to fill out the personal information form. They do not assess L1 literacy, except to ask about the student's previous education level.

B = They use an in-house instrument, which has a grammar and oral component.

B = They use an in-house instrument, which has a grammar and oral component. They do not have that many levels to place students into, so it is not a very sophisticated assessment tool. Also teachers are not given any release time for assessment. They do not assess L1 literacy, but they do ask about the student's previous level of schooling and if they have had any jobs or previous ESL experience in Canada.

C = They use in-house test, with an oral interview. The test has both reading and writing components. They don't formally assess L1 literacy skills, but they do ask about previous education. They also take the Benchmarks assessment into consideration.

D = They use both an oral test and a written test. They don't have a formal tool, to assess L1 literacy. There are questions on the form about previous education, and they use an interpreter to ask if they can read in their L1. They place students in the literacy or regular streams depending on: the amount of formal education they have had, their age, the difference between their L1 and the TL, the number of languages the person has learned, and the amount of stress they are under. They try to find the level and type of class where students are going to feel successful. If the students fall between levels they are given the choice.

E = They do not assess students on-site. Through teacher observation in class, they see if the students are in the right level. They also assess the student's L1 literacy by observation.

5) On average, how many students (or what percentage of students) who come to enrol in your program are non-reader/writers in their L1?

In which classes are these students placed, or are they referred elsewhere? (3.1.2)

A = Most of their students have at least six years of education in their countries of origin. They do offer one literacy class and so students are placed in that class. The waiting list for this class is from 1 to 3 months. They would like to offer more literacy classes, but they do not have the funding nor the space for them.

B = They only have these students in the ESL literacy class. There are seven students in this class and on average 10% are non-readers/writers in their L1.

C = In general their program is at a higher level than this, so they have very few of these students. They would probably refer these students to the other major ESL program in the city. This program has the mandate to accommodate such students.

D = They have about 30 students a year who are non-reader/writers in their L1, and they are placed in the new special literacy class. However, with Bridging Students, they don't know what to do with them. There are not enough Bridging Students to justify a whole class.

E = At a guess, the percentage of this type of student is under 5%. If the student seems to be successful in the class, then they keep them and sometimes they get a volunteer to assist with the literacy work. If not, they send them to another program which has an ESL Literacy class, or to the community college class for Bridging Students. However, this class is only offered in the evenings which is a problem.

6) On average, how many students (or what percentage of students), who come to enrol in your program, have high oral skills but much weaker literacy skills? In which classes are these students placed, or are they referred elsewhere? (2.2.2 and 3.1.2)

A = The situation for the Chinese population, that they primarily serve, is quite the opposite. Most of their students have quite high literacy skills and low oral skills. They have weak oral skills even if they have been in the country for quite some time. In the computer class, there is sometimes a mixture of students who are readers/writers in their L1 and those who are not. Teachers find this situation quite challenging.

B = These students are usually also placed in the ESL Literacy class. At the moment this class has two such Bridging Students. This issue tends to be a problem for Arabic speakers, but the opposite is the case for Chinese speakers. Students are usually placed in classes based on their oral skills. Thus in each class there are some students who have literacy issues.

C = Yes, this type of students tends to show up in the LMLT classes. They could be described as typical Bridging Students. They have all worked in Canada for some time. If they don't have certain levels though, they wouldn't get into LMLT. They might refer them to the ESL Literacy program or they make a guess as to where to put them. They have no guidelines on this. She thinks they are maybe 10% of the students each year.

D = It is very relative. If we're talking about a great range between oracy and literacy, then they get about 15 students a year. They are usually placed in an ESL Literacy class. If their oracy is high and they have some basic reading skills, then they are referred to ABE/Literacy programs. She has found that ABE/Literacy programs require that they can read their names and addresses. It is not easy to place these students.

E = They do not get any of these types of students.

7) Do you ever refer students to a local ABE / Literacy program? Why or why not? (3.2)

A = They would like to refer them to other bilingual literacy programs, but there are very few available. They might refer a couple of students each week to literacy programs.

B = Yes, they try to refer Bridging Students to literacy programs. However, the location of these programs is an issue for some students, and generally once students are in a class they are reluctant to go elsewhere.

C = They refer them to the other ESL program which offers literacy classes.

D = Yes, on occasion they refer Bridging Students to literacy programs.

E = Part of their curriculum is "Life After LINC" which explains to the students the different options available in relation to education. In this curriculum they get information about ABE and literacy classes.

8) Is there any co-ordination in your province between providers of language instruction (ESL / FSL) and providers of ABE / Literacy instruction? What type (conferences together, discussions between the professional associations, shared professional development)? (3.5.3)

A = No there isn't. Even within the school board there are two separate systems.

B = There is very little.

C = The literacy coalition in the province invites participation from ESL practitioners as well as literacy practitioners. Some connections are starting to be made. There are some workshops together at conferences. In the Workplace Language Training Programs, there is a bit of both.

D = No, not very much. This is the result of different people providing leadership in the fields and different approaches to ESL literacy. Her experience with ESL Literacy students is quite different than the typical literacy approach. For example, she doesn't advocate LEA and Whole Language for these students. They need an eclectic approach. There is a difference between traditional literacy students and L2 students' needs, and she doesn't think L1 approaches should be imposed on L2 students.

SECTION 3 - Program and Resource Issues

1) Are there any classes at your institution specifically designed for students who are non-reader/ writers in their L1? (3.1.2)

A = Yes, there is one ESL Literacy class.

B = Yes, there is one ESL Literacy class.

C = No, there are not.

D = Yes, there is one.

E = No, there aren't. But there are such classes at other institutions in the area and A-Linc refers them to these programs.

2) Are there any classes at your institution specifically designed for students who have high oral skills, but weaker literacy skills? (3.1.2)

A = In general this is not applicable. These students would go into regular ESL classes.

B = No, these students are either placed in the literacy class or in regular ESL classes.

C = No, they are sent to another ESL program which offers a literacy stream.

D = If it is a really large difference then there are not any classes. If it is a smaller difference then they are accommodated in the literacy stream.

E = They are referred to the bridging class at the local community college. In general about 70% of their students have higher oral skills.

3) Are students with specific literacy needs placed in general language programs? If yes, how and how well do the teachers of these classes cope with these students (that is, how do teachers cope with the situation when there are one or two non-reader/writers among a class of proficient L1 reader/writers)? (3.1.2)

A = Yes, they are and it is very difficult for teachers.

B = Yes, they are. Teachers try to simplify the written tasks for these students and they try to pair them with stronger writers. Sometimes students are sent to the literacy class for certain times. They also try to bring in volunteers to work with these students.

C = Not often, but sometimes teachers realize this after they are accepted to the class. The teachers may then try to help them with extra tuition. Overall, they try to avoid this situation.

D = No, they are placed in the literacy stream.

E = Some times they provide extra tuition for these students with a volunteer tutor.

4) Besides language based credentials (such as the TOEFL), does your institution run any classes specifically designed to help students get Canadian credentials for work or study (such as high school equivalency, the GED, commercial driver's licences)?

Are there any classes designed to assist students on re-qualifying for Canadian jobs (i.e. students who were perhaps nurses in their country and want to be nurses here)?

(Question Eliminated)

5) Do you feel that the variety of programs offered at your institution is adequately meeting the needs of students who are either non-reader/writers, or who have literacy issues?

Why or why not? (3.5.2)

A = No, she doesn't think they are meeting these students needs. In their annual report they always say that they need more literacy programming, but funding is a major issue. Also it is very hard to find teachers who are trained both in ESL and in literacy. She would be interested in professional development in this area. Even the ABE and ESL departments at the school board don't talk.

B = No, she doesn't thinks they are meeting there needs. Especially because they have continuous intake. Often these students feel overwhelmed when they arrive and they drop out. Also, in multi-level classes the lower students tend to drop out.

C = No, but this is not their mandate.

D = No, they are not meeting their needs. Students with high oracy and low literacy are not having their needs met. Also students with LD (i.e. they graduated from high school and can't read) are not having their needs met. Literacy programs need to follow up on the referrals they make.

E = She thinks the region could use another bridging class offered during the day. But she is not sure if the numbers are there to support it.

6) Are you aware of any particularly good classroom resources or approaches designed to meet the needs of students with literacy issues? (4.1.3)

A = None that she is aware of.

B = The literacy teacher is using the Laubach ESL materials which she likes because with the weekly taping students can see their results. Also, they can each start at their own individual level. She also uses LEA, picture dictionaries, and picture stories. She recommends: Live Action English, A Picture's Worth a Thousand Words, and the Canadian Job Search Binder.

C = Their teachers are trying to become aware of more material and they would like professional development in the area. They would like literacy people to come and do some professional development with them.

D = They have developed packages of materials for low literacy, low oracy students, which they are demonstrating at conferences.

E = She likes the Longman Literacy series, Survival English and picture stories.

7) What changes, either at an institutional or at a provincial level, would you recommend in order to further assist these students? (throughout report)

A = The amount of funding available is always an issue. Also, there needs to be more awareness about ESL Literacy as a distinct group. Awareness needs to be raised, especially among LINC teachers and LINC assessors. More teacher training needs to be provided.

B = More space and funding are needed. At the moment the larger sized classes are carrying the smaller classes. Funders need to realize that ESL literacy classes have to be small. Also, more materials for Adult ESL literacy are needed.

C = The situation is okay since they work in conjunction with a program that has a literacy stream. However, the region is not meeting the needs of students who have work experience and low literacy skills.

D = They need more coordination between the fields. ESL and literacy need to be seen as a continuum and ESL Literacy needs to be seen as its own speciality. Teachers need to use an eclectic approach which is learner-centred. Also as professionals, we need to be more open and flexible to different approaches. There are no experts in ESL literacy, and therefore no one should take a stance. We all have a lot to learn from each other. It is important for practitioners to understand the impact of L1 on L2. It is hard to make people understand the importance of contrastive analysis. We also need to understand how stabilization occurs and look at the causes of it vs. how to cure it (i.e. why and how does it develop).

E = The key thing would be to have a daytime bridging class. Benchmarks is working in the area of ESL Literacy so this should help. They also probably need more materials.

8) Do you think it is worthwhile trying to establish better links between the ABE / Literacy and ESL / FSL programs in your area? If so, how would you recommend doing this? (3.5.3)

A = Yes, of course it would be worthwhile. However, she thinks literacy programs consider themselves as entirely different from ESL. She thinks more communication between the fields is needed, and a willingness to understand each other.

B = She has found that most of their students who have tried to enrol in ABE classes are rejected because their oral skills are too low. There needs to be more communication between the fields with regard to expectations of student levels.

C = Yes, more shared professional development would be useful. Also, they need better understanding between the funders.

D = Teachers and volunteers need to be better prepared to teach these students. They need to understand that Bridging Students are different than L1 learners.

E = Of course more coordination would be beneficial. Joint conferences may be useful. They get some of the literacy teacher material, but she doubts it is a two way street.

9) Are there any other questions or concerns you have about this survey and project?

A, C, D and E = No

B = She has noticed that with the current immigration policy they are getting more students at higher levels. She is not sure if this trend will continue. At conferences she is always searching for sessions which address the issue of ESL literacy, and there is little information available.

4) SETTLEMENT AGENCY SURVEY

1) On average how many individuals does your agency assist in any given month?

A = Not answered.

B = They serve 600 students per month in language classes.

C = 3000 to 5000 people a year.

D = They see about 100 clients per month

2) How do you assess the language and educational needs of individuals who approach your agency? (3.3)

A = They assess the student's needs with a bilingual councillor in an interview format.

B = They refer students to the LINC assessment centre. For fee paying students they conduct on-site interviews.

C = The assessment is informal. If student express a need to work on language then they are referred to the A-Linc Centre.

D = They use the Benchmark assessment tool, which is better than the old A-linc instrument for referrals. They do not formally assess L1 literacy skills, though through the interview they try to get this information.

O1 = Students are referred to Citizenship and Immigration for language assessment and eligibility. Some students go directly to programs.

O2 = For students who take the A-Linc assessment, if they do not pass a preliteracy assessment then they are generally placed in a LINC 1 class. In general, this placement does not take their oral skills into account. Only if there is a huge discrepancy between their oracy and literacy skills are they referred to other (non-LINC 1) classes. There is a bridging class available in the region. In the last four years they have referred about 60 students to this class.

3) With regard to language needs, do you always refer students to ESL / FSL programs, or do you ever refer students to ABE / literacy programs? (2.2.2)

A = Students are usually referred to LINC classes. If they don't qualify for LINC, then they look to the school boards for appropriate classes (but these are not systematically organized, and they don't receive enough information about them. Also the school board classes tend to be too structured in terms of times and content.) They do not have any contact with ABE / Literacy programs. They would like more and they would like to form partnerships with them.

B = They refer students to their own language programs, and they never refer students to ABE / Literacy.

C = It depends on their needs. There are a few ABE programs that are geared to the ESL learner. However, this is a grey area and they don't know where to refer them. It is a problem for those students in the middle. As a conservative estimate, she said she probably had about 200 of these students in the last year.

D = They refer about 5 to 10% of the students to literacy programs for upgrading (GED, Grade 12 -any post grade 9) and about 2% to basic literacy programs if they have been in the country a long time. The rest are referred to ESL programs. There are also ESL literacy classes available.

O1 = One of the school boards offers both ESL and ABE so there is some overlap there.

O2 = If students are not LINC eligible then they are given a resource list of other programs in the province. Some of these are ABE / Literacy classes. With the new Benchmarks assessment, more students will be eligible for LINC.

4) With regard to other educational needs, such as employment training or obtaining Canadian credentials, where are students referred to?

(Question Eliminated)

5) Are you aware of any mother-tongue literacy programs available in your area? (3.5.2)

A = She is not aware of any mother-tongue programs. At the cultural centres there are programs for children to maintain their L1.

B = No, she is not aware of any, though there are classes which use bilingual tutors and she knows of other programs that have bilingual Korean classes. At their centre they have bilingual materials for learning English literacy.

C = She is not aware of any, but she would like information on them if they do exist.

D = She is aware of one mother-tongue program in Spanish.

6) Are you aware of any provincial literacy needs assessments that have been done for Bridging Students? (3.5.2)

A = She is not aware of any needs assessments.

B = No, she is not aware of any.

C = She is not aware of any initiatives.

D = The school divisions have done work about children, but she is not aware of anything about adults.

7) How much co-ordination or contact do you have with local ESL / FSL providers? With local ABE / Literacy program providers? Would you like more contact with these programs? (3.5.3)

A = There is some coordination with ESL, through LINC and the school boards. There is not any with the ABE people and they would like to have more.

B = There is lots of coordination with ESL people through LINC functions and groups. Also all of the NGOs dealing with immigrants meet as well. They have no contact with ABE / Literacy people, but she feels that the needs of their clients are too different from mainstream literacy students to warrant mixing the two.

C = In their case they run a LINC program and so they are very much in that loop and they are in touch with the local Board of Education. There are not enough ESL literacy classes to refer students to. Sometimes the school boards will arrange a special, spur-of-the-moment class if there are enough students. There is not much contact with ABE/Literacy at all.

D = They have a lot of contact with ESL providers, but very little contact with ABE providers. There are now some evening ESL programs at local high schools where there are also ABE programs. So, there is a greater overlap of students (i.e. ESL students go to the school and find out about the ABE classes and join them). She would like more contact with ABE people and she would especially like an updated list of the programs available. A better dialogue between them and ABE/Literacy would be useful.

O3 = There needs to be an intra- and inter-governmental agreement on who should fund what, to meet the learning needs of adult immigrants.

8) Overall, do you think the issue of literacy is a major or minor concern for the communities you work with? (5.1)

A = It is a big issue, especially if Canada wants informed citizens. The areas of concern are: small refugee groups (Kurdish, Somali, Afghan) who do not have the larger cultural networks, women immigrants, and family literacy issues (division of the families once the children learn to read and write and English).

B = It is a minor concern as most of their clients are straight ESL students.

C = One of the biggest problems is Bridging Students who range in age from 16 to 20. They are between regular high school and adult high school, and they can't access other programs because of literacy difficulties. The adult classes are often not geared to this group. At the moment, she just refers them to the Adult High School and they would refer them elsewhere. However, she feels it is a case of passing the buck.

D = She thinks literacy is a pretty major issue for her clients, including a wide variety of problems from GED qualifications to L1 literacy problems to Roman alphabet issues. Students need skills to move beyond basic jobs. Also they need more coordination among the programs. For example, she had one student who had tested at Benchmark 7 oracy and Benchmark 1 literacy, and they sent her to a literacy program. She was termed ESL and sent to an ESL program and then after attending ESL she was sent back to a literacy program.

O1 = Thinks it is a big issue in certain parts of the province. Literacy teachers need more support in this area. She gave an ESL training session, and of the 24 teachers there, 19 were literacy instructors. The issue of Bridging Students is definitely a grey area. A couple of her clients each year are Bridging Student.

O3 = The issue of students who are not literate in their L1 is a primary concern. With the current cutbacks and restructuring of education, it is likely that the issue of SL literacy will become a greater concern in the years to come and it is likely that the gap in accessibility to programming will grow.

**9) If it is a rather major problem, what changes would you recommend to the current situation?
(throughout report)**

A = She wants to see more participatory programs, targeted at the specific communities to meet their particular needs. She finds that students do fall through the cracks as there is no systematic information available about programming availability. Also they are constantly battling ESL funders to open up their classes (i.e. trying to get LINC funders to accept citizens and fund literacy classes), but they refuse. Students tend to shy away from mainstream programs due to language and cultural issues.

B = NA

C = There is lots of ESL available, but there is no coordination between the programs. There is a need for ESL Literacy classes, more advanced ESL classes and something to bridge from ESL to Adult High School.

D = She thinks there should be more English for Specific Purposes Classes, instead of general ESL. That is either courses teaching a specific skill (i.e. reading, grammar) or for a specific occupation.

Bibliography

Acosta, J. (1990) "The Westcoast Reader's ESL literacy article provides a starting point for adult learners", TESL TALK (20)1, 261-266.

Auerbach, E. (1990) "Moving On: from learner to teacher" in P. Bossort, C. Monnastes, and G. Malanarich (eds), Literacy 2000: make the next ten years matter. Burnaby, BC: Douglas College.

Auerbach, E. (1992) Making Meaning, Making Change: participatory curriculum development for adult ESL literacy. McHenry, IL: Centre for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems Inc.

Barker (1992) Adult Literacy in Canada in 1992: initiatives, issues and imperatives. Ottawa, ON: Prosperity Secretariat.

Batell, E., Blackwell, M., and Darville, R. (1981) Handbook for Teaching ABE/ESL "Bridge" Students with a Selection of Reading and Writing Materials. Vancouver, BC: Vancouver Community College.

- Bell, J. (1993) "Discussion of Kerfoot and Wrigley: the teacher as bridge between program and practice", TESOL Quarterly 27(3), 467-475.
- Bell, J. (1995) The Relationship Between L1 and L2 Literacy: some complicating factors", TESOL Quarterly 29(4), 687-704.
- Bell, J. and Burnaby, B. (1984) A Handbook for ESL literacy. Toronto, ON: OISE Press.
- Belifore, M. and Burnaby, B. (1995) Teaching English in the Workplace. Toronto, ON: Pippin Publishing and OISE Press.
- Boyd, M. (1991) "Gender, Nativity and Literacy: proficiency and training issues" in Adult Literacy in Canada: results of a national study. Ottawa, ON: Statistics Canada.
- Bogdan, D. (1995) The Importance of First Language Literacy in the Acquisition of a Second Language. Toronto, ON: Canadian Multilingual Literacy Centre.
- Burnaby, B. (1992a) "Official Language Training for Adult Immigrants in Canada: features and issues" in B. Burnaby and A. Cumming (eds) Socio-Political Aspects of ESL. Toronto, ON: OISE Press.
- Burnaby, B. (1992b) "Co-ordinating Settlement Services: why is it so difficult?" in B. Burnaby and A. Cumming (eds) Socio-Political Aspects of ESL. Toronto, ON: OISE Press.
- Citizenship and Immigration Canada (1994) Into the 21st Century: a strategy for immigration.
- Crandall, J. (1993) "Professionalism and Professionalization of Adult ESL Literacy", TESOL Quarterly 27(3), 497-515.
- Crandall, J. and Peyton, J. (eds) (1993) Approaches to Adult ESL Literacy Instruction. McHenry, IL: Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems Co, Inc.
- Crandall, J. and Pharness, G. (1991) "Whole Language Approaches in Adult Literacy" in Launching the Literacy Decade: awareness into action. Alberta: International Reading Association. ERIC Document 348 890.
- Cumming, A. (1990) "The thinking, interactions, and participation to foster in adult ESL literacy instruction", TESL Talk 20(1), 34-51.
-

- Cumming, A. (1991) "Uses of Biliteracy among Indo-Canadian Women Learning Language and Literacy", The Canadian Modern Language Review 47(4), 697-707.
- Cummins, J. (1979) "Linguistic Interdependence and the Educational Development of Bilingual Children", Review of Educational Research 49(2), 222-251.
- Cummins, J. (1986) Empowering Minority Students: a framework for intervention", Harvard Educational Review 56(1),18-36.
- d'Angeljan, A. and DeKeninck, Z. (1992) "Educational Policy for a Culturally Plural Quebec: an update" in B. Burnaby and A. Cumming (eds) Socio-Political Aspects of ESL. Toronto, ON: OISE Press.
- D'Annunzio, A. (1995) "The Training of Bilingual Tutors in an English as a Second Language Program", Adult Basic Education 5(1), 3-13.
- Darville, R. (1989) "The Language of Experience and the Literacy of Power" in M. Taylor and J. Draper (eds) Adult Literacy Perspectives. Toronto, ON: Culture Concepts, Inc.
- Delpit, L. (1991) "The Silenced Dialogue: power and pedagogy in educating other people's children," in M. Minami and B. Kennedy (eds) Language Issues in Literacy and Bilingual/Multicultural Education. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Review.
- Dixon, C. and Lyons, S. (1995) A Teacher's Guide to Enhancing Literacy for Learners with diverse language and cultural backgrounds, who are studying in Adult Basic Education Programs. Victoria, Australia: Adult, Community and Further Education Board.
- Edelsky, C. (1991) With Literacy and Justice for All: rethinking the social in language and education. London: Falmer Press.
- Grabe, W. (1993) "Current Developments in Second Language Reading Research" in S. Silberstein (ed) State of the Art TESOL Essays: celebrating 25 years of the discipline, Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Gunderson, L. (1991) ESL Literacy Instruction: a guidebook to theory and practice. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Hammond, J., Wickert, R., Burns, A., Joyce, H., and Miller, A. (1992) The Pedagogical Relations Between Adult ESL and Adult Literacy. Sydney: Commonwealth of Australia Language and Literacy Centre.
-

Ho, L. (1992) "Both Sides Now: toward a multicultural framework for adult education in English-speaking Canada" in B. Burnaby and A. Cumming (eds) Socio-Political Aspects of ESL. Toronto, ON: OISE Press.

Hornberger, N. (1994) "Continua of Biliteracy" in B. Ferdman, R. Weber, and A. Ramirez (eds) Literacy Across Languages and Cultures. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Jones, S. (1992) "Literacy in a Second Language: results from a Canadian Survey of Everyday Life" in B. Burnaby and A. Cumming (eds) Socio-Political Aspects of ESL. Toronto, ON: OISE Press.

Kaplan, R. (1988) "Contrastive Rhetoric and Second Language Learning: notes toward a theory of contrastive rhetoric" in A Purves (ed) Writing Across Languages and Cultures: issues in contrastive rhetoric. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Klassen, C. (1992) "Obstacles to learning: the account of low-education Latin American adults" in B. Burnaby and A. Cumming (eds) Socio-Political Aspects of ESL. Toronto, ON: OISE Press.

Klassen, C. and Burnaby, B. (1993) "Those Who Know: views on literacy among adult immigrants in Canada", TESOL Quarterly 27(3), 377-397.

Klassen, C. and Robinson, J. (1992) An Approach to ESL Literacy Assessment. Victoria, BC: Ministry of Advanced Education Training and Technology.

Leki, I. (1993) "Twenty-Five Years of Contrastive Rhetoric: text analysis and writing pedagogies" in S. Silberstein (ed) State of the Art TESOL Essays: celebrating 25 years of the discipline. Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Lenning, L. and Richardson, D. (1996) Guide to Using Theme Units with an ABE/ESL Literacy Class.

McGroarty, M. (1993) Cross-Cultural Issues in Adult ESL Literacy Classrooms, ERIC Digest, Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Metro Toronto Movement for Literacy (1992) Literacy Needs Assessment: final report. Toronto, ON: Addison Consulting Services, Inc.

Miramontes, O. (1987) "Oral Reading Miscues of Hispanic Good and Learning Disabled Students: implications for second language reading" in S. Goldman S. and H. Trueba (eds) Becoming Literate in English as a Second Language. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publish Co.

Ontario Literacy Coalition (1996) Field Development Needs Assessment: final report. Toronto, ON.

Rado, M. and D'Cruz, J. (1994) English Literacy Provision for NESB Immigrants. Canberra: Bureau of Immigration and Population Research, Australia Government Publishing Service.

Raimes, A. (1993) "Out of the Woods: emerging traditions in the teaching of writing" in S. Silberstein (ed) State of the Art TESOL Essays: celebrating 25 years of the discipline. Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Rigg, P. (1990) "Using the Language Experience Approach with ESL adults", TESL Talk 20(1), 188-199.

Sampson, G. (1990) "Teaching English Literacy using Chinese Strategies", TESL Talk 20(1), 126-127.

Santopietro, K. and Peyton, J. (1991) "Assessing the Literacy Needs of Adult Learners of ESL", ERIC Digest, Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Sauve, V. (1990) "Socio-political concerns of ESL in Canada: a discussion paper", TESL Talk 20(1), 52-67.

Shields, J. and Matheson, S. (1990) "Whole Language and Then Some!", TESL Talk 20(1), 213-223.

Silberstein, S (ed) (1993) State of the Art TESOL Essays: celebrating 25 years of the discipline. Alexandria, VA: TESOL

Statistics Canada (1991) Adult Literacy in Canada: results of a national study. Ottawa, ON: Ministry of Industry, Science and Technology.

Statistics Canada (1996) Reading the Future: a portrait of literacy in Canada. Ottawa, ON: Ministry of Industry.

Swain, M., Lapkin, S., Rowen, N., and Hart, D. (1990) "The Role of Native Language Literacy in Third Language Learning" in S Norris and L Phillips (eds) Foundations of Literacy Policy in Canada. Calgary: Detselig Enterprises Ltd.

Tollefson, J. (1985) "Research on Refugee Resettlement: implications for instructional programs", TESOL Quarterly 19(4), 753-764.

TESL Talk (1990) Special issue on ESL Literacy, 20(1).

Wallace, C. (1988) Learning to Read in a Multicultural Society: the social context of second language literacy. New York, NY: Prentice Hall.

Wallerstein, N. (1983) Language and Culture in Conflict: problem-posing in the ESL Classroom. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.

Wiley, T. (1993) "Discussion of Klassen and Burnaby and McKay and Weinstein-Shr: beyond assimilationist literacy policies and practices", TESOL Quarterly 27(3), 421-429.

Wrigley, H. and Guth, G. (1992). Bringing Literacy to Life: issues and option in adult ESL literacy. San Mateo, CA: Aguirre International.

Zuss, M. (1994) "Value and Subjectivity in Literacy Practice" in B. Ferdman, R. Weber, and A. Ramirez (eds) Literacy Across Languages and Cultures. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
